



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 15

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

20 March 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Yesterday there was a query raised about a notice of motion brought in by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition in view of my ruling earlier on a point of privilege. I have looked into that and it certainly seems to be almost exactly as in the quotation from Maingot that I read out and it is certainly in order.

Statements by Ministers

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:
On behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Justice and the Department of Municipal Affairs, I would like to inform the House of Assembly of the transfer of E.M.O, the Emergency Measures Organization, from the Department of Justice to the Department of Municipal Affairs.

The rationale for such a move is as follows:

One of the main functions of the E.M.O. is planning and preparation for disasters. This involves close liaison with Municipal Government in the preparation, testing and implementation of emergency and disaster plans.

In addition, most natural disasters which occur in Newfoundland have an immediate impact upon municipalities. That

was particularly true in Bishops Falls when the Exploits River flooded its banks and was also the case in Labrador West when the power outage occurred with consequent wide-spread damage.

In actual fact, the Director of E.M.O. spends more time in day-to-day communication with Mayors and Councils than officials in the Department of Justice.

In addition, in all four Atlantic Provinces, Newfoundland was the only Province where the Department of Justice had responsibility for the operations of the Emergency Measures Organization.

It is considered that a transfer of the E.M.O. to the Department of Municipal Affairs will provide a more rational approach toward meeting the needs of both the Province and the municipalities in a mode which is separate and distinct from the general mandate of the Justice Department to provide law enforcement. That approach is in line with the experience of other provinces in Atlantic Canada.

Both the Minister of Justice and the Department of Municipal Affairs feel that the move will send a clear message to municipalities that the Department of Municipal Affairs is directly interested in emergency planning and response. It will also rationalize the delivery of the service to municipalities and ensure a level of accountability to the Department of Municipal Affairs and will serve to establish good lines of communication between the municipalities and the Department to which they will be accountable in the emergency planning area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we thank the minister for giving us a copy beforehand. I believe, at first glance, that this is a sensible move. There will be times when consultation will be required with the Department of Justice, but most of the day-to-day work, I believe, is in conjunction with municipalities and the department which the minister represents would seem to be the logical one to carry on those duties.

On a related matter, I would suggest to the minister that he look closely at an idea which has been pushed by the Town Council of Pasadena, I believe, which has a representative, or did, on the Federation of Municipalities, which is that each municipality have an emergency measures plan in operation. I know many of them already do, but the idea was to try and have a standard plan with such modifications as might be necessary for the peculiarities of a particular community. If it is an area where flooding is most probable that is one thing, if it is an area where forest fires are most probable that is another, for example, or if it is an area where a power outage in Winter is a problem, that is another. But there should be certain common elements contained in any emergency measure plan of a municipality. I believe that it is a very wise idea and I would ask if the minister would consider

having his department support that concept, which has been promoted by at least one councillor from the Pasadena Town Council, of encouraging each municipality to have a standard emergency measures plan drawn up before the emergency occurs.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank the hon. minister for the copy of his statement and would add that this seems to make a lot of sense in terms of the administration of the Emergency Measures Organization, to bring it to Municipal Affairs. We have two concerns, though, that we would like to mention: One, is whether the minister might not consider in continuing administrative moves to bring Ground Search and Rescue under the purview of the Department of Municipal Affairs instead of leaving it to Justice, which was a move that was made not too long ago and there are still some questions about the ability of that structure to work effectively.

The other concern I would like to bring to the attention of the minister on this issue of emergency measures is that there has been an issue raised at City Council, in St. John's, in the past couple of months about American warships visiting St. John's and the possibility of their carrying nuclear weapons. There is a question that in this Province the Department of National Defence does not have

what it calls Nuclear Emergency Response Teams - the closest one is in Halifax - and in the event of a nuclear accident in Newfoundland, there is no way of dealing with it. That is a concern I intend to raise with the minister and would like to put on the record at this time.

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that officials of my department, together with officials from Environment Canada and Corner Brook Pulp and Paper Company Limited, today signed an environmental compliance schedule. This compliance schedule fulfills a very important requirement of the modernization agreement reached between Kruger Incorporated and the federal and provincial governments in 1984. As part of the modernization agreement a sum of money in excess of \$12 million was allocated to be spent on achieving environmental compliance at the Corner Brook Mill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:
The compliance schedule addresses the three important areas of water effluent, air emissions and solid waste. In terms of water pollution this schedule addresses a number of important improvements aimed at reducing the amount of suspended solids in the water effluent. Significant in this respect are the change from wet to dry debarking in the wood room and

a number of new installations to collect and save pulp fibers in various effluent streams.

Emissions of soot and particulate matter, which have resulted in complaints from Corner Brook residents in the past will be reduced significantly by the installation of new pollution control equipment and improved controls on furnaces. In addition, heat recovery units will reduce fuel requirements of the mill.

Solid wastes will be inventoried and any wastes identified as potential problem sources will be dealt with accordingly. At this stage, however, there are no problems with solid wastes that have been encountered.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying that this important step forward has been achieved in a spirit of complete co-operation between the company and government agencies. It is encouraging to see the responsible attitude that the company has taken in addressing environmental concerns. I am sure that with this co-operation the environment of Corner Brook and surrounding area will improve substantially over the next two years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight); I am pleased to stand to respond to this Ministerial Statement.

MR. MATTHEWS:

What, is he on the campaign trail?

MR. SIMMS:

You did a good job on On Camera last night, by the way.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I thought it was not bad, yes. I am not sure everybody agrees.

MR. EFFORD:

Everybody does not agree.

MR. J. CARTER:

Oh, oh, oh?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, everybody is going to have their opportunity to have their say in public on those very important issues, I am sure.

Any of us who have spent any time in paper towns or cities, whether it be Corner Brook, Grand Falls, and to a lesser extent Stephenville because of the location, have always been aware that they were in a paper town, a paper city, usually from the sulphur that was contained in the air. Now, the minister did not address directly what impact it might have on sulphur emissions. There has been a lot of improvement made over the years, in any event, in that area, but I understand from the content here it would probably be improved. And while from a nostalgic basis we will probably miss that distinctive sign that you are in a community, the smell which indicates the good smell of money. When I was there if anybody criticized it I would say, Look, it is the good smell of money. The same with the fish guts on the beaches that we used

to see at one time but we see much less of now, that was the good smell of money as well.

But anybody who has ever looked at a map of North America connecting health problems to industry would have to be struck by things such as the amount of cancer incidents in areas where there is high industrial activity and high industrial pollution; things such as the sulphur emissions from well blowouts in Alberta have been documented as creating health problems over a period of time in those areas. So there is absolutely no question, apart from preventing detrimental impact upon the fishery, the salmon fishery in the rivers around these mills, for example.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

If I could just by leave for a few minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. BARRY:

From the point of view of preventing a detrimental impact on the health of individuals, I commend the minister and his department for proceeding in this direction. It is going to mean something of importance to the health of the people of Corner Brook over a period of time. Who knows how long it takes for these detrimental impacts to occur? But

they do occur, and it is absolutely essential that we minimize industrial pollution wherever we can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the minister for providing me with a copy of his statement. We wish to go on record as being very supportive of any efforts to reduce pollution either in water or in the air, or, quite frankly, any forms of pollution that detrimentally affect the environment. There is only one point that we would like to raise with respect to this statement and that is although it indicates work being done by Kruger, and we laud that, there is no indication here where they in terms of the standards that we wish to enforce province-wide. In other words, are they complying with the standards now? Obviously, there is some improvement needed. When this is complete, will they comply with our standards? Will they comply with standards generally acceptable across Canada? In other words, although there is an indication something is being done, it would have been helpful if the minister could have given us a final indication of where Kruger sits once all these improvements are done. Maybe somewhere in the future he can give us more information on that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr.

Rideout) I would like to welcome to the visitor's gallery twelve adult education students with their teacher, Bill Smith, from the Avalon Community College in St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, over the past number of years, my department has been involved in lengthy and often frustrating discussions with the federal government in efforts to develop appropriate management plans for the Atlantic salmon resource.

The Atlantic salmon has become a very controversial species as a result of domestic competition among recreational, native and commercial fishing interests. In addition, there is an international fishery in the waters off the coast of Greenland. Increased pressure from recreational lobby groups, together with conservation requirements, have resulted in drastic cutbacks in the commercial salmon fishery of this Province. The Port aux Basques area has been closed to salmon fishing altogether through a mandatory buy-back of licenses. Part-time fishermen throughout the Province have also been forced out of the fishery in this manner. The commercial season opening date has been rolled back two and a half weeks and the Fall fishery now

ends October 15th. The combined effect of these measures is to reduce the viability of the fishery, especially in Southern areas of the Province where revenues are down significantly.

My department has opposed these reductions which were implemented primarily to improve stocks in mainland rivers by reducing interception of salmon by Newfoundland fishermen. For their part, the Maritime Provinces have agreed to phase out the commercial fishery and are now placing priority on the development of recreational fisheries. However, some commercial fishing continues in certain areas of Nova Scotia and along the Quebec North Shore.

Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Fisheries I assure the people of this Province that I will do everything in my power to ensure that the commercial fishery in this Province will not be sacrificed in order to reallocate the resource to other user groups. The commercial fishery is a vital part of the fishing plans of nearly 4,000 Newfoundland fishermen and contributes significantly to income in certain areas. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the recreational fishery is an important contributor to tourism related revenues and to the quality of life of many Newfoundlanders and it is my view that, with a co-operative approach, the commercial and recreational fisheries can coexist in this Province. Our salmon stocks are in good shape and should further conservation measures become necessary, I am sure that both groups would be willing to make sacrifices for the long-term benefit of the resource.

Mr. Speaker, as a demonstration of

our support for a continued and viable commercial salmon fishery, I am presently working with the fishing industry, especially the fishermen's union to convince the federal government to adopt the following resource management policies:

(1) Transfer Policy For Commercial Salmon Licences:

The present system permits transfers only to family members. Over time this will lead to a reduction in the number of licences. This policy is unacceptable and must be expanded to permit transfers to other commercial fishermen, thereby maintaining the number of licensed fishermen.

(2) Tagging Of Atlantic Salmon:

Although tagging is being implemented as a conservation measure, the benefits of this programme are questionable and it is suspected that this could lead to further restrictions on commercial salmon fishermen through the introduction of tag quotas. Therefore the Province opposes implementation of a tag quota system in the commercial fishery.

(3) By-catch Issue:

By-catches are inevitably associated with most directed fisheries. In the case of salmon I agree with the practice of releasing live salmon caught in non-salmon gear types. However, the mandatory dumping of dead fish caught in this manner serves absolutely no purpose from a conservation perspective. While I believe that efforts should be made to minimize by-catches, I believe that commercial fishermen

should be allowed to retain dead salmon which are legitimate by-catches.

(4) Opening Dates For The Commercial Fishery:

During the early 1980's resource constraints led to a two and a half week roll back in the opening dates of the commercial fishery. Now that stocks elsewhere are recovering and our rivers are in good shape, further cutbacks are unacceptable. My view is that the season should revert to its original opening dates.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, the commercial fishery is critically important to our commercial inshore fishermen because of its occurrence in early Spring prior to the cod and capelin fisheries. In recent years the decline in the seal fishery has increased the relative importance of salmon in many areas along the Northeast Coast and Labrador.

I am committed to ensuring that the commercial salmon fishery is preserved and its contribution to fishermen's incomes is maintained. The measures I have outlined represent current efforts on our part to protect this vital component of the Province's traditional inshore fishery.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that I will be leading a delegation from the Fishermen's Union and the Fishermen's Salmon Committee to meet with the federal minister to present officially this Province's position to him, in case he has not heard it strongly enough before, on Monday afternoon, in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I am glad, and I am sure the fishermen of Newfoundland will be happy to learn that the government has finally decided to come down on the side of the commercial salmon fishery. We welcome the initiatives outlined in the minister's statement that will be taken by him to ensure that the commercial salmon fishery is allowed to continue.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that there is a very strong lobby, a very, very strong and, I suppose, vicious lobby being mounted in North America and in certain parts of Europe against the continuation of the Newfoundland commercial salmon fishery. I have had the privilege of attending meetings in other parts of Canada and in parts of Europe where this lobby became very much in evidence. In fact, the American lobby, for the benefit of the House, was headed, and I believe is still headed, by one of the most powerful men in Washington, a gentleman who is very, very close to the U.S. President. In fact, I believe he is the President's chief advisor on matters pertaining to the Atlantic salmon. This gentleman's name is Dick Buck, former Vice-President of the Pepsi Cola Company of the U.S., and he is a very wealthy and a very influential person.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have already allowed the federal government to take too many rights

away from the commercial salmon fishermen. We have, over the years, seen a whittling away, a gradual chipping away of the salmon fishing season. For example, only this year on the Northeast Coast, which of course takes in my district, the closing date for what would normally be a very lucrative Fall salmon fishery has now been changed to the point where it is almost uneconomic. It just does not make sense anymore for a Northeast Coast fisherman to gear up to prosecute the Fall salmon fishery.

