



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 17

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

24 March 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, today I wish to announce a major reorganization at the senior executive level of the Department of Forest Resources and Lands. These changes are designed to improve the efficiency of delivery of departmental programmes, as well as to provide new opportunities and challenges to the senior public servants involved.

Mr. Kenneth J. S. Beanlands, who has been Assistant Deputy Minister of Lands, moves to a new position of Assistant Deputy Minister of Administration and Support Services.

Mr. Beanlands has been Assistant Deputy Minister of Lands for the past twelve years and holds a Bachelor of Science degree in forestry and a Master of Science degree. He has been with my department and its predecessor departments since 1964. During his time as Assistant Deputy Minister of Lands, Mr. Beanlands vastly improved the department's capability in handling virtually all matters affecting administration of Crown lands, including the speeding up of applications and claims so that today about 60 per cent of lands applications are processed within

sixty days.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. Robert Winsor as Assistant Deputy Minister of Lands, succeeding Mr. Beanlands. Mr. Winsor moves from his position of Eastern Regional Director. A Corner Brook native, Mr. Winsor has been with the department for twelve years and holds degrees in Geography and Economics, and is widely experienced in lands administration and public relations.

The other major change affects the very important Regional Services part of my department, with four regional offices in St. John's, Gander, Corner Brook and Goose Bay, and many forestry unit offices in other locations. Approximately two-thirds of the activity at the Regional Office level is in forestry, and the four Regional Directors will now report directly to the Assistant Deputy Minister of Forestry, Dr. M. Nazir. These Regional Directors formerly reported to the position of Executive Director of Regional Services, which has now been replaced.

Mr. Sterling Hoddinott, formerly Executive Director of Regional Services becomes Executive Director of Special Projects. He holds a degree in Forestry and has provided strong leadership over the years in setting up our regional system, and will continue to be part of the senior management team, providing advice and assistance to the Deputy Minister, Mr. R. D. Peters.

Mr. Speaker, these changes mean that all aspects of forestry, including policy and planning, field operations, and direction of

the department's headquarters in Corner Brook, will come within the administration of the Assistant Deputy Minister of Forestry, setting the stage for better co-ordinated forestry management and development in this Province.

Dr. Nazir, who has been Assistant Deputy Minister of Forestry since 1979, holds undergraduate degrees in Agriculture and Forestry, and a Doctorate degree in Economics. He first joined the Department in 1976 as an Economist and served as Director of Forest Products Development before being appointed Assistant Deputy Minister of Forestry. Dr. Nazir is also involved in various interprovincial forestry issues and is currently Chairman of a National Committee under the direction of the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers which is developing a package of provincial measures to replace the current 15 per cent export tax on softwood lumber.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) I am going to respond to the statement. What we see here is a little bit of housekeeping on the part of the Department of Forestry, where they are reorganizing some of their people. There are some very fine gentlemen there, Mr. Speaker. I know most of them personally, having had occasion to deal with them. I cannot help but notice the lack of women in that department, though, Mr. Speaker.

The government is not living up to its avowed aim to put women into those influential positions. I would like to see more.

Mr. Speaker, whenever we get any correspondence from the Department of Forest Resources and Lands we always look at it closely to see if there is any attempt being made to deal with the problems within that great industry, the biggest industry money-wise in the Province.

It is lamentable to realize that loggers who used to be guaranteed eight to ten months employment a year are now in the ten week syndrome. Most of the loggers in the Province are now lucky if they get stamps to collect their unemployment insurance which is a sad reflection, I believe, on the way that the logging industry has been managed in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

The other part of this statement deals with the Crown lands Division. Now, if there is a frustrating division in that department it is Crown lands. The minister is now saying it is possible to bring in application to apply for a piece of Crown land and that you can get it in sixty days. Now, I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that that is absolute nonsense. They attempted to bring it down to ninety days some time ago, but it still takes a year or two to get a piece of Crown land in this Province. The rigmarole, the regulations, the bureaucracy that people have to go through to get a piece of Crown land turns many people away and they give up, they will not wait for it.