Of course, as the minister points out in his statement, the fishermen on the Southwest Coast of the Province have lost the commercial salmon fishery altogether, they were bought off. I suggest to the minister that if the Government of Newfoundland does not take some firm action to protect the rights of our commercial salmon fishermen, then it is only a matter of time when the commercial salmon fishery in Newfoundland will go the way of the commercial salmon fishery in New Brunswick, in parts of Nova Scotia and other provinces.

We know now, of course, that in Nova Scotia we have the presence of very wealthy American sportsmen, internationally known figures, who own cabins and real estate on the Miramichi River. And I am not discounting for a moment the importance of that to the tourist industry. Of course, it is very important. Sports fishing is important to the Newfoundland tourist industry. But, Mr. Speaker, my concern and my interest at this point in time, and I think it should be the interest - I believe it is - of the minister and the government, is to protect the rights of our

commercial salmon fishery. These are the people who need the dollars that are there, certainly more so than some of the people who benefit from the sports fishing fraternity.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER:

Could I have leave for a few minutes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. W. CARTER:

The matter of policing, Mr. Speaker, is very important. We hear a government in Ottawa that will talk about conservation and salmon enhancement. For example, there have been millions of dollars spent on the West Coast of Canada for salmon enhancement, in fact, I believe probably well in excess of \$50 million for the past few years.

In Newfoundland, we have a policing problem. We have seen, while they in one breath spend money on salmon enhancement programmes, cutbacks, for example, in river guardians and the policing of those rivers.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I commend the minister for the initiative. I think it is a little too late. I think he should have done it before, but there is no point in belabouring that point. I hope he succeeds in convincing his counterpart in Ottawa that Newfoundland fishermen must continue to have the right to

fish salmon on a commercial basis.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. MORGAN:

He would make a fine Leader of the Opposition.

MR. FENWICK:

I think so too, actually. He would make a good Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the initiatives taken here and, in responding to them point by point, I can agree with one, three, and four. I have some questions about number two. Number one, the transfer policy on commercial salmon licence: I can see that being absolutely necessary, if we do not expect a number of people pursuing it, it will just decrease continuously. And obviously we support that.

The by catch issue, the idea of keeping the dead fish certainly is the most intelligent move. And hopefully will be able to do, although I do suggest there may be a difficulty in terms of enforcement of it. But we certainly support that.

The opening date of the commercial fishery as well, Mr. Speaker. We can support that considerably as well.

The question of tagging, however, is one that we would like the minister, if he gets an opportunity in the future, to discuss more of what the uneasiness is with regard to the commercial tagging of it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. FENWICK:

That is really the only problem because in your statement you say, the benefit to this programme are questionable. We thought that there may be some benefits put forward by the people who advocate the tagging programme.

One or two other items that I would like to raise with regard to salmon. In my opinion, as long as the tagging programme is in, I think, it is absolutely essential that it also be mandatory for the sports fishermen as well. My experience last Summer was the quotas on the sports fishermen were grossly exceeded in a lot of cases, and without a tagging system there was no way to impose that quota on the sports fishermen. That was a right that they had really beyond the commercial fishermen, because the commercial fishermen were there tagging it. But I think it is extremely important that tags be introduced for them. And I personally would support that.

The last comment I would like to make is the one that - I am repeating the comment made, I think, by the Secretary of the Salmon Protection Association of Waters of Newfoundland. I am not sure of the fellow's name. There was a letter I received a few days ago, and one of the things that he was complaining about -

MR. W. CARTER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

- is what my hon. friend from

Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) said, the reduction in the number of wardens on the rivers. And one of the suggestions he had in the letter is one I would like the government opposite to think about, what is the possibility of combining the federal wardens to police the salmon rivers with the game protection people we have? Maybe looking at an integrated force that protects all of our resources in this Province. Because we have problems of policing all of them. And having alternate kinds of forces seems to me a duplication of the facility and it is something we should do. Maybe some of the ministers afterwards would like to respond to that suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! At this stage I would like to welcome a group of students from Mount Pearl Senior High with their teachers, Daryl Penney and Dorothy Sullivan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn). I wonder if he would inform the House whether there is any recent information relating to the status of Wabush Mines and the concerns that have been expressed arising from the decision of the company to

purchase concentrate from within Quebec, I think from Quebec Cartier? There were some questions raised about the long-term viability of Wabush Mines in light of these developments.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the purchase of 28,000 tons of concentrate from Quebec essentially was for a pilot project to determine whether the manganese content in the ore at Wabush could be reduced by combining the Wabush ore with the Quebec ore. That would never have been a long-term process because there are bodies of ore in the Wabush area that they could use if that system works. So that was a kind of a one shot deal, it had really no bearing on anything but the fact that Wabush wanted to decrease the manganese content of their ore because some of their customers were concerned about the manganese contained in the concentrate that was shipped out from Wabush. So that was a one shot deal and that was the only reason it was done. It was just a pilot project to determine whether they could reduce the manganese content in the ore for some customers.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

I think the minister should take a

look and see whether the employees at Wabush Mines have the same equanimity with respect to this situation as does the minister. In a related matter, would the minister inform the House with respect to the statements made in the process of the negotiations, that have commenced now, I understand, with IOC employees, some references to the fact that what is involved in these negotiations is a battle to save the town? Could the minister respond to that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, without creating any undue concern in the Western Labrador area, there are obviously things that have to be done at the Iron Ore Company of Canada and at Wabush Mines to decrease their cost per ton in order for them to be competitive on the world market. In the Wabush case, as the hon. member knows, two of its US customers have ceased buying concentrate from Wabush, or pellets from Pointe Noir, and therefore the amount, the tonnage that they will produce or that they plan to -

MR. BARRY:

Wabush or the Iron Ore Company?

MR. DINN:

Wabush in this case. I will get onto IOC later if the hon. member wishes.

In the Wabush case where their capacity is 6 million tons, if they could produce 6 million tons then the cost per ton would be down substantially. This year it is somewhere around 4 million tons and they are attempting to sell

some of their ore on the open markets. They had been successful last year in doing some of that, but their preliminary indication is that they will be down to somewhere around 4 million tons. Therefore, because of that, the cost per ton rises, because they have the same carrying charges, if you will, so they have to somehow decrease their cost per ton, that is number one. Number two, they have to try to get their level of production up closer to the 6 million ton capacity.

In the case of IOC, they are still in a very serious situation with respect to competing on the world stage. Their markets are a little bit more secure in the sense that a lot of their customers are Canadian, etc., and they have been into the world market before. They do not have, for example, the manganese problem that Wabush has. So they are in a little better situation but they still have to cut costs in order to become a little bit more competitive so that they can compete on the world market stage. That is what the situation is.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

In light of this uncertainty arising both from the Wabush problem and from the negotiations now underway at IOC, would the minister inform us what has the government, of which he forms a part, done to ensure that there is alternative employment for the people of Wabush and Labrador City who have tremendous amounts of

anxiety and uncertainty created every time there are some indications that there are problems at either one of these operations?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think as members of the House of Assembly we should not raise the problems that Wabush and IOC have in Western Labrador to a point where it causes more concern on behalf of the people down there. From the point of view of what has government done, we have met with Wabush and they have presented us with certain items that they would like for us to have a look at.

IOC the same way. A Committee of Cabinet met with the Iron Ore Company of Canada and they presented, and we have discussed, some of the problems that they have. We are currently now having a look at what, if anything, government can do with respect to making sure that the operations are maintained in Labrador West. We have also had some discussions with some of the customers of the two companies to see what the outlook is for not only this year but ensuing years. So we are currently looking at some of the suggestions they have made to us and of course we will be dealing with them. But I would not want to go any further than that in the House because, as I say, I do not want to raise the anxiety level of the people in Western Labrador.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There have been two serious mishaps at Gander International Airport in the last few days. We have seen in the last couple of years a lot of cutbacks at airports; MOT has cut back on overtime, it has cut back on services manpower and facilities, I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) first of all, if he is on top of this situation with his federal counterpart, and if in fact he will assure this House that these mishaps are not the result of these federal cutbacks in manpower, facilities and services that have occurred in the last two years?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman realizes, of course, coming from the community of Gander, that matters dealing with the airport in Gander are those of a federal nature and perhaps they might be better addressed by relatives of his in another assembly. But as it relates to dialogue between myself and the federal minister, it is an ongoing process and certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Province's stand is on record. I appeared before the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Freedom to Move documents, on deregulation and reregulation in a number of industries and expressed the Province's concern, as well as the concern of most Canadians, that the good things about deregulation and reregulation would not be overshadowed or negated by a lack of safety controls and the necessary

procedures put in place to make sure that the Canadian public air travel and road travel were protected through the implementation of stringent and very strict safety regulations. And that is the position we have taken and that is the position we will continue to take.

MR. BAKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker: I did not expect a flippant answer from the minister. He has, after all, some responsibility for transportation in this Province. I would like to ask him, again, will he now, in the next short while, in the next day or so, contact the federal minister and insist on an enquiry as to whether cutbacks in staff, in weather office staff and any other staff at Gander International Airport was part of the contributing cause to these two mishaps? It is very unusual to have two in a row like this.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, there is an ongoing process between my department, through our Transportation Policy Division, and the federal government in dealing with these matters. I am sure, although I have not checked this morning, that that dialogue has already taken place between our department and the federal government to do, from our perspective at least, an assessment of the situation,

obviously understanding that it is out of our jurisdiction. But certainly, if there are concerns that need to be expressed, we will be doing so in due course.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). The minister, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, is aware that at the ERCO phosphorus plant at Long Harbour first-aid courses and cardiopulmonary resuscitation courses are obligatory. In addition to that, at that plant at Long Harbour there is a doctor on staff there two days a week and a nurse five days a week.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member is making a speech.

MR. CALLAN:

A good one too, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Let me ask the Minister of Labour, these safety and medical facilities at the ERCO plant at Long Harbour, are they there because it is a requirement of government, a government regulation, say, under the Occupational Health and Safety Division of his department or were they forced there by the union on site? Why are they there?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, there is no requirement that I know of on any company to have a medical doctor, or a nurse for that matter, on staff. Some companies in the Province have. ERCO is one that I know of that has had a doctor on staff, and they have also had a nurse on staff. But as far as a requirement to do it, I think it is an initiative by the company. First when they started operating there their incidence of industrial disease was pretty high. They have been responsible corporate citizens and they have taken this action, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware, on their own initiative. They are to be complimented on that.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the minister is aware, I am sure, that Newfoundland Energy at Come By Chance has indicated to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) that they do not intend to carry out such a practice.

Let me ask the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that there is no union at Come By Chance, in view of what is happening at ERCO, and in view of what happened to the medical facility at Come By Chance - it is an eight hour facility - will he be pressing his colleague, the Minister of Health, and other colleagues, to try and bring up the Come By Chance medical facility to at least a twenty-four hour clinic status, especially once the refinery gets started up? Because obviously it will be

a twenty-four hour operation, as all refineries were, and as the refinery was at Come By Chance back twelve or thirteen years ago when they had a twenty-four hour cottage hospital.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, everybody in this House knows that my hon. colleague, the Minister of Health, is quite capable of dealing with matters and does not need any pressure from me or any other hon. member in the House, to carry out his job. I am sure he is doing a good job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell), and ask him is he aware, or had he been made aware of the situation with respect to Northern Lights Bakery Limited in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, who are presently under, and have been since December, considerable economic pressure from the federal Department of National Defence by way of the fact that they have now established a bakery unit in direct competition to the local entrepreneur? Has he been made aware of that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

No, Mr. Speaker. Certainly I have not received anything personally on it, but I will undertake to check with the officials in the Consumer Affairs division of my department and find out whatever information we have, if any, and get the information to the hon. member as soon as I can.

MR. KELLAND:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I gather some correspondence has gone to the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and myself from the local businessmen up there. I did not know that your colleague had not passed it along to you yet.

However, what I would like to say, and ask the minister, is would he be prepared, under these following circumstances - for example, the Northern Lights Bakery has been employing thirteen people up there but now it has been reduced to ten because of this economic pressure from a federal government department - is he willing to give a commitment at this stage of the game for that to be fully investigated and perhaps make representation to Ottawa? Because what is happening now is the Northern Lights Bakery is caught in a squeeze between two federal departments, where the Department of National Defence has brought in a bakery unit in direct competition to them, and the Department of Public Works, Canada, is trying to increase its annual rent from \$20,000 to \$34,000 in one jump. Would the minister undertake and give a

commitment to investigate that completely - I will provide him with copies of the correspondence - and give a commitment also to make representation, following the investigation or immediately, to the federal departments to cut out this unfair competition to a local entrepreneur who is in danger of closing down by June?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly undertake, once I get all the relevant information, to make representation to whomever is it necessary to to try and resolve the matter to everyone's satisfaction. As soon as I get the information I will proceed with that.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) referred to chiropractors as a dangerous bunch of quacks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Would the minister advise if the member's statement reflects the government's position on chiropractors?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. TWOMEY:

I am sure the hon. member knows that this is a democratic House, and as a democratic House each and every one of us is entitled to one's own opinions. And if I could stifle that I think that you would be the first to challenge me as a member of this House and as a minister of this government because you really believe in democracy.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I gather, from the charming answer of the Minister of Health to the question, that it is not the position of government to refer to chiropractors as a dangerous bunch of quacks. I ask the minister will he be issuing a statement so that chiropractors, their clients and the numerous people who are writing to the newspapers for clarification, will know just where this government stands on chiropractors?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

If I were to undertake that burden and that duty I think I might be up here every day and occupy the whole time allotted to us to make Ministerial Statements. Someone can get up every day and make a charge and you know that we would not challenge the opinions of everyone every day of the week.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have to commend the Speaker on recognizing members on this side of the House who have a right to ask questions in this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and I would like to commend him on his Ministerial Statement this morning. The management of the Atlantic salmon fishery in Newfoundland certainly is a concern to everyone over here. Mr. Speaker, in the statement by the minister he made reference to the Southwest Coast of Newfoundland, the LaPoile district, with the closure of the salmon fishery there a couple of years ago. That portion of the Province was closed to the commercial salmon fishery by the then federal Liberal government and I noticed that in the Ministerial Statement-

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is now making a speech. Would he please pose his question?