Another problem, Mr. Speaker, with applying for Crown land is this

requirement that when Crown land is applied for you have to include a \$50.00 deposit. Now, this makes sense, I suppose, as far as the bookkeeping end of it goes, but if I apply for a piece of Crown land and my application is turned down because of the Environment Department, the Health Department, or what have you, and I apply for another piece of land, I have to come up with another \$50.00 and I still do not know whether or not I can get that piece, and I could end up paying \$500 for ten different pieces of land, because every time I apply I have to pay extra money. I think the minister should look into this so that a person living in St. Julien's, which is the example I am thinking about, who wishes to apply for a piece of Crown land, if he is not successful in his first application his application fee can then be applied to the second, third or fourth application, or until he is finally allowed to get a piece of Crown land.

If the reorganization in the department means the clearing up of some of that bureaucracy it would be a wonderful thing for the people of this Province, and the people of Newfoundland would be happy to know that when they apply for a piece of Crown land they do not have to wait two or three years, they do not have to fight the government to get it, they can get it by just filling in their application and without going through too much bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker. As for the people who have their had jobs moved up, or whatever, I offer them congratulations on behalf of this party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Without having had a copy in advance and not an awful lot of time to prepare a response, I simply say that we look forward to the reorganization to streamline and make more efficient the delivery of services, in particular the regional offices, and we hope that this reorganization is a move toward decentralization, making contact with people where they are and making regional services more easily accessible.

Thank you..

Oral Questions

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. The Premier may be aware that the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Clark, wrote a letter, dated February 14, 1986, to Mr. L. Perouan, the Assistant Representative for the French government for Maritime Affairs. I have obtained the wording and I have supplied a copy of the wording to the Premier through the Government House Leader a few minutes ago. The letter says, in part, that the French fishing fleet will be allowed to continue to fish in Canadian waters outside the Gulf, I quote, "en mille neuf cent

quatre-vingt six et bien au delà" - in 1986 and beyond. The letter makes no reference to any reduction in the total allowable catch.

I ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, was he indeed aware of the content of this letter prior to this afternoon and, if so, when did he become aware of it? And, more to the point, would he not agree that the letter constitutes a clear admission by Mr. Clark and the Government of Canada that it supported, as much as a year ago, the concept of trading away Canadian fish to accommodate French concerns?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have some difficulty in reading the writing the hon. member sent over. I became aware of the letter this morning at around 10:15 a.m. when I viewed the tape of the programme on CBC television last night - which was well done, by the way. I very often condemn CBC television for various things that they say and do so I should also, if they do something well, compliment them upon it, and I do that wholeheartedly today because I think they did it well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know who in CBC are responsible, but I guess the reporter who went over must be one, and she did just an excellent job. It was one of the better programmes I have seen on CBC television to document an issue.

I became aware of the letter on

the tape from the programme that was aired last night, and I was surprised, to say the least, at some of the quotes that were taken out of the letter and aired on the programme. The hon. member raised a couple of the quotes. There was also one there dealing with 'we will not let the fishermen of Saint-Malo down', or whatever.

MR. SIMMONS:

Will not abandon them.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

'We will not abandon them,' or whatever. One would think that Newfoundland and Canadian fishermen come first and second and third, and perhaps then after that the others.

There is a right of perpetuity there that was in the 1972 agreement, that obviously was not signed by the present federal government, which gives them rights to Canadian fish. That is there, but there is no need for one to go out of one's way to reiterate their ongoing interest in insuring that the French fleet are protected off the Coast of Newfoundland and outside the Gulf. So I am disturbed by the comments or the contents of that letter, and I will be taking the matter up with the federal government at the earliest opportunity, which, quite likely, will be either later on this afternoon, but for sure tomorrow when I go to Ottawa myself for the aboriginal conference.

I express, on behalf of the government, our deep concern with ongoing comments that are emanating from the Government of Canada through the Secretary of External Affairs. We are in negotiations again today, I think it is, on some of the matters that

are outstanding. Our position has not changed, and I join with the member opposite in saying that we are very, very concerned with what is just another piece of information which tends to show - or shows, better said - a preoccupation by the federal government in things French rather than things Newfoundland.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

The Premier is right that he will have difficulty with my handwriting. I got the French text just an hour or so ago and I will have a translation of it later today and I will be happy to make a copy available to him. It is a devastating letter, I say to him, in many respects. A number of the details in it are quite shocking admissions.