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, I am leading up to my question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's preamble is too long.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries when he meets with his counterparts in Ottawa on Monday, will he raise the issue of the closure of the Southwest Coast salmon fishery with the minister to try and have that fishery reopened to fishermen in Newfoundland?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I can understand the concern raised by my colleague from LaPoile. Obviously the closure of the commercial salmon fishery on the Southwest Coast of the Province has created a lot of difficulty for his constituents. With the rejuvenation of the Atlantic salmon stocks over the last few years, I can see absolutely no reason why the Province would not adopt a very sensible and intelligent and worthy recommendation coming from my colleague and I can assure him that we will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Mines and Housing (Mr. Dinn). Several constituents of mine, in the district of Eagle River, are receiving letters from the Minister of Mines and Housing saying that they are in arrears in their payments and they have to evacuate their house, get out. It is a difficult time for them to get out of their house and go out in a snow bank or go back to their old condemned houses. A lot of the problem stems from the fact that this government's development policy, is to get people who are on social services off social services and get them on UI. When they are on UI they have to look after their mortgages themselves and find out that they cannot pay them. The question I want to ask to the Minister responsible for Housing in this Province, his being the landlord in Labrador, will the minister undertake and say to this House that no people will be evicted from their houses in Labrador and that his officials will take every precaution possible to ensure that negotiations can be undertaken to see that the people remain in their houses and that some financial arrangement can be made for them to pay back Newfoundland and Labrador Housing?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon.

member for his question. It is a very difficult situation. When a person on social assistance is in a house constructed through the Rural and Remote Housing programme, the Department of Social Services pays the rent or that portion of the mortgage that would have been paid by the person in the house. When they go to work, a policy that has been in place for years is that 25 per cent of income is paid towards the mortgage of the house and the remainder of that mortgage is paid on a 75/25 basis by the federal and provincial governments. That is in place throughout Canada. That is in place in the Northwest Territories, in the Yukon, in Labrador, in Newfoundland and in all the other provinces in Canada. It is something that we have a lot of concern about. As a matter of fact, we introduced a heating subsidy last year to attempt to assist some of the people who were having difficulty with their mortgages. Mr. Speaker, it becomes an impossibility to change a regulation of that nature under the National Housing Act when you have signed an agreement to subsidize on the basis of a 75/25 per cent. The people the hon. member is talking about some of them pay, Newfoundland is the only province in Canada where they pay sometimes like only 16.7 per cent. The formula that we have is not 25 per cent or 30 per cent, as in other provinces, because we have a range, depending on income, from 16.7 per cent up to 25 per cent. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has a specific case in mind he could relay that family's name to me and I will have it investigated, because I understand his concern. It is a very difficult time of the year to do anything like as proposed, as the

hon. member just mentioned to me was proposed.

MR. HISCOCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

There have been a lot of people having to move out of these houses because they cannot afford to maintain them.

There is another programme that the minister is responsible for and that is the RRRAP programme and we have one person looking after the full Coast. Will the minister undertake to have another employee of his department stationed in Southern Labrador so that they can fix up the homes that they have and not have to go into \$60,000 and \$70,000 mortgages, which they cannot actually afford to pay anyway, particularly in view of the bad fishing seasons of the past couple of years? Could his department, being the landlord, show a little bit more compassion toward the occupants of these units?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member wrote me respecting the appointment of another employee down on the Southern Labrador Coast. We have done a complete investigation as to the number of requests for RRRAP versus the number of requests in other areas. We have determined that the employee doing the job down there is doing an adequate job, and we want to make sure that those people who qualify

for RRRAP get the RRRAP funding. But the investigation indicated that the employee there doing the job was doing a sufficient job.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). It is concerning the situation facing the Victorian Order of Nurses having to lay off staff because of not being awarded a contract by the St. John's Home Care Programme. In view of the fact that the St. John's Home Care Programme itself was established by government, is entirely funded by government, and on its Board of Directors are representatives from the Department of Health and the Department of Social Services, will the Minister of Health intervene on behalf of the Victorian Order of Nurses and have this decision changed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health, in its wisdom, has felt, as is right and appropriate, wherever humanly possible to give the people of a community, of a town, of a city, the right, as far as possible, to govern their own health services. That has been done in a very democratic way. The board that governs the St. John's Home Care Service has representatives from all the institutions in St. John's, one from the Department of Health and one, I believe, from the

Department of Social Services.

They have been given the mandate to run these services and they are doing an extremely good job. Every now and again they have to make a decision on how they are going to run things. I am sure that you, being a prudent and wise legislator, would say we should make the best use that is humanly possible of our money. They have submitted a contract and it is open to bids. There are many groups, I believe, that can bid on it, the Victorian Order of Nurses, Jack and Jill, and, I believe, Upjohn. It is an open bid.

There was a fourth position, whether they would go ahead and form their own team of nurses under direct control of St. John's Home Care Services. The bids were submitted. They decided it was wise and prudent, from the point of view of spending money, to form their own cadre of nurses and run the services. It is not a matter of the government intervening. It is giving the people the right to run their affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to follow up on the comments the minister has made. The input that a representative from his department gives, as a member of the Board of the St. John's Home Care Programme, in view of comments by the Director of the Programme that they would be

looking for a non-union company, would the minister admit that this represents a policy by his department and other departments of this government to contract out and to go with services that are non-union?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

No, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:

A few minutes ago I made a statement in this House, and I believe in democracy just as much as you do. If we interfered we would be charged with using dictatorial power to impose the will of government. That is not my belief. That is not my policy, and it is not the policy of this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) concerning the Sea Cadet base proposal in Stephenville. I would like to ask him has he had any meeting in the last number of months and if he has had those meetings, could he tell us the results of his efforts in lobbying, and also could he tell us what correspondence he has written on the subject in the last

number of months?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I responded to a written request for answers about that yesterday. I assume maybe the hon. member was not here and did not receive that. Maybe he will apprise himself of the information which I have already provided.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

No leave.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table two reports, one is the annual report of the Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission of Newfoundland and Labrador. The other one is the annual report of the Department of

Social Services.

MR. YOUNG:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a list of tenders awarded other than the lowest tender from December 1 to December 31.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. YOUNG:
Boy, you get it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Are there any further Reports By Standing And Special Committees?

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, yesterday during Question Period and again in the Late Show a question was asked by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) relative to some snow clearing activities. And they were specific questions. He identified two particular days and asked questions, why the snowploughs were not on the road on those days? And, subsequently, Mr. Speaker, and Your Honour is

going to have to make a ruling on this later of course. He referred to my colleague, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) as a liar. But that is to be dealt with by Your Honour at a later date.

I would just like to point out, Mr. Speaker, to answer that question because I never had he answer readily available. On March 16, was the first day the hon. member referred to. I have the report from the department which says, 'The weather was reported clear and cold, minus 21 degrees Celsius, all pavement dry, and driving conditions reported good'. So I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether there was a need for a snowplough to be on the road that particular day.

On the second day he mentioned which was March 16, where he said, 'There was no ploughs on the road'. I would just like to give the House, and I am sure he will read Hansard or he will find out somehow, that the plough left Bishop's Falls at 5:30 A.M. and proceeded to Gander. It left Gander again at 8:00 A.M. and proceeded back to Bishop's Falls. It left Bishop's Falls at 10:00 A.M. and proceeded back to Gander. At 12:30 P.M. it left Gander and went back to Bishop's Falls. At 4:00 P.M. it left Bishop's Falls and went back to Gander. At 7:00 P.M. it left Gander and it went back to Bishop's Falls, and on the way back stopped for an hour to assist the R.C.M.P. with some flooding problems that were occurring at a particular part in the road.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it necessary or felt it necessary to put that on the record that the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans, as usual, failed to get his facts

straight and, in fact, should apologize to the House for asking such a question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion 2.

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

0 0 0

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order before you do.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

I am not sure where the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) has gone but he made a statement in the House yesterday to the effect that he had been misinterpreted in remarks which he made to the press in respect to the young boy who had escaped from the Boys' Home, having been a hardened criminal. Members of the press have come to me and informed me that there was absolutely no question about what the minister said. I see the minister is coming there now. I wonder if the minister would be able to elaborate on that point. Members of the press have come and said that there is absolutely no

doubt the minister went on for some length emphasizing on that theme.

MR. SIMMS:

Why did you not ask him a question in Question Period?

MR. FUREY:

Because he raised it as a point of order.

MR. BARRY:

We had other questions and it was raised as a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I do not think that is a point of order, but by leave, if the hon. minister does want to comment on it, he can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I think I acknowledged yesterday - if I did not I intended to - that, in fact, if that is what I said, and I did not dispute it, I did not put up any argument about it, but I tried to explain yesterday to try to clarify that that was not my intention to say that, certainly, and I think I explained very clearly why I would not make that type of statement. I was not prepared to put up any great argument. I realized when I made the clarification that there were at least seven or eight microphones in my face. I realize it was quite easy for any member of the press to check what I had actually said. Inasmuch as I do not think the person who wrote the article intentionally misquoted me, I also pointed out clearly that, if I said that, it certainly

was not what I meant at all.

I was trying to point out to the press that the juvenile in question, while not a hardened criminal, in fact had committed offences and had been charged by the court. So I guess it was a matter of trying to clarify what it was that I wanted to say. I guess there is really not much more I can add to it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

A matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A matter of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, it relates to the same matter. I believe it is quite a serious matter. I want to just give notice now that I want to reserve my right to raise this matter as soon as I get the appropriate documentation because, Mr. Speaker, the understanding I got from the minister then is quite different from the one we got in the House yesterday. Now, we are going to pursue this supposing we have a point of privilege every single day until we get the message across that we have to be able to rely on the information ministers are giving us in this House, whether it is the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), or anybody else. So I give notice that, at the earliest opportunity, as soon as I get the documentation to substantiate the point I want to raise, I would want to hopefully have the indulgence of the Chair to raise that point of privilege at that time.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, the

hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) has given notice about it and we will deal with that at the appropriate time.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, I am just waiting for members to settle down. There is no great concern.

MR. SIMMONS:

You always get this kind of excitement when you rise.

MR. LUSH:

That is right.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday in talking to this particular bill and pointing out and substantiating how it was that this government had sunk us to \$4.5 billion in the hole of public debt, and had indicated that we got in this position through mismanagement,

through political patronage and pork barrelling in particular. Once one engages in patronage and political pork barrelling, quite obviously, that is not spending money wisely, it is not spending money in order to reap the greatest return.

I served warning yesterday that we on this side of the House would be looking particularly at the expenditures of the Department of Transportation and the Department of Municipal Affairs. I wanted to repeat that this morning because the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) is now coming back, so I wanted to repeat that. I did indicate how we were satisfied certainly with two departments in the past year with the equitable way and the fair way and the just way in which they engaged in their activities, particularly the Department of Forest Resources and Lands.

With Department of Forest Resources and Lands we were very pleased, illustrating again how fair minded the Opposition are. It is not a matter of saying that is the natural thing for them to say, that there is patronage and pork barrelling. That is proof positive. We commend the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) for the fair way in which he allocated the jobs in these forestry related job creation programmes. We commend him.

We also commend the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) with his job creation programme and the fair way in which he allocated his money.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is proof positive that the Opposition just does not say those things as a

matter of course. It is just not something they say. When we say that, we have grounds on which to lay these charges, Mr. Chairman. So now I am suggesting that we are going to be watching the two major departments. The two major departments in the past that got involved in pork barrelling were the Departments of Municipal Affairs and Transportation. There is no question, Mr. Chairman, in the past, but I am willing to say to let bygones be bygones and we will look at this year's expenditure. I mention that because I see monies in this bill for these two departments. Municipal Affairs is getting close to \$30 million, I believe, and the Department of Transportation is up around the same area. So we are going to be looking at these two areas.

Mr. Chairman, there was a question I raised with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) yesterday and he did not answer this particular question, or at least I did not hear it. We were talking about Special Warrants and suggesting that the government was making excessive use of Special Warrants. They were abusing the privileges given them by this House with respect to the use of Special Warrants. This can be very insidious. Number one is the excessive use of Special Warrants, a clear demonstration of disdain and contempt for the House of Assembly. It demonstrates a government that has become arrogant and a government that has lost all respect for this Legislature.