I want to identify with his commendation of Marie Thompson, because it was a marvellous job and brought some important facts to our attention.

The supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The letter also indicates on page 2 that French and Canadian officials would be meeting shortly - now keep in mind this letter is being written in February, 1986 - to discuss the tradeoffs implicit in the letter. That is not a quote from the letter, it is a conclusion I draw, to discuss the tradeoffs implicit in the letter. I ask the Premier, therefore, given that Mr. Clark was aware as early as February, 1986, that such a meeting would be proceeding almost immediately, at what time

were the Premier and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador made aware of the intention of the Government of Canada to commence these negotiations?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know that off the top of my head, but I will undertake to get the exact dates of when the meeting occurred after February 1986 to see, in fact, were we involved or were we notified about the meeting. I will get that for the hon. member as quickly as I can and supply him with that information just to see when we were.

May I just go on to say that I am sure the hon. member and all hon. members were also rather surprised, and we have to check this out as well, to hear in the programme the representative of the EEC talking about, as he understood it, a commitment by the Government of Canada to renew the long-term agreement which runs out at the end of 1987, which is just as disturbing. One can only hope that the representative for EEC was speaking on some kind of an opinion that he had rather than there being any commitment given by the Government of Canada.

MR. TULK:

So that is new?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, yes. Very definitely. From all of our information the federal government does not intend to renew that long-term agreement. And, therefore, it was rather surprising to hear a representative of EEC make the commitment that they have a

commitment to have that renewed. We said in January and February that one of the fears that we had was that France, being a member of the EEC and now getting some fish, singularly itself, through its 1972 agreement, would also mean that the other EEC countries could come looking for more fish after the 1987 agreement was up and, obviously, our worst fears have been validated by what these gentlemen said last night on the television show. So it is an ongoing battle and an ongoing affair which we will be on top of daily and we will pursue all of the things coming out of that programme. And I undertake to get the information sought in the previous question as to when we knew about the meeting of February, 1986, whether we were involved, whether we were consulted and whether we knew about the meeting beforehand.

MR. SIMMONS:

One other supplementary question, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS:

The Premier will note in the letter, just in fairness to all concerned, that Mr. Clark did indicate in Paragraph 5 that he did not foresee any possibility that the agreement of 1972 would be renewed or reopened or extended.

The Premier alluded to another part of the letter in which Mr. Clark assured the people of Saint-Malo that the federal government was not abandoning them. And the quip from my good friend from Fogo is apropos, because one would get the impression that somehow there was some special obligations beyond

those that nations normally have between each other, some special obligations there that the minister felt in saying that he was not abandoning the people of Saint-Malo. I would hope that he would have spent some time saying whether he is going to abandon the people of Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

And my supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier is, will he, during his trip to Ottawa, maybe, or otherwise in talking to Mr. Clark and Mr. Mulroney, determine what is it - is it something beyond the fish issue, something beyond good Francophone relations? - that appears to be so preoccupying the mind of the federal government on this Canada - France deal that it is not seeing the cause of the people of Newfoundland, the fishermen who are being abandoned outright in this issue?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There is no question about that, Mr. Speaker, that I will do my utmost to find out if there is something that is not apparent, you know, and why would they have this pre-occupation with the fishermen of Brittany over the fishermen of Newfoundland. I will use my best efforts, through the telephone, through letters and through direct meetings in the next two or three days to find out just what this meant and what led to this letter and what other kinds of correspondence came out

of that letter to the French people. It is just an incredible situation. It shows an attitude. I think that is the problem with it all, it shows an attitude.