Mr. Chairman, I asked the minister yesterday with reference to one particular Special Warrant. There are several. You can ask questions on just about every one

of them because a Special Warrant is issued in the circumstance when the Legislature has not voted for the monies and they cannot find any countervailing savings in another department or under another head, so they issue a Special Warrant.

The one that I questioned the minister on yesterday was the one related to the Department of Career Development, dated February 27.

I have just forgotten exactly all the identification of it, but the minister will know the one that I am talking about. February 26, I am sorry, not February 27. Money was requested by Special Warrant. There was close to \$3 million requested by the Department of Social Services for salaries at trades schools throughout the Province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the question that I asked is how come that could not have been budgeted for. You know, the schools were there. There were no new schools. I do not suppose there were any new employees. The schools were in place. The staff was in place. They had to be paid.

How was it that the government could not budget for these salaries? That would seem to be an easy thing to budget for. We know how many people are there. We know how many staff members there are. We know what the salaries are. That would seem to be a strange situation indeed, that we could not budget for these salaries.

Now, the minister has not answered that question to my satisfaction. How come his officials or he could not budget for something that

seemed quite straightforward. We know how many trade schools there are in the Province. We know how many people are working there. Why was it that we could not budget then for that salary group?

Or is it again a case of trying to cook the books? I do not know where it came from, Mr. Chairman, but it seems to me I heard that there was a deliberate attempt to cutback on that particular budget by 5 per cent or so so that the minister could indicate that he was going to arrive at a certain deficit naturally. He was going to arrive at a certain deficit knowing that that would not be the case, that he was going to have to issue Special Warrants. That would certainly make the books look good for this year.

In any event, if the minister would address the question all suspicion would be gone and people would be happy. If the minister could indicate why it took place because it seems like a very straightforward situation. Maybe it is not straightforward at all. But it would seem to the normal, average person that certainly we should be able to budget salaries for instructors in our trades schools or any other schools. It is not as if there was any great change during the year. We know how many are going to be there. It would seem obvious to me that the minister should be able to project these figures accurately for any year, the salaries of any of our educational institutions. We should be able to project the salaries for that particular year.

So, maybe the minister can address why it was, in that particular instance, that particular Special Warrant, somewhere close to \$3

million, was needed by the Department of Career Development.

Mr. Chairman, I do have that particular warrant now. It was February 26, under subsection (2) of section 28. It was asking for the sum of \$2,950,000. That was it. It was for salaries at Fisher Technical College, Bell Island Vocational School, Burin Vocational School, Carbonear Vocational School, and the whole list.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like for the minister, in speaking sometime, to address that particular issue, to explain to the House why it was that that particular Special Warrant became necessary for salaries to instructors at vocational schools, why it was that this could not be foreseen and why it was that this could not be predictable. It seemed to me to be a very normal thing to be able to predict the salary package for the Province in any of our institutions. So maybe the minister could address that for us.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Chairman, sometimes you wonder if you are wasting your time. However, we have to assume we are not.

I already answered the question that was raised about Special Warrants. Are we abusing the system or not? Of course we are not. I have already answered that. But I guess I will have to answer it again if I have the material with me and I feel

certain I will be able to find it here if I keep talking long enough. Yes, I found it.

In 1983/84 total Special Warrants, \$134,651,700. That was in 1984, say \$135 million rounded off. In 1984/85 Special Warrants \$56 million so on and so forth, let us round it off to \$56 million. So \$134 million in 1983/84; \$56 million in 1984/85; \$52 million in 1985/86; and 1986/87 \$33 million.

Now it seems to me fairly clear there is a trend there and the trend starts up here a number of years ago, and the next year it is a bit less, and the next year it is a bit less and the next year it is a bit less. I would interpret those series of facts as showing a downward trend.

Now the hon. member in his remarks is strongly suggesting there is an upward trend and he has a right to suggest whatever he wants. The only thing is his suggestion does not accord with the facts. I have pointed out those facts once before and I point them out again and I have no doubt that I will have to point them out sometime in the future. Because quite often things are said but they are not really either understood or taken in, assimilated or processed or whatever. But as I have said before, you can bring a horse to water but you cannot make him drink. Anyway, I put that aside.

Now, on that particular warrant, the hon. member quite rightly said I think it was something over \$2 million in Career Development and Advanced Studies. Now the whole amount was not for salaries as the hon. member suggests. He may have misunderstood that. I do not have the breakdown with me unfortunately but I will certainly

get it at the earliest opportunity, but a certain amount of that was for student aid. There was an appreciable amount of additional student aid deemed desirable during the year that should be given to students. It was not anticipated at the time of the budget. It was not actually planned at the time of the budget, so it was not a case of not giving a sufficient amount in the budget at the time but as the year went along, for good reasons, the Department of Career Development felt that they should increase the amount of aid given students and they therefore requested an increase in the amount of funding. They did not have enough countervailing savings in other parts of the department so we had to go for a Special Warrant to top up that particular part of the vote.

In addition, the member is quite right, there were additional salary monies needed. The member will clearly remember, I am sure he will clearly remember this, that there was a large amount of reorganization on the vocational and trade school structure last year. There was an indepth study done. There was a lot of reviewing and reassessing of tasks and the courses and so on and so forth and when that very detailed process and a very necessary process to keep our vocational schools up to scratch and make them relevant in this day and age with this rapidly changing society were are in, when that exercise was completed, it was determined that there were additional salary units needed that were not anticipated at the time of the budget because, of course, the exercise was not completed at the time of the budget. One could not really foretell with any accuracy

what the exercise would turn out to be in terms of needs for salary monies.

So when the task was completed, sure enough, there was a shortfall. It was not an anticipated shortfall. I do not think it would be reasonable to say that we could have anticipated it because the upgrading need was greater than we thought. Having determined that that need was there, it would have been totally irresponsible for us not to fill in that need by voting the extra monies. That is what the department again did. They came and asked for top up salary votes and it was given. So I hope that that will clarify it.

I think the hon. member may well have just not appreciated that there was that quite appreciable need that we did not know was there. We knew there was going to be a need there, as was obvious in this exercise, but when we looked at it there was a much greater need to revamp and to update and to make more relevant the vocational school system than we imagined there was when we started out the exercise.

I rather think that we probably might well have hesitated to start out on the exercise if we knew how much revamping, modernization and updating there was there but, having done it, it was certainly money well spent.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, very much, Mr Chairman.

In my few remarks on Interim Supply I do not profess to be any sort of a financial expert whatsoever but I do have, I suppose, some basic grasp of what happens in our Province from a financial point of view and from other points of view as well.

It strikes me that in the two years I have been here in the House of Assembly and watching the performance of the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), both in the House and, of course, out of the House in his role as a Finance Minister, I find it just a little perplexing that the manner in which he explains financial actions of government often leaves me less knowledgeable than I should be. In other words what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that when the Minister of Finance explains a certain point on any financial action, or reaction for that matter, taken by government, we should be leaving the Chamber at that point with much more knowledge than we had before, but I find that the minister seems to have a particular facility for being able to say something or mouth words that really do not say very much at all.

He will often, I find, resort to his well renowned ability to speak witticisms with the hope that it will pass off or get him by any one particular sticky problem or sticky question being put to him by members of the House. As I do admire and respect the hon. minister and I do enjoy his wit in the House, I thought perhaps I could give a little analogy that somehow or other explains my view of the minister and his ability to function as the Minister of Finance, in my opinion.

In my opinion it strikes me that

the Finance Minister of this, or any other province, is somewhat - if I can say so first, if I can say that he does not really seem to understand, in my humble opinion, financial matters to any great degree, although he is a Minister of Finance. So, as he is a doctor by trade, perhaps I could make some inexpert reference to my analogy in more medical terms.

What I would like to say is that the Minister of Finance, of this or any other province, strikes me as being roughly similar to the prostate gland in a human being. He takes that as a compliment quite obviously. I am no medical expert and without going into any great detail I can say that the prostate gland in a human being is that which is responsible for causing certain reactions and for giving forth certain things of value.

By that method and in that analogy, the Minister of Finance, when he rises slowly in the Chamber, and gives forth certain supposedly valuable information on the financial conditions of the Province, he is similar to the prostate gland. He is responsible for delivering and having the ability to deliver financial information of some value and for taking certain financial actions which are of benefit to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I look at him with due respect to his somewhat advanced years as compared to other members of the House and there is nothing wrong with that. He is a venerable gentleman of wit, humour and intelligence. I visualize him, perhaps, even with the benefit of Geritol, when he takes his little break every now and then, slowly rising in his place until he reaches a fully erect

position facing all of us, at which time he spouts forth his financial information.

Now, the thing is, as with the prostate gland in the human body, age and a lot of other factors eventually take their toll, as they obviously have taken their toll on the Minister of Finance, my respected colleague in the House. So that in his deliberations and in his advice to his colleagues in government he sometimes appears to have lost his effectiveness. He is not able, for example, to accept a Liberal premise that if you could reduce, let us say, retail sales tax, that he would indeed stimulate the economy of our Province. We have been saying that for years. The government seems to want to turn a deaf ear to that sort of thing. Perhaps, as I said, his advanced years, and probably the strain of so many years in office, has taken its toll on him.

For example, he could take a lesson from the retail trade itself, when they have their weekend sales, '\$1.44 Days' and things of this nature. They know that the money a retailer will receive will be less per item. I think that is fairly obvious. Consequently, people become stimulated and more interested, and they will go out to these sales and they will make more purchases. By volume purchasing, of course, they will increase their overall revenue, which is the whole name of the game.

Now, we can take that and translate it into the effects of the retail sales tax, when the government brought that up to a terrible level of 12 per cent, although granted there were some concessions given to people who

produce handicrafts in our Province and as a stimulus to the tourism trade and so on. Why can the minister not, in seeking ways and means of raising money to carry on the business of government, accept and pass on to his colleagues that a reduction in the sales tax, which is part of the overall price of any item to which the tax applies, would have the same effect to some greater or lesser degree as a retail sale.

If the tax was reduced immediately to 10 per cent, as we have recommended on this side of the House, at least 10 per cent, then there would be greater impetus and greater incentive for more people to go out and spend their hard earned dollars and take advantage of almost a tax sale. Where they would reap smaller benefits from each individual item, they would gain in the long run by a considerable amount. It would stimulate buying. It would stimulate the economy. It would stimulate employment, and we all know we need more employment in this Province. So I cannot understand why the minister has some difficulty in accepting that good Liberal principle as they have accepted many other principles of ours. Why can he not accept that particular principle and put it into effect, reduction of the sales tax, a generation of more revenues by way of taxes, because people are spending more, there would be more employment, more life in the economy, and the benefits would be a hundred fold multiplied by a hundred fold.

So, I find that again, as I get back to my little analogy of the prostate gland, the minister being the prostate gland of the government, when, as I have said,

he rises in his place until he reaches his full erect position as the minister, facing all of us and delivers or attempts to deliver, in a very, very short spurt of enthusiasm, I suppose, that the minister, of course, is subject to the inability to deliver fully on his mandate as the Minister of Finance, and like the prostate gland, of course, has to retire and retract and go back to where he was before. Then what should be the object of the minister's affection, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, then has to quietly withdraw to a corner of Canada and hang her head in disappointment at the minister's inability to deliver one more time.

Now, having said that to the hon. minister, and having mentioned retail trades, it is obvious, of course, in government, as it is in the human body, that the prostate gland or the Finance Minister, in the analogy, must have something to back him up. So what does the Minister of Finance in the Peckford Administration have to back him up? Who provides the drive for the prostate gland? Who provides the drive for the Minister of Finance? And we would have to say that the hon. the Premier, of course, is the driving force.

How much time do I have?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. KELLAND:

I will continue at a later time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, just on one thing, if the Minister of Finance wants to raise funds in a substantial way, we would arrange to buy the member who just spoke for what he is really worth and sell him for what he thinks he is worth. We would make a real fortune. Because the hon. gentleman standing up and making such a silly, stupid speech clearly shows, unfortunately, not the media, they are not there, so I know what I am going to say will not be covered by the media. They are not in the gallery, but unfortunately they are not there to listen to such trash because it would quite evidentially show how ineffective the Opposition really are. The Opposition members have been so caught up in their own little activities, knifing their leader in the last few days, they have lost their total effectiveness in the House. They do not have more homework done on scrutinizing the spending of \$753 million by this government. They had someone stand and talk about the prostate gland. To compare the minister to that and get on with such trash in the House. How ineffective does the Opposition now come to. The reason being they are so taken up with their own affairs they do not have time to do their homework and properly scrutinize government spendings.

Now, for example, Mr. Chairman, even if they did do their homework and took the time, of course there is still the question of their capacity and ability to be able to scrutinize this government's spendings anyway according to last year proceedings through the Committee stage.

There was no mention of the way the economic is looking in the Province. No mention of what is going to be spent by the government to help boost the economy in the different parts of the Province. For example, this interim bill there is \$16 million on the construction of roads; \$8 million on roads and bridges; rehabilitation; bridges and causeways, \$3 million; highway transport, \$12 million, and on we go, forest roads, \$2 million. All this is going to be done and tendered, by the way, which is not even mentioned by the Opposition, tendered before June 30 of this year. So we are going to inject into the economy some works programmes which is obviously going to help the economy in many parts of the Province. And, maybe, just maybe in Labrador, where the member is the member for the Happy Valley area.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Naskaupi.

MR. MORGAN:

Naskaupi.

Now, Mr. Chairman, he stands up in the House and he says the minister has lost his effectiveness. Oh, is this not funny. When I turn on television and I see the Chairman of Caucus tearing into Mr. Barry, the Leader, in fact, almost calling him a liar. Then I see Mr. Barry coming back and, rightly so, correcting these kinds of untruths. And I am inclined to believe the Leader of the Opposition. I am inclined to believe the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

There is no question. The fact is that the -

MR. BUTT:

He should have their heads on a platter.

MR. MORGAN:

And I hear rumblings now, Mr. Chairman, that they are even going to go so far on Monday morning as to call a special meeting to oust the Leader of the Opposition, in his position as the Leader of the Opposition. Can you image that, Mr. Chairman? And he talks about government members and the minister being ineffective. What government really needs in this Province is strong Opposition. Government welcomes strong Opposition. It welcomes effective Opposition. But we do not have that.

Now maybe, just maybe the NDP Party is coming on, just maybe. The way the things are going with the Liberal Party, the way they are eating themselves alive publicly and otherwise, do you know something? It is almost unbelievable that we are here in the House and it is like watching a soap opera. They come in the House and they sit there and they pretend everything is fine. Let Mr. Barry ask a few questions and let Mr. Simmons ask a few questions. They sit there so prim and proper. Meanwhile, the rest of the Province is saying, 'Did you see Mr. Barry on last night? Did you see Mr. Decker on the night before? Did you hear Mr. Baker on Open Line, when he said the caucus was ready to disintegrate, 'the Liberal caucus was ready to disintegrate', was the quote. Then Mr. Rowe said, 'Well do you not have someone to take over from Mr. Barry? You have knifed Mr. Barry? Do you not

have somebody to take over Mr. Barry?' Mr. Rowe said, 'Well, they have asked me to run?'

Now, can you imagine how desperate they are now getting to go back and look for a man who was already there and they knifed before. Mr. Rowe said, and I was quite amused, Mr. Rowe said, "What? Me go back there to be knifed again the second time? I still feel the knife wounds," he said.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is indeed relevant because we are talking about effective Opposition and how ineffective they are. This is all relevant because unless we get in place, and there are no by-elections yet, but unless we get increased members from the NDP Party in this House, we are not going to see an effective Opposition. I mean with the kind of things that have been said so far even by the official spokesman on finance matters, and I have lots of respect for my colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), one of the best men in the Opposition, in fact I would welcome him to this side of the House. I would personally welcome him over here. I would welcome him to our side of the House any day of the week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Now for the rest of the fellows over there, I have much reservation, with the exception of one or two, especially the man who got up and refers to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) as a prostate gland. Can you imagine? Just imagine that. The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) did not mention what is happening in Saskatchewan today and their

budget problems, having to lay off at last report 1,500 people from the civil service. Looking at the problems of British Columbia with their budget and their economy, looking at the problems in PEI and Nova Scotia next door, no mention of all of that. The fact is the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has been doing a hell of a good job managing the financial affairs of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Now the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), I mean I know he is vying quite hard among his colleagues for the job as Opposition House Leader. But the thing is against him. I listened this morning to Mr. King, a Liberal Party supporter, Mr. King called Open Line this morning from Wesleyville -

MR. BARRY:

A former Conservative by the way.

MR. MORGAN:

A former Conservative many years ago and joined the Liberal Party when I lost the nomination in Bonavista North for the PC Party. He supported me and I lost and he became a Liberal.

Now, this morning he said, "Why do not those fellows over there take some aspirins and clear their heads, those caucus members? What a fine man Mr. Barry is, what a fine job he is doing." I say today very sincerely, I commend the job that the Leader of the Opposition has been doing over the last two years in this House. I sincerely hope today is not going to be his last official day as Opposition Leader, but I understand from my friend from St.

John's East (Mr. Long), I understand that the move is afoot to even further disintegrate the caucus over there. They are going to take a move to oust them if the executive of the Liberal Party makes a decision on the weekend to call a convention whether the member for Mount Scio stays on as Leader of the party or not. The caucus is going to decide to put in place a new Opposition Leader. So one of the friends of the group that is knifing the leader is going to get the extra \$15,000 a year or more than that, and all the benefits of a Minister of the Crown.

Now that kind of thing is shameful. It is shameful. It is disgusting. The reason why I say it is disgusting is because it is adversely affecting their role in this House. What they do as a party, I have no concern with. Let them kill themselves and I will laugh all the way to the next election, and all of us on this side will, but in doing what they are doing, they are destroying the true democracy of government.

Every government needs scrutiny of their operations, whether it be in Ottawa or any other province of Canada and now we have no longer an effective Opposition. The only effective Opposition we have are two members in the fair corner over here who are trying their best to do with what they have as two members as an opposition to government.

What is happening now? The CBC, The Sunday Express and others are taking on the role of official opposition to government. They are trying to scrutinize what government is doing or not doing. Because no longer do we have an effective Opposition, and that is

very sad.

MR. BAIRD:
You cannot blame them.

MR. MORGAN:
No, we cannot blame them because they see what is happening. It is very, very sad.

No more do I see a situation of discipline. I see a member of the House of Assembly going on television and calling a Minister of the Crown a liar. He does not have the nerve to say it in the House of Assembly. Two nights ago I saw him on CBC and NTV saying the minister, in this case the Minister of Social Services, the so-called spokesman for Social Services is matters in Opposition goes on television and says, 'The minister is a liar, the minister lied.' Of course the reason he can do that now is because there is nobody with any authority to control him.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I will be coming back again.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything this morning and make any reference.

MR. DINN:

A few pearls of wisdom are coming now.

MR. EFFORD:

If the hon. minister would sit down in his seat, he would probably listen and get a little bit educated this morning. It would be a great improvement over what he is carrying around in his head right now.

Mr. Chairman, not the minister, the former minister, I suppose there is another name we could put on him, the brown nose jigger.

MR. MORGAN:

That is one thing you will never be is a former minister.

MR. EFFORD:

No. Because when I become minister I will be staying there. I will not be out jiggling salmon and brown nosing around to obtain it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

We have a situation, Mr. Chairman, in this Province where a government that has absolutely no control over spending, no control of its financial department and we wonder why. We just sat down in our chairs and heard a prime example as to the situation on what brought the situation in this Province into the place it is today. A former Cabinet minister stood in his place for approximately six or seven minutes and made absolutely no reference to the situation at hand, no reference to the financial situation and he showed no signs of credibility whatsoever except to attack the Opposition or a member of the Opposition on some statements he made in reference to

an hon. member of the Opposition, who I must commend, did an excellent job in making reference to the Minister of Finance.

Certainly any government, or any bodies of people could justify the fact, for example, in drawing up estimates that they would estimate a shortfall of \$8,500,000 in one department. They could stand in their place and say, "Yes, we have an excuse for that, a logical excuse. We did not anticipate the extra jobs, we did not anticipate the extra expenditure, we did not see any evidence of coming close to the estimates spent in this particular department." I refer you, Mr. Chairman, to the Department of Social Services in which they had a Special Warrant of \$8,500,000. I want to tell the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), I am not making any reference to him or his department in this. I am talking specifically about the Minister of Finance.

What people do not recognize is that the government, the institution or government body is like a business. It is a business. It is a major corporation, where you have an influx of money and you have an expenditure, an income and an expenditure. In order to be able to handle the financial position of the government you must have a knowledge of business. You must have a knowledge of finances. Now, with all due respect to the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) - and I think my colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) made reference to some health and some health problems and to why he was in the situation he is - probably there is some substantial facts to believe there because the hon. Minister of

Finance is certainly out of his league. He is a very educated man. He is a very knowledgeable individual, but not in his department. As a doctor, I have great respect for the man. As a politician, not so great a respect. But as a Minister of Finance, less and less respect. Because this is where the problem lies.

When you come and take the position of handling a large corporation you must have the experience and the knowledge of how to handle finances. We have seen, time and time again, where private businesses, the same as a government, have had the ability to run a business or not to run a business. We have seen many businesses, through the incapacibilities of its management, succeed or not succeed. The same precedent is set by the present Minister of Finance. He has shown, through his inability to run the financial matters of this Province, nothing but a total downgrading of the system.

Just think about the figures. We have an influx of approximately \$1.2 billion. Approximately \$1.2 billion comes into the provincial treasury from the federal treasury. We have approximately another \$900 million - you can almost say \$1 billion more - collected by the general revenue of this Province. Now that is over \$2 billion that comes into the provincial treasury in different forms.

We have a population of approximately 600,000 people, decreasing day by day because of the numbers of people who have to leave this Province in order to obtain any form of living standard whatsoever. Day by day the

population of this Province is decreasing because there is nothing to stay in Newfoundland for. Young people, families, people with secured homes in the communities around this Province, are forced to leave because of the lack of ability of the present government to manage its affairs.

We have just seen recently where the Department of Finance, two months after the beginning of the year 1987, had to come up with \$150 million to balance a Current Account for 1986. I would like the Minister of Finance to clearly state. The question is, where is or where have, or where will that money come from? Will it come from the monies that are going to be collected from the federal treasury this year or the taxes? Will it further deplete the amount of money that the governing bodies have to spend in education, in health, in social services, and in other ways to make up the departments' ability to collectively put together a system whereby the people of this Province can, at least, obtain close to the poverty level in terms of income?

My colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) gave a prime example on reducing sales taxes. We, the Liberal Opposition, the official Opposition of this Province, have firmly on numerous occasions stated that, if you want to stimulate an economy, if you want to generate jobs, if you want to generate the peoples' expenditure of their personal finances, you have to give them a reason why they should. You have to give them an increase in their morale.

One of the ways in which we say - everybody in this Province, outside of the few thick-headed

members of the Tory Government - it can be done is to reduce sales tax. It was proven in 1986 when the 8 per cent sales tax on building materials was increased to 12 per cent. We said, and I will stick by it, and I will say, very adamantly, that if you had reduced it to 6 per cent you would have given people a reason and an incentive to repair their homes, to build, to construct, or whatever. That way you would have put more money into circulation. By operating on 12 per cent, you would further decrease that morale and that incentive to spend. If you had reduced the sales tax, more money would have been spent, and, therefore, 6 per cent of monies being spent is better than 12 per cent of no monies being spent.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. FLIGHT:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will continue at a later date.

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue on because ten minutes go very fast.

I think I would like to emphasize some things which are not as political as what I talked about last time, but are still, I guess, relevant. When we talk about trying to boost the economy of areas like Newfoundland, which is always at the end of the stick-

MR. FLIGHT:
At the end of the jigger.

MR. MORGAN:
Go out and sell your stoves.

Mr. Chairman, when we try to get economies improved in the poorer regions of Canada, we have to find means of, number one, creating jobs. Now, today we have a situation for the first time in the history of Newfoundland where we have a chance of boosting our most important industry, the fishery. Now, how are we going to do that? We have been saying for years and years that the only way we can get more jobs in the fishing industry, whether in processing or in the harvesting side, is to have more markets for our products. Well, here we are now, for the first time in the history of Canada, the possibility of breaking the barriers in our major marketplace, the U.S.A.

What do we see happening? We see the Liberal Party of Canada opposed to doing that. How are they going to justify that in the federal election campaign in St. John's East? I just do not know how they are going to justify taking a stand and saying, 'No, we are opposed to more jobs in the poorer regions of Canada.' In other words, "We are opposed to more jobs and a boost to the economy.' How can the Liberals justify doing that! Maybe the local Liberal Party, when they get their problems resolved and get their house in order, will take a stand against the national Liberal Party, because that kind of a policy is not good for this region.

The same goes for the NDP Party. How Mr. Broadbent can stand up and say, 'I am opposed to free trade,' I do not know. I know how he can

do it. He is looking at the protection of jobs in Central Canada, in Ontario and Quebec, and nothing else. How can Mr. Cashin, the head of a fishermen's union in this Province which represents all the plant workers and all the fishermen, stand and support the Auto Workers of Canada? The Auto Workers of Canada is part of the NDP, no question about that. They are an integral part of the NDP Party. They put finances in there, big finances. They have a say on policy development, and they influence Mr. Broadbent's thinking from day to day. Bob White is a very influential man with Mr. Broadbent. No question about that.

Now, Mr. White's position, as head of the Auto Workers' Union, is, 'We are opposed to free trade.' So, what does Mr. Cashin do? Goes to Montreal last weekend, stands in Montreal at a convention and says, 'Yes, we support the Auto Workers' Union's position, we are opposed to free trade,' at a time when we need jobs and more jobs in every fish plant around the Province, at a time, Mr. Chairman, when, for the first time in our history, we see a possibility of tariffs being removed on secondary processed products. It is the only way to get additional jobs, by having more processing take place in the fishing industry in Newfoundland.