The other point that needs to be made - and I will not delay the proceedings of the Question Period - is, as the Europeans have said, there does not seem to be a question of principle with the Canadians, just a question of how much. I mean, we always, in this part of the country, have some principles relating to our resources, I think on both sides of the House, and I find that somewhat alarming to hear Europeans depict, describe Canada's stand as not one of principle on this issue but one of just how much they have to give.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier and it concerns another letter that was sent to the Prime Minister as reported in a Canadian press story out of Halifax yesterday. The letter is reported to have been written by the Premier of Nova Scotia, and its contents were supported by his Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Leefe), and in it they are strenuously opposing any attempt by Newfoundland to get shared jurisdiction. I wonder will the Premier tell the House what effect will that lobby have on his efforts, and will he be discussing that matter tomorrow, or at least this week, with the Prime Minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I have all ready discussed it and I have also sent off some letters concerning it because I did get a copy of it. Nova Scotia has always been in a strange position. Some years or some months they have supported us on the whole question of concurrent jurisdiction in the fishery, and then at other times, two or three or four months later, they take a completely different approach. It is disturbing. We have had resolutions out of Premiers' conferences, and one last year where Nova Scotia supported the Newfoundland position, and now we find that they are not supporting us, that they are, as well as other Eastern Canadian provinces, looking for more Northern cod. Everybody is after the Northern cod, every man and his dog is after the Northern cod, Mr. Speaker, and it is just incredible. I do not understand why Nova Scotia takes their position. I have also mentioned the matter to the Premier of Nova Scotia and written him about it and will continue to use our best efforts. You know, Nova Scotia has nothing to lose on it. If they are going to be looking for more of cod, then we want more of their shrimp or more of their scallop or whatever, which they would adamantly refuse to give us. So they have been, in our view, extremely unfair and unreasonable in their approach to this whole question of concurrent jurisdiction, which could give us some greater security for resource supply in the future.

MR. W. CARTER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder can the Premier tell the House if the views expressed by the government of Nova Scotia are shared by the other Maritime Premiers? Is the Premier of Nova Scotia being aided and abetted in his lobby against Newfoundland by large fish companies that have branch offices here in Newfoundland, with maybe their headquarters in Nova Scotia?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No. Not at all in the sense that we find none of the large companies against us in what we are proposing. The other Maritime Premiers have been on side and have supported us. It has been Nova Scotia, by themselves, who have from time to time reversed their positions back and forth, at one period of time supporting us and another period of time not. I think everybody else seems to be very supportive of the position that we are taking, to the point where, as soon as the Quebec Constitutional matters are over, the next round of Constitutional talks are going to center on fisheries and Senate reform and property rights. All of the Premiers agreed that fisheries would form the subject of the next round of Constitutional talks along the lines of our proposal for concurrent jurisdiction.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier has the present administration had the opportunity yet to prepare a position with respect to the Quebec proposals for amendment to include Quebec in the new constitution and, specifically, whether the Premier believes that any of the proposals would involve special status for Quebec?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there have been ongoing bilateral meetings between the various provinces and representatives of the Government of Quebec over the last number of months. The Quebec Government has sent emissaries, individuals representing their government and representing their position on the constitution, around to see whether, in fact, there was sufficient support to lead to a First Ministers' Conference so that Quebec could become part of the constitution. These discussions have centered around the position that Quebec is taking. Now that has varied from time to time, and it gets difficult to characterize whether, in fact, on certain issues one can classify or characterize it as special status or not.

We are going to have to wait to see what their final position is in the meeting that is scheduled to be held on April 30 of this year, next month, that the Prime Minister has called to deal, at this point in time, with the final position of Quebec and where the provinces stand.

In their positions right now, I think perhaps most people would characterize it, if not special

status, as very close to it. If you get into immigration, for example, they want certain special requirements there that the other provinces do not have. Does that constitute special status, given the preponderance of the French language and French culture in Quebec, versus not having that kind of thing in the rest of the provinces?