How can we get more processing? Stop the shipping of raw material, the cod blocks, into the U.S.A., as my friend from Twillingate is quite aware of. He was minister and he fought it as well, and I will give him credit for that. I know he agrees with what I am saying. He tried to get, and we try to get, as a government, each year more of our fish products

processed more in Newfoundland. Instead of having a cod block going into a plant in Vermont or down in Denver or Massachusetts and these places, providing jobs for Americans, these products, fish sticks, fish pieces, battered pieces, etc., can be produced right here in Newfoundland, in Bonavista or in Charleston and in places along the South Coast. Mr. Chairman would agree on this, I am sure. But, Mr. Cashin says, 'No, no, no. We are opposed to free trade because I support the NDP Party and the NDP Party is standing against free trade.' The Leader of the NDP Party provincially must understand what I am saying is very true. If the NDP Party provincially stands against free trade they are standing against future development in the fishing industry and more jobs in the fishing industry in this Province. We export on an annual basis approximately \$425 million a year worth of fish to the USA. How can we, as a people, say, yes, we are opposed to opening more doors for the marketing of our products? It would be ludicrous to do that, but for some reason the NDP is doing that and Mr. Cashin who is now a part of the NDP, is doing it as well. Now, it is even more difficult for me to understand why and how Mr. Cashin can do that, when in Bonavista, in my area, the plant workers are wanting more work every year, they want more jobs in the fish plant. They do not want to see the cod blocks shipped from Bonavista down to Boston, they want the cod blocks taken and produced to the final product right there in Bonavista, in Charleston, in Catalina or in Port Union. So, Mr. Cashin, to me is blindly supporting the NDP. What I say in the House today I can say outside

the House. I do not want the immunity of the House of Assembly, I never did. What Mr. Cashin is doing is taking a stand which is hurting, in fact damaging substantially the fishery of our Province. How he can blindly support a party that is so opposed to creating jobs in our Province to me shows just what I said, blind support of a party. So, that is one aspect of the opposition.

Now, the other aspect is Mr. John Turner's position. Does he understand we have high unemployment in Newfoundland? Does he understand that we need more jobs in our primary producing industries, like the fishery? Does he understand that we export all of our products to the US, our major market? No. But he understands one thing, he understands free trade may be strong competition to the industries in Central Canada and Central Canada could lose jobs whether it be the auto workers' industry, the textile industry or other industries around Central Canada. He understands that.

Now, our Premier here is firmly standing, firm and square, fully supporting free trade because he can see the benefits of what free trade will do for Newfoundland. Yesterday evening we saw on television Mr. Lougheed, a politician formerly, fine, and we see Mr. MacDonald, once a very prominent Liberal Cabinet minister, the Minister of Finance in the federal Liberal Cabinet, taking a stand on his own, with business associates traveling across Canada to support and promote free trade because it means jobs for the poorer regions of Canada. So, gentlemen, make no mistake, you are in a big enough

mess now as a Liberal Party, but if your party opposes free trade in Ottawa and you support your party in Ottawa what it means is you are standing against Newfoundland and progress in Newfoundland for jobs, and the same goes for the NDP Party.

Mr. Chairman, that is the key to our economy, more jobs so more taxes can be paid into the coffers of the government to enable Mr. Collins, the Minister of Finance, to balance his budget by getting revenues from the work force, revenues from industry, and without that he is going to have a difficult time, the same as we saw a few days ago in Saskatchewan where Premier Devine had to announce he is going to pay off 1500 workers within the civil service. That is very unfortunate but it has to be done. It is a loss of jobs and it is all because his province has not got the industrial background, the backbone there of industry there. It has not got that economic viability to be able to keep the government going from taxes, from revenues, but he stands firmly and says, 'Yes, if we can get this free trade package together before the end of June of this year, what great things it will mean for Saskatchewan!' He is right.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would, in fact, like to see an unanimous resolution from this House on free trade. The NDP Party, I know, will never agree to this because Mr. Broadbent would disown them. I would say the official Opposition when they find a leader and get their problems worked out

MR. W. CARTER:

When is that going to happen?

MR. MORGAN:

It could be the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), or the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), because the other members do not even come in on the scene. These are the only potential leaders.

MR. DINN:

What about the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock)?

MR. MORGAN:

That member ran before as a leadership candidate and may run again.

MR. DINN:

He came in second.

MR. MORGAN:

In fact, Mr. Chairman, maybe that should be an automatic decision of the caucus, that the man who ran against Mr. Barry last time and came in second should be the obvious choice for Opposition Leader. But that is their affair.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. MORGAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On Interim Supply, the government

is asking for almost \$750 billion. One has to wonder, as pointed out by the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), why the government did not budget for certain household items like salaries for people in the College of Trades and Technology and other vocational schools.

But the issue I want to address, Mr. Chairman, is with regard to different departments in government working against each other as a result the human element getting caught up in decisions. The point that I raised in Question Period was when people apply for a house under Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, under the programme - it is a good programme - 25 per cent of your earnings have to be paid. It also works from the point of view that what you have to pay for your mortgage depends on how much you made the following year, not in the current year.

So you have a situation where people are living in substandard housing want better housing. So they apply to the government, get approval, but when they find out that two of them are working and doing okay and then for reasons only one is working, for that full year the mortgage rate depends on what the two income earners were making the previous year. They find themselves in a tight financial bind and their hard earned savings and equity put into these units gradually disappear. The end result is that they either move out on their own or they are forced out by government because of arrears in payment.

You also have the example where people are on social assistance, living in substandard housing, condemned by the Department of

Health, condemned by the social worker and the fire commissioner and the Department of Social Services sponsors one of these rural remote houses for these people. So you get people who have had really, really bad housing and you have children in them. The Department of Social Services builds this unit for them, with the help of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, and now the Community Development Programme we have in this Province is employing some of these people. I think the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) would point out this as being correct.

Almost \$30 million a year more is being spent through the Community Development Programme. His department really should be called the Department of Development, not the Department of Social Services. That \$30 million is making make work projects, taking people off social assistance and getting them on UIC. Some of them going back into the work force. Now, it is a commendable programme because it has been proven that people who are on social assistance, some of them, if you get them back into the work ethic and who find them jobs, they will continue to work and not depend on social assistance.

So \$30 million is geared towards that programme. As I have said, the philosophy behind it in many cases is that the province has to pay 50 cents of every social welfare dollar and the federal government pays the other fifty cents, whereas under UIC, the federal government pays 100 per cent of the dollar and the Province does not have to pay anything.

So here are families that are on

social assistance and needing adequate housing. Government provides them with adequate housing and then, because this programme is in place, the social workers get the people off social assistance and get them onto these make work projects. After that they find out that the Department of Social Services is no longer paying their mortgage and they have to look after the mortgage themselves, they have to look after their heat and light, they have to look after their food bill and this, of course, all comes out of the amount that they make on UIC. Then they find out that they start falling in arrears because they cannot balance their books and they are evicted out of their units and back into substandard housing.

I have said to the Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn) when I appeared before this House in Committee with regard to his department, because Labrador was an isolated area depending on seasonal work at the fishery, instead of having the income for their mortgages depending on the year before, where two of them may have been working, we should have it so that the income that you pay on those mortgages or those units should be geared towards what you are making in the present year. Surely the social worker and other people in the area can easily check out what a person is making each month. That way you would not find people going into arrears and having to be evicted.

The other thing is it takes about \$70,000 to build one of these houses on the Coast of Labrador because of the expense in building supplies and getting carpenters to come in from outside. You have to have a contractor. They do not

allow individuals to build their own because they have to be built to certain standards.

The RRRAP programme is an extremely good programme and is making great headway in Labrador. You had three people employed as supervisors. One had an accident and the Department of Mines and Housing ended up retiring that position. Another person got fired from the job and now you have one person for the full area.

The minister stated today that there is only a certain number of enquiries the present person can look after. As I pointed out to the minister, the person is stationed in the Labrador Strait area. When he has to go down and inspect something like fifteen other communities, he can only go down when the snow is gone and he only has about a four or five week period to do that because then the people are moved out from their Winter places and out to their Summer places. So even if he does get down to it, the amount of communities he can visit in that period is limited. The person is married and cannot be away from his home base all of the time because he is also responsible for that.

If we had another person employed for a couple of months in the Spring and in the Fall and the Summer for probably a four month period, we would see more people making use of the programme. More people making use of the programme, Mr. Chairman, means that more of the houses are looked after, brought up to standard conditions and there is no need then for the government to get into \$70,000 homes and then have to turn around and evict people

from them.

So I do think if the minister looks at statistics, sure the statistics will say only so many people are applying for these units by way of an application to RRRAP. The only reason why there is only so many applying is the inspector can only get into so many of the houses and so many of the communities at one time.

MR. DINN:

You can only get into one at time.

MR. HISCOCK:

One at a time and two or three houses in that community. So by having that programme, we would end up having a lot more people helped out under it and we would see that the government would not have to be embarrassed. The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) would not have to be embarrassed and the people would not have to take their children back into substandard housing.

It is an excellent programme. I hope that the minister takes note of what I said and make sure that you have an extra inspector go into that area. Otherwise you are going to have, as has been pointed out by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), housing conditions for our aboriginal people deteriorating with the years, particularly in Eastern Labrador. The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening) is quite aware of coastal Labrador and has many friends down there. The people there have to maintain two homes, one for the Winter in the community of Cartwright and another one in Spotted Islands or Batteau; they have to maintain their skidoos for getting wood and water and for hunting in the Winter, etc. They also have to

maintain their boats and fishing gear. The fishery has been a disaster in the past two years on certain sections of that coast, so again there is not enough money for them to upgrade their houses themselves, or, in cases where the RAPP programme is on the go, getting help from government to be able to utilize this programme.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope the minister does establish another co-ordinator for the RRAP programme.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the hon. the member for bringing something before the House that is of concern to his constituents. I just want to relate some of the statistical information that is being compiled during the study, as a request by the hon. member, in the Housing Corporation with respect to inquiries for RRAP and rural and remote housing in Southern Labrador, in the district of the hon. member.

Now, we had last year 288 enquiries for assistance under those programmes. Of the 288, 271 of the enquiries were dealt with. Of the 271, there were commitments of 254, Mr. Chairman, which is, just to tell the hon. member, a very high average on the basis of the enquiries. So that left 17 enquires. Now, one officer last

year when assistance was required, got other assistance and went in and handled just about all of the enquiries for the programme. Late in the year they got some more, and that is where the 17 comes from. This is a compilation of data that I requested of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing to try to justify having another person in coastal Labrador to handle the enquiries the hon. member is talking about. So of the 288 only 17 - and they came later in the year - were not acted upon.

We really cannot justify another person for coastal Labrador for those 17 enquiries. Now, there will be other enquiries this year, but we have determined, based on the number of enquiries that our staff handled, that that gentleman down on the Labrador coast - I believe his name is Flynn - is doing an excellent job and, as the hon. member says, really is handling the area quite admirably.

Some of the reasons why some of the enquiries have been turned down relate to the following: costs exceeding forgiveness level and applicants unwilling to take repayable loans. Some of the applicants wanted the grant portion but they did not want the loan portion, and therefore turned down, themselves, the assistance that was available to some of them. Incomes were too high to qualify for a substantial forgiveness level: In other words, the amount of grant and loan is based on the income of a particular family or individual, and the repair costs were exceeding programme maximum loans. These are problems that we have had with the federal government. As a matter of fact, during the discussions as it

related to the global agreement last year, one of the things that we asked for was a little more flexibility. We got some flexibility in the programme, but we were looking for a little bit more even than what we got. And they were quite receptive to giving us some flexibility, and we pointed out some of the cases from the hon. member's district, as well as from the member for Torngat Mountain's district, and the member for Naskaupi's district.

So, we did get some flexibility, but we could do with a little more in some of those areas. Because we think it is necessary for some of the people on coastal Labrador and in the hon. member's district to receive assistance under both of those programmes. The RRAP programme is a fantastic programme. It is a real good programme.

We have also handled some of the minor enquiries under the Emergency Repair programme which is now cost-shared with the federal government, but it is for differing amounts. If someone wants a porch on his house to cut down on the escape of heat through his main door, that kind of thing can be handled through the Emergency Repair programme, and those have been looked after.

So based on the information that I have, and if the hon. member has more information that he can supply to me, I want to make sure that everyone has the same opportunity for the programmes that are available, whether it is through Newfoundland and Labrador Housing or through mining, for example. So if the hon. member has more information that he can provide, then, of course, I would be open to reassessing the

situation on the Coast of Labrador, as I would anywhere else.

But that is the information that I received as a result of the hon. member's enquiry. And I really cannot justify another person on the Coast of Labrador for the seventeen-plus enquiries that we have left on our books.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is one thing. The other thing I would like to deal with this morning, because hon. members seem to be getting off on tangents, is we are talking about supply and monies that have been expended over the past year through Special Warrants - that is one thing we could talk about - and, of course, what the hon. minister is requesting as an interim measure so that we can carry on through the period until the budget is approved.