In some of the other areas, on their preambles dealing with duality of the two nations or two peoples, and so on, if you add them all up, the amending formula and so on, especially in immigration, everything else being equal, perhaps the majority of the provinces could go along with it. But as you get into amending formulae, the preamble to it and some of the other issues, I think it is going to come down to, perhaps, the amending formula and opting out financial compensation as things that could be stumbling blocks to bringing everybody together.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

Is the present administration in this Province in agreement with the concept of a veto built in for Quebec with respect to the amending formula for future amendments?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there has not been, I do not think, any specific veto asked for at this point in time,

so we will have to wait and see what happens at the end of April. If in fact there was a special veto, a bona fide veto there, it would be very difficult for this Province to find favour with that. We have always taken the position, from our constitutional paper that was issued before the last round of constitutional talks where the constitution was patriated, that juridical equality must be the overriding principle that would guide us in our constitutional discussions. We have not steered away from that principle which we think is very important for the ongoing Confederation as we know it.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

Will the Premier undertake, in the House, to present the position of this administration prior to making the presentation at the Constitutional Conference?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I could agree to do it beforehand because I do not know what some of the final positions are, and there are still talks going on between the various provinces and Quebec. I would not want to go to the conference, having put all our positions on the table beforehand, until we have sat down together around the table, and in any way try to preempt the negotiations so that Newfoundland would be seen to be trying to stop the negotiations or to stymie the negotiations

before they began. But after the conference is over I would have no hesitation in outlining in complete detail what our positions were on all of the basic issues that Quebec are putting on the table.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) to provide some information with respect to the following subject matter. Recently, within the last few weeks, an electrical inspector's job was filled in the area. I would like to ask the minister to tell us, tell the House, what method was used to fill that particular job? Did it go through the Public Service Commission? Was it advertised? Were there interviews?

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, I am not fully aware of the particular position. I know the position, where it is and everything, but I am not fully conversant with what happened here. I will undertake, Mr. Speaker, to find out. It could be that there is a temporary appointment, a gentleman on sick leave or out for some reason, but I will check it out, Mr. Speaker, and report back later.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), and it is concerning, Mr. Speaker, the young boy who is still at the Health Science Centre. There were a number of questions asked last week concerning the visits, but I did not want to get the issue clouded with the original question of his escape. I would like to ask has the minister, since the young boy escaped, had any enquiry held as to the circumstances surrounding the escape and if he is satisfied that there were enough attendants with the young boy when he was transported from the Boys' Home to the Health Science Complex?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that there was enough security with him.

MR. EFFORD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister has he had any enquiry made as to the circumstances of the boy's escape because we could have seen another loss of life. The minister owes it to this House and owes it to the family, and to all the young boys at the home who are his responsibility. Will the Minister tell this House has he made any enquiries into the

circumstances surrounding the escape of the young boy?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
There is no need for an enquiry, Mr. Speaker. The boy left his own home. He was at home with his parents and when the police went to the front door he went out the backdoor and he went into the woods, so there is not much need of an enquiry there. When the police left he came back with his parents again.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, what the minister has said is totally false. The young boy escaped custody from the Health Science Complex. He ran into the woods twelve hours later when the Mounties went to his home. The question to the minister again is: Has he investigated or will he undertake an investigation as to why the young lad escaped, and why there was no search for him until twelve hours after he escaped, until the next day when the RCMP started looking for him?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement that he made about being totally false. I would refer him to Beauchesne, page 106, and that says "false", "false representations", "false statement" is unparliamentary. So I would ask the hon. member to

withdraw that.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that statement and say it is not correct what the minister said.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, all these questions were answered last week when the issue came up, every single one of them. I do not see the need to repeat them and the matter is now in the hands of the police.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. It concerns the recent restructuring of the Workers' Compensation Board and the patronage appointments to be compensated for before these commissioners could be removed. Let me ask the minister has a settlement been reached with these gentlemen or just what is the status of the settlements at this point?

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, settlement, as far as I am concerned, was reached with the two gentlemen. There was a proposal and a settlement made before the board was put in place. It was one of the reasons for the delay.

MR. TULK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I wonder could the hon. gentleman tell us what is the cost to the subscribers since the Workers' Compensation Board is paid for not by the government but by people in the Province? I wonder could he tell us what the cost of all the settlements, if any, were to these hon. gentlemen?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared at this time to state what the cost was. I have checked with the Department of Justice and received a legal opinion. I have been asked that same question by the media. And the answer is, Mr. Speaker, that this matter was dealt with in an Order-of-Council. Within the meaning of The Freedom Of Information Act that information is not available.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. TULK:

Do I correctly understand the minister to stand in this House and not tell us what three patronage appointments have cost the people of this Province? As a member of this House I do not know how much, and the people of this Province do not know how much the three patronage appointments cost the people of the Province. Am I now given to understand - I want to hear him again, just to make sure I heard correctly - that this

has been dealt with in a Minute-of-Cabinet and that he is not going to release those figures to the public?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member is making a speech. I did not hear any question.

MR. TULK:

I asked a question, Am I given to understand?"

MR. TOBIN:

You are not in caucus now, Beaton. You are not in caucus now.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I felt I answered the hon. the member's question. That is information that I am not prepared to give at this particular time unless I am directed by some different authority to make that information available. There were not three appointments anyway, Mr. Speaker, there were two.

MR. TULK:

Two, yes. How much did it cost?

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

My question is for the Minister of Labour concerning the walk-out by members of Steelworkers' Local 5795 at Labrador City. Could the minister tell us what involvement he or his department had in events

leading up to the strike?

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, we have had a conciliation officer dealing with the dispute at IOCC and the USWA, Local 5795, for some weeks now. As far as I know he is still there today, Mr. Speaker. After they had the first vote and the discussions broke off, our conciliator brought the parties back together again, and we had thought that they had reached an agreement. But, unfortunately, that was not the case.

MR. LONG:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
My supplementary would be concerning actions that the minister took on Sunday, over the weekend, in going to the media in contradiction of a press blackout. Could the minister tell us why he went to the media on Sunday to say that there was a tentative agreement when there had not actually been an agreement, and an agreement on a press blackout?

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, as far as I know there was no press blackout in

this particular case. I was in my office Sunday at about 8:15 and I received a telephone call from my deputy informing me that an agreement had been reached at the table between negotiating committees representing the Iron Ore Company of Canada and the United Steelworkers, Local 5795, and that within the next day or two they would be voting on the agreement. And he had said that the conciliator had called him and told him that a release could be made on it.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). I want the minister to tell us what is the rationale for limiting the size of new homes for special care, the boarding home, to six residents?

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. TWOMEY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We always get various inputs from different people in our communities and across this country as to what is the ideal kind of personal home or licenced boarding home. I would say that it is a fair reading that most people would say that 'I would like to be in an environment which closely resembles my home. That is where I would like to live. I would like to have the opportunity

of treating the owners of that home - you can call them the landlord and the landlady - in such a way as if I was dealing with my own family. And if on certain days of the week or certain times of the day I might like to eat something that is very difficult to get in the larger institutions, then I would feel that I was closer to home.' I have been to many of these homes myself and each and every one has his own perception of what he would like best. I know that in Saskatchewan five or six or seven bed nursing homes are the most popular.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

It is a very laudible reason. The unfortunate thing operators are saying that six bed homes are not viable, thus the quality of care is endangered, as the hon. minister will know. Will the minister be increasing the subsidy in his desire to keep those small homes down to six people so they can have all this interpersonal relations? Will he be increasing the subsidy so they can become viable? Or will he be increased the number of beds to twenty, as the operators are asking for, so that they can become viable at the present subsidy which is being offered? You cannot have it both ways. A small home is great but it is not viable.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I get many reports and varying advice as to what is ideal, whether it is six or twenty, and that is being frank. I know that the entrepreneurs in the field would like to have a twenty bed home, because obviously there is more profit in that. We have not got a complete costing of what it costs to run one of these homes per day for each individual. We have some idea and, hopefully in the near future, we will have a better idea of what it costs to support an individual in a licensed boarding home.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

As the hon. minister rightly says, he does receive advice, and among the advice the provincial bed count, which has been completed since July, I understand. Would the minister tell this House why he is sitting on this study? A lot of entrepreneurs want to build homes and are waiting for the result from this provincial bed count.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

I hope that within the next week or ten days I will be able to release that report.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Petitions

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here and it is done in different forms. One form is the form that was ruled on by Your Honour yesterday but another form is different Your Honour. It is the same subject matter. There are a large number of citizens of this Province who have signed it. I think there are 1,258 names. I have not counted them myself but that is what the total says on the envelope. It looks like more than that actually. Anyhow, there are over 1,200 citizens who have signed.