I would like to just deal with mining in the Province because I think that is of importance to many hon. members. Hon. members may or may not know that prior to, say, the early 1970s in the Province we had a concession arrangement whereby land concessions were made to particular developers in the Province who would parlay those concessions, those land concessions, to mining companies and developers with the hope that they would do some exploration, they would discover some ore bodies and then, as a result of that, would get into development. As a matter of fact, through that system is how we got the Iron Ore Company of Canada and Wabush Mines and several other major operations in the Province. But it was felt to be an inequitable system and, as a result, government in its wisdom changed that to the system we have now which basically gives

anyone who wants to become involved in the mining industry the capability of becoming involved. It is a matter of going out where they see some possible potential, or potential, and they can claim stake and they can then go out and do some surface prospecting and if that looks good, then they can go on to development of that area.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of bringing in that system, in Newfoundland today, whereas in the fifties and sixties we had fifteen or sixteen companies involved in the Province in exploration, we now have something like 200 separate companies or individuals involved in claim staking and mining exploration in the Province. Last year, 1986, was not as good as in numbers of claims staked as 1985, but we had a substantial number of claims staked in 1986. As a matter of fact, we have passed another record in Newfoundland with respect to the number of claims staked in good standing, which means that the people who have those claims staked out there are involved or will be involved, in 1987, in active exploration, which augers well for the future of the mining industry in the Province.

Now a lot of this, of course, has been brought about by the fact that Newfoundland has a mineral development agreement with the rest of Canada, with Ottawa. So what happens is that geo-scientific surveys are done. The Mines Department, along with other groups from Memorial University and geologists who are hired throughout the Summer, go out and do their sample collections and do their exploration work, and they map the lands on both the Island part of

the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and in Labrador. And I have to give credit to both the Liberal Administration in Ottawa and the present administration in Ottawa who have continued these mineral development agreements, because what it does to miners and to exploration companies is identify what the potential is in a particular area of the Province. Mr. Chairman, every October or November the Department of Mines and Memorial and Geo-scientific Surveys of Canada get together and lay out these maps of the different areas of the Province so that mining companies can come in and have a look to see what interesting work they did the previous Summer and, therefore, where they would like to claim stake or go in to have a look.

Now, a lot of the exploration that is going on is with respect to precious metals, gold, platinum, that kind of thing. Just to relate to the House, for your information, there are twenty-one different areas of the Province with possible gold potential. Many of them have gone to drilling. So they have gone beyond just the normal surface prospecting to drilling to delineate sizes of gold fields and so on. West Field Minerals down in the Bay d'Espoir area, for example, concluded a large drilling programme in 1986, and have indicated a continuance of that in 1987.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. minister's time is up.

MR. DINN:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will possibly get onto it a little later on.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to make a brief reference to some of the comments of the previous speaker. I guess we do tend to get off on tangents on occasion, Mr. Chairman, but, I suppose, through tradition and custom members on both sides of the House take the opportunity when we are in debate on supply to voice certain regional or district concerns, or personal concerns.

MR. BUTT:
Tell us about your concerns about NATO in Goose Bay.

MR. KELLAND:
We will certainly get to that, because I know that the hon. member from the NDP is now in a quandary as to what to do about NATO. We will probably be addressing the issue as we get an opportunity.

Just in reference to what the Minister of Mines and Housing said with respect to interim supply, and keeping to the subject, I will say that I am aware of that, of course, all members are, but they do by tradition and precedent in the House take advantage of the moment, in their ten minute speeches and so on, to address regional and district concerns. And so they should, I think, because in the long run it does all tie into the financial situation within our Province, as to what we can do and cannot do and might do. So, I will say that.

I would not want this year again

to hear the Minister of Finance stand, for example, and say that the Liberals in delaying any kind of granting of supply are trying to hold up the pay for the poor government employees in this Province. I know he said it tongue in cheek and he does not really believe that, but I would not like to hear him say it again, because one tongue in one cheek is enough for any one subject, I suppose, if you can put it that way.

In actual fact, we do have to take advantage of these opportunities. I know, also, that the Minister of Finance, in my analogy the first time I spoke in the Supply Debate, will take it in the context it was intended, knowing full well that anything that happens in this Province, anything that the government initiates or tries to initiate is directly related to the financial situation either in our Province, in Canada, in the World, or all three, of course.

I will give some attention, briefly, to the member for Bonavista South who, unfortunately, has left the Chamber, as he frequently does for one reason or another, whether it is a trip to Puerto Rico in high chagrin with the Premier, as he did last year, or simply because he wants to go out and talk to a constituent or take a break. A lot of people think, though, that when he does leave the House he is the type of person, the hon. the member for Bonavista South, who will take a shot or make a statement and then run away because someone is going to answer it and he does not want to hear the answer.

DR. COLLINS:
A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I realize the hon. member is relatively new to the House, but he really should learn the rules of the House, he should learn the rules of debate, he should learn the rules of Parliamentary practice. You are not permitted under Parliamentary procedure and habit and custom to refer to a member's performance of his duties in the House except in a laudatory manner. You are not permitted to refer to a member's absence from the House and all that sort of thing. Not only is it discourteous and often untrue to leave the implication that somebody is neglecting his duties as an elected member, but also it is totally unparliamentary. I think the hon. member should apologize to the member for Bonavista South.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Did you wish to speak to that point of order?

MR. KELLAND:

No. I am waiting for your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order I refer the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) to Beauchesne 316. (c). It is unparliamentary to 'refer to the presence or absence of specific Members' of the House of Assembly while that person is not present.

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you very much, Mr.

Chairman. Your wise and just ruling, of course, is accepted by this member from Naskaupi district. I might ask the Chairman, perhaps as an aside, when he became aware of this. Even though I am a new member, as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) suggests, relatively new, I have frequently heard references from the other side of the House when members were out on quite legitimate business from this side, and making derogatory comments about it. But I certainly accept the Chairman's ruling and I will keep that in mind the next time our colleagues from across the way make such a parliamentary breach themselves.

Nevertheless, I will give some attention to the member from Bonavista South who spoke in somewhat derogatory terms a little while ago and who is now not among us but will be shortly, I assume. If anybody else in this House, either side, had made some of the statements that the member for Bonavista South had made there may be some small smidgen of credibility in it, but I can remember the hon. the member for Bonavista South walking into this House last year - I can be laudatory. I can very laudatory. I laud the way he jumped all over his Premier in this House, the first time I had ever seen it, and perhaps the first time anyone had ever seen it. I laud him for having the nerve to stand up and lay it on the line for his leader, the Premier. Now that is a laudatory comment, Mr. Chairman, I submit - and by innuendo, by threat, by statement, by apoplectic fits get up and say he would tell the whole story. I submit he probably does not have a shred of evidence for a whole story. He has never told that

whole story and he has promised to do it. I would suggest, also, that it may be unparliamentary to come in here and make a promise and then not live up to it, such as the hon. member has done. But on the question of the credibility of the hon. the member for Bonavista South in this House, as I said, any single member other than the member from Bonavista South, by making the statements he has made just recently, would certainly generate much more in the line of credibility than that hon. member was able to do.

Now, I find it a little distressing, too, Mr. Chairman, to find the depths that anyone will sink to in order to curry favour. He was kicked out of the provincial Cabinet - no other way - because of certain things pending against him. Now he was subsequently cleared of that and there is nothing wrong with that, but he had expected and had given every indication that once he was cleared and exonerated and found not guilty of the offense for which he was charged that he would be welcomed back into the provincial Cabinet almost immediately. Now, that has not happened.

You know, for two years I sat here and watched him when he came into the House and admired the beautiful suntan the member for Bonavista South often seemed to be sporting, quite brown in the face, quite healthy looking, robust, but it has come to us, and it has come to us in watching his attempts at gaining attention, at increasing his credibility, in watching his attempts to defend the actions of the Finance Minister and the Premier, that that is not suntan on his face, the brown on the member's face comes from another

action entirely.

So I do say it is amazing that he would find it necessary to sink to the depths he has in order to curry favour and get back in the Cabinet, but it will never happen.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

It is hard to get up now, because one expects to get up to make a comment on some point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Could we have order, please!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, as I say, one usually gets up to comment on some point of importance that was made by the other side. It is very difficult for me to get up now, because there are almost no points of importance coming from the other side, particularly from the member who just sat down. He was up twice, he made the most asinine remarks in each case that did not have anything to do with the issue before the Committee, and it is really very hard to comment on that. I will just make one comment in regard to a subject he did bring up, though, and again it just shows his lack of grasp of the whole issue. His cure for our problem in this Province is to decrease RST. Now, that was the only suggestion he made that is worthy of any comment, decrease RST and everything will be fine; decrease RST, he implied, and your revenues will increase. Well, now, can you think of anything

more naive, juvenile and shallow than that? In other words, what he is saying is that every government in the world is silly when they increase taxes. He is saying the way to get better revenue is to decrease taxes, that no government should increase its personal tax, its corporate tax, its fuel tax, its other consumption taxes and so on and so forth. This is going the wrong way. The way to increase revenues is to lower taxes. Why do governments have tax rates if the way to raise money is to lower them? and presumably the best to lower them is to bring them down to zero. If you want to increase your revenues really effectively, the hon. member is implying, just cut out all taxes altogether; do not only lower them, bring them down to zero. That is the only comment, that I am having some difficulty making, I will make on the only comment the hon. member made that is worth even partially referring to.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman, I want to, if I can, refer to the statement made by the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), the Minister for Forest Resources and Lands, the other evening, in which he stated that -

MR. MORGAN:
That is something else, forestry.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Chairman, could you keep the hon. gentleman quite, unless he wants to stand up and tell us a story?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Could we have silence, please, while the hon. the member for Fogo is speaking?

MR. MORGAN:
A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:
If the hon. member for Fogo wants a story I can tell him a beautiful story about the meeting in the hotel a few nights ago. Ten members were at a meeting and one of their colleagues came out from the meeting and told me the whole story about what took place at that meeting.

MR. TULK:
Sit him down, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN:
I am sure my friend for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry) would love to hear what took place at that meeting.

MR. TULK:
Sit him down, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN:
If the members want to give leave for me to tell the story, I would love to tell the story today in the House.

MR. BARRY:
Leave! Leave, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN:
I will tell a story. I will tell a story about Twillingate and Naskaupi.

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

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, I am referring to another story, the story that the gentleman, in his parliamentary fashion, stood in this House last year and told us that he was going to tell about his leader and then he refused to answer the question. He should be quiet when it comes to stories, or otherwise tell what he should have told in this House. Never mind getting over there and yapping about the Opposition, clear your own soul first.

MR. MORGAN:

I am hurting you this morning, am I?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Could we have silence, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, if I could speak to this motion that is before us on the amount of money that is being asked for by the government? The member for Grand Falls made a statement the other evening in the Legislature and I said to him he would probably get Interim Supply by May 15 if certain questions were answered, and there are certain questions.

There are certain questions which this House legitimately has the right to ask about what the government is doing with its money when it walks into this House and asks for \$753,486,100 in Interim Supply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, they are frightening me to death over there. Will you keep them quiet?

MR. BARRY:

Have you got thirteen or fourteen, 'Haig'?

MR. TULK:

On this side, too, it looks like.

Mr. Chairman, we look at a situation in this Province where patronage is running wild in the government and I want the minister to answer certain questions for the Opposition. For example, how much did the buying out of the contracts of people with the Workers' Compensation Board cost, who were patronage appointments? The minister has admitted that they were patronage appointments; we know they were, regardless of whether he has admitted it or not, patronage appointments made by the former Premier of this Province, Frank Moores, and the present Premier of this Province to the Workers' Compensation Board.

Now, we have a right and the people of Newfoundland have a right to know if, in fact, the buying out of those contracts did cost \$500,000, or if, in fact, it cost close to that. Was it \$400,000? Was it \$300,000? Was it \$600,000? That is a question that I would like the Finance Minister to answer.

Let me take him through another one. The Peter Loughheed deal which we in this Legislature were told was going to cost us \$40,000, we are now being told that a law firm, Bennett Jones of Calgary, to which Mr. Loughheed is attached and in which, I understand, he has a great concern, has also cost us perhaps \$440,000, perhaps \$500,000. It says nothing about the cost of reception that was held for him, I believe it was at the Arts and Culture Centre. So, I say to the Minister of Finance,

if he wants Interim Supply in this House before March 31, he should stand in his place and tell us just how much that cost us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am already looking at something like \$1 million.

MR. MORGAN:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, members of the House should not be threatening other members. Now, the statement was just made, unless, unless, unless, you know, you will not get your Interim Supply by March 31. I mean, he is using the same kind of tactic he used with his leader in the last two or three weeks, unless you do this, unless you do that, we are going to take action to get you out. Now, he cannot threaten the Minister of Finance in the same way as he threatened his own leader. He cannot do that, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

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

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, we have a right, as I say, to ask the hon. gentleman to answer those questions. I have spoken already about \$1 million. How much did the former Minister

of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, the former member for Naskaupi, cost this Province - another patronage appointment? How much did the former member for Windsor - Buchans cost this Province? That is a question that has not been answered in this Legislature. How much is the former Minister of Social Services, the former member for St. John's East Extern, going to cost this Province? Just how much? How much is the former member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir going to cost this Province, who was at one point the official handshaker of this Province?

Mr. Speaker, why is it that we have seen a Special Warrant brought into this House that shows an increase of 37.5 per cent since the estimates were brought down last Spring in the Travel and Communications section of the Premier's Office? Why is that? Why have we seen under Executive Council another \$125,000 added to the \$250,000 for Purchased Services? Why is that?

Those are the types of questions we want answered if we are going to see Interim Supply passed through this House by March 31. If we are, for the member for Bonavista South - keep his ears and his mind open, which is impossible for him to do - if we are going to see Interim Supply passed in this Legislature by March 31, answer those types of questions for us. Tell us exactly what the bill for the patronage deal is going to be for Newfoundland and Labrador, for the taxpayers of this Province. I would suspect I have listed well over \$3 million worth here this morning: \$500,000 for Workers' Compensation, \$500,000 for Peter Lougheed -

MR. DAWE:

That is an assumption.

MR. TULK:

Yes, they are assumptions until the questions are answered, too, and I suspect pretty good assumptions until the questions are answered.

How much, as I said before, for all of those former members who got the boot in the last election? What kind of dealings are going on with the Minister of Public Works when we see a blank space on a tender call for certain office space in Corner Brook? What is happening there?

Those are the types of questions, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance has to answer for to this Legislature, and they have to be answered. He can sit there and he can have the maw mouth from Bonavista South go on all he likes. The truth of the matter is he will answer those questions or they are going to be posed time and time again.

MR. MORGAN:

Judas! Judas!

MR. TULK:

Speaking of Judases, look over there. The Judas! Just look at him.

Mr. Chairman, we have another question to ask this hon. gentleman that has to come before this Legislature as well. What was the snide story about the Premier in cutting up his files? He tried to leave the impression that the Premier of this Province had something to do with cutting up his files. What about that? When are you going to answer that?

MR. MORGAN:

Do you want me to give you a story? I will give you a good story.

MR. TULK:

Yes, you are good at stories. Unfortunately, you only tell what suits yourself. That is the problem.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me get back to the question. I asked the Minister of Finance to stand in his place and answer the questions that have been asked in this Legislature on patronage deals.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I had great hopes when the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) stood up that at least we were going to hear something of importance about the issue before us. Because, you see, the member for Fogo is an experienced parliamentarian in this House. He has been through quite a number of budgets here. He has known quite a few leaders, more leaders than budgets probably. He has done a worse job on leaders than he has done on attacking the budget. I will have to admit that. Anyway, he knows what is important in the Province and so on and so forth, in financial terms. I expected him, therefore, to come out with some good, solid questions of importance to the people.

What did we see? What a disappointment! How much is it costing the Province for a change in the arrangements down at Workers' Compensation Board? Zero! Zero! We do not fund the Workers' Compensation Board. I do

not know what they pay down there. We do not pay it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

The hon. the minister is absolutely right, and he has put his foot in it, because what has happened there is that the patronage appointments on that board are now costing the people, the workers of this Province, who pay into that Workers' Compensation Board. You have put your foot right in it! Through your patronage appointments, not only have you spent the dollars that are under your control, you have spent other peoples' money as well.

MR. MORGAN:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, just a brief comment. The hon. House Leader of the Opposition - yes, he is still House Leader until Monday. We will see what happens then. I have a feeling there could be a major revolt against him as well. But he is now attacking a board that is functioning as one of the better boards across Canada, our Workers' Compensation Board. He is not now attacking the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance does not control that

board. He does not administer the board. It is now a reorganized board. It is functioning properly. It is working to the benefit of fishermen and to all workers around the Province.

What the hon. gentleman is now trying to do, after attacking his leader and attacking the Minister of Finance and attacking me, now he is choosing to attack a workers' board that is working properly on behalf of all the workers of the Province.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, further to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the Workers' Compensation Board reorganization does not cost us a cent. It does not cost the workers a cent. They do not pay into it. Employers pay into it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Will the hon. member opposite ask a sensible question for a change?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

To continue, we have totally gotten rid of that foolish comment about the Workers' Compensation Board. He has fallen into it again.

Now, we have a marvelous offshore oil resource. We have one of the most valuable offshore oil resources in the Western World, and I do not know but you could put it up against the whole world. We have a treasure offshore for the people of Canada and we have a responsibility to handle that treasure with due diligence and care. Now, we are not experts in that. This government are not experts in this. There is no one in this Province who are experts in this. But we take our responsibilities sensibly. So if we have such a treasure out there held in the name of the people of Canada, and we are not experts ourselves, we go and get experts. That is what is called sensible responsible governments.

MR. SIMMS:

Right. Exactly.

DR. COLLINS:

Now, where do you go and get advice from a very unusual combination to do with the oil industry? That combination being legal expertise and, at the same time, financial expertise, not two separate expertise, but wrapped into the one thing. Where do you get that very unusual source of advice and recommendations? In Canada you go to Alberta, because Alberta is the centre or was the centre, the centre is going to shift East, but was the centre of the oil industry in Canada. There is tremendous expertise out there. In the very narrow, but extremely important field of the combined legal and financial

experts, there is only one firm that stands above all the rest out there.

For many, many years that firm did not have on its roster the name of Peter Lougheed. For many, many years Peter Lougheed had other things to do. He had a province to run, and he was one of the greatest statesman in the provincial area that this country has ever thrown up. So he had that job to do. Therefore, he was not involved in a legal firm. But that did not say that this particular legal firm, I have just forgotten the name of it, Bennett and something, whatever. Anyway, that legal firm, during the period when Mr. Lougheed had other things to do, was carrying on with this tremendously important work. If Mr. Lougheed had never joined that firm, we would have gone to that firm and paid them good money, our good money, Newfoundland peoples' good money, we are paying it for a very good reason, we would have paid them that money whether Mr. Lougheed joined it or not because that is where we wanted our advice to come from. That is what we did.

Now the hon. member is implying, in a sort of round about way, that that is not what we gave that money to that firm for. He is implying that we gave that money to Mr. Lougheed, who later on joined that firm. He might have been associated way back in his youth, and so on and so forth, I do not know about that, but he certainly was not for the many years when he was the Premier of Alberta. But he joined it later on. Now, the hon. member is implying that we gave that sizeable sum of money to that firm to put it into Mr. Lougheed's pocket. Now that is a despicable thing to say about Mr. Lougheed

that he would accept money on those terms, which he never would do. It is also despicable to say that we would discharge our responsibilities as the Newfoundland Government in such an underhanded way. It is totally despicable. We paid that firm good money for good advice. We paid it to them because they were about the only ones who would give us that advice.

Now, we also paid money to Mr. Lougheed, but not for that. We paid Mr. Lougheed a standard amount each year, if I remember correctly, I think it was \$40,000, as a fee. What is it called again?

MR. SIMMS:

A consultant fee.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, a consultant fee. He was paid that not because he is a member of the firm, not because of that firm's very deep and hard to get combined legal and financial expertise, we pay him that because he was a former Premier in an oil province and is very knowledgeable in his own right about the oil industry. He has contacts in the oil industry and he had been negotiating with the oil industry for years and years and years and so on and so forth. So we wanted to tap that quite separate but also invaluable expertise that Mr. Lougheed had. So we paid him a relatively paltry sum. I am sure there are many people in a whole year do not earn \$40,000. I do not mean it in those terms. I mean a paltry sum in terms of what we are getting, this unique advice that we could only have gotten from a Premier of Mr. Lougheed's pre-eminence and expertise and contacts and so on over many, many years with the oil industry.

For the hon. member to in any way suggest that this government did anything improper either in going to that particular law firm I mentioned to you or in taking Mr. Lougheed aboard with this treasure we have that we hold in the name of Canada and which we hold for the good and the future of the people of this Province, for the hon. member to suggest we are doing anything improper in that regard is ridiculous and it really is beneath him. I did not think that he would get into. I thought that he had a better regard for his concern for the Province and for his concern for this Chamber for him to suggest that that was the case.

Mr. Chairman, on the other points. What does Joe Goudie do? Joe Goudie has a job with the government, everyone knows that. I have a job with the government. The hon. member, in a way, has a job with the government. My deputy minister has a job with the government. They do work and they get paid. Joe Goudie got a job, he does work, he gets paid. So what? Are the people of the Province worried about that?

Tom Hickey has now got a job. It has been laid out in the paper. There is nothing secret about it. It has been laid out in the paper a dozen times. It is in an act what he is supposed to do. He has got a job now and he is going to set up a committee to deal with the youths that unfortunately have run afoul of the law and have got their whole lives before them. This government wants to make sure that we do the very best thing we can to alleviate any troubles they are in and set them on the right track. So Tom Hickey, after twenty-one years in the House, many, many years in government,

spent the vast majority of it in social services. I do not think there is another person in this Province - with all due respect to the present minister, and the present minister would be the first one to say this - I do not think there is anyone else in this Province who has had more contact with the social services aspect of this Province than Tom Hickey.

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Chairman, I understand perfectly well what the hon. gentleman is saying. I do not doubt one word of what he said, that Mr. Hickey was indeed a top man for the job but just out of interest, did you try to get another man or woman? Was there any attempt made?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order.

The hon. minister's time is up.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I will rise the Committee.

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 have considered the matters

to them referred, reports progress and asks leave to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I move that the House adjourn until Monday at 3:00 and we look forward with anticipation to see the arrangement opposite.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, March 23, 1987 at 3:00 p.m.

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C., Premier

Hon. P.J. McNicholas, Speaker

Leo Barry, Leader of the Opposition

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Aylward, Kevin (Lib)	Stephenville
Aylward, Hon. Robert J. (PC)	Kilbride
Baird, Raymond J. (PC)	Humber West
Baker, Winston (Lib)	Gander
Barrett, Hon. Harold (PC)	St. John's West
Barry, Leo (Lib)	Mount Scio - Bell Island
Blanchard, Hon. Ted. A. (PC)	Bay of Islands
Brett, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Trinity North
Butt, Hon. John (PC)	Conception Bay South
Callan, Wilson (Lib)	Bellevue
Carter, John A. (PC)	St. John's North
Carter, Walter C. (Lib)	Twillingate
Collins, Hon. John F. (PC)	St. John's South
Dawe, Hon. Ron (PC)	St. George's
Decker, Chris (Lib)	Strait of Belle Isle
Dinn, Jerome W. (PC)	Pleasantville
Doyle, Norman E. (PC)	Harbour Main
Efford, John (Lib)	Port de Grave
Fenwick, Peter (NDP)	Menihek
Flight, Graham (Lib)	Windsor-Buchans
Furey, Chuck (Lib)	St. Barbe
Gilbert, Dave (Lib)	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Greening, Glenn C. (PC)	Terra Nova
Hearn, Hon. Loyola (PC)	St. Mary's-The Capes
Hiscock, R. Eugene (Lib)	Eagle River
Hodder, James E. (PC)	Port au Port
Kelland, Jim (Lib)	Naskaupi
Long, Gene (NDP)	St. John's East
Lush, Tom (Lib)	Bonavista North

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

...2...

Member

Matthews, Hon. William (PC)
McNicholas, Hon. Dr. P.J. (PC)
Mitchell, Calvin (PC)
Morgan, James (PC)
Ottenheimer, Hon. Gerald R. (PC)
Parsons, Kevin (PC)
Patterson, William G. (PC)
Peach, Milton (PC)
Peckford, A. Brian, P.C. (PC) (Premier)
Power, Hon. Charlie (PC)
Reid, James G. (PC)
Rideout, Hon. Thomas G. (PC) ,
Russell, Hon. Maxwell James (PC)
Simms, Hon. Len (PC)
Simmons, Hon. Roger P.C. (Lib)
Tobin, Glenn (PC)
Tulk, R. Beaton (Lib)
Twomey, Hon. Dr. Hugh Matthew (PC)
Verge, Hon. Lynn (PC)
Warren, Garfield E. (PC)
Windsor, Hon. H. Neil (PC)
Woodford, Rick (PC)
Young, Hon. Haig (PC)

District

Grand Bank
St. John's Centre
LaPoile
Bonavista South
Waterford - Kenmount
St. John's East Extern
Placentia
Carbonear
Green Bay
Ferryland
Trinity - Bay de Verde
Baie Verte - White Bay
Lewisporte
Grand Falls
Fortune-Hermitage
Burin - Placentia West
Fogo
Exploits
Humber East
Torngat Mountains
Mount Pearl
Humber Valley
Harbour Grace

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C.	Premier
Hon. Robert J. Aylward	Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
Hon. Harold Barrett	Development and Tourism
Hon. Ted A. Blanchard	Labour
Hon. Charlie Brett	Social Services
Hon. John Butt	Environment
Dr. The Hon. John F. Collins	Finance
Hon. Ron Dawe	Transportation
Hon. Jerome W. Dinn	Mines and Energy
Hon. Norman E. Doyle	Municipal Affairs
Hon. Loyola Hearn	Education

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

-2-

Hon. William Matthews	Culture, Recreation and Youth
Hon. Gerald R. Ottenheimer	Energy President of the Council Government House Leader
Hon. Charlie Power	Career Development and Advanced Studies
Hon. Thomas G. Rideout	Fisheries
Hon. Maxwell J. Russell	Consumer Affairs and Communications
Hon. Len Simms	Forest Resources and Lands
Dr. The Hon. Hugh M. Twomey	Health
Hon. Lynn Verge	Justice
Hon. H. Neil Windsor	President of Treasury Board
Hon. Haig Young	Public Works and Services