If I could just read it out, I believe it should satisfy the technical requirements but I will leave it to Your Honour. It says, "We believe that most citizens of our Province would agree that child abuse is a most serious and heinous crime. The recent court decision to reduce the sentencing of offender Dr. S. Collins from five years to two years seems to us a trivializing of the enormous suffering endured by eleven children. "If you agree, sign here and we will take this petition to the Department of Justice."

Underneath is the St. John's Status of Women Council with the related groups who make up the council. This particular one is a one page thing and it is signed by twenty or so individuals.

Now, that is one form of another petition which I would submit to, Your Honour, is in a sufficient or legitimate form in that it says, "If you agree, sign here and we will take this petition to the Department of Justice."

So, I would submit that under the aegis of this document we should have before this House the very great concern that has developed throughout the Province as a result of the decision of the Court of Appeal.

Now, I do not believe it is fair to blame the judges of the Court of Appeal because they are there trying to do the best job they possibly can.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

We will have to accept it as a valid petition before the hon. member can speak on it.

MR. BARRY:
Well, I would submit to, Your Honour, that this form should be sufficient. Just to save time I can indicate another petition form in this total package. There is another form of petition which went out by way of advertisements in newspapers and, in the same way, these advertisements have been signed by individuals and sent in, the subject matter being the same. In some of these cases, Your Honour, there is not more than one signature on that piece of paper which is the clipped out advertisement, but in this time of

mass media communications, I would ask, Your Honour, to take a look and see whether it is not possible for Your Honour to consider the total package which is being presented all of which are obviously instigated by the same group, all of which have the same substance and are signed by a large number of citizens whose concern should not be ignored.

So, I will submit this entire package to Your Honour and ask you, Your Honour, to make a ruling. If Your Honour wishes some time, it is not necessary for my own purposes that it go forward today. I would be pleased to leave it with Your Honour and let Your Honour bring in a ruling at the appropriate time. It is an issue which, I believe, members of this House should address before too long.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member does not feel that there is a great urgency about it, I would prefer to have a look at it and rule later.

MR. BARRY:

Yes. I will leave the outside one because I think that is the most clear one where we have an obviously appropriate form of petition under which all the rest can be lumped.

Orders of the Day

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Motion 1.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion debate was adjourned by the hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and

Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I will not be too long. I spoke on the resolution yesterday afternoon. I will just clue up.

As I said yesterday afternoon, I was a member of the Royal Canadian Air Force for some ten years and lived at various air force stations. As a matter of fact, for six of those years I was on the flight path of one of the main runways at Greenwood. I trust there was not too much of an affect on me as a result of having lived near the end of that runway. We had all sorts of jets take off, we had four engine, as I said, Bristol Britannias take off at all times of the day and night.

Mr. Speaker, I saw no reason why this House should not support this resolution with respect to the NATO base in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. Mr. Speaker, it was peculiar to hear the hon. two members down on this end of the House, the left wing of Newfoundland politics, the NDP, talk about the possibility of the effects of a NATO station in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier pointed out Tommy Douglas was one of the first people in the world, in Canada, to sign an agreement to have low level missile flights over Western Canada, and Blakeney, another NDP Premier, also supported the flights. Roy Romanov, another minister in that NDP government was one of the great supporters of low level flying over Western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, Pawley today is crying to the federal government for the F-18 contract, an NDP

Premier. It is funny what happens when people of the NDP stripe get into power. When they are outside looking in they can espouse everything but when they get into power, Mr. Speaker, they generally go along with some rational thinking.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution as presented by the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer). Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to stand on the floor of this Assembly to support it. The hon. the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Fenwick) in the House talked about and read letters showing opinions from different people in the Province who are against the NATO station and the low level tactical air base at Goose Bay. He quoted different people.

He quoted the Roman Catholic Diocese of Schefferville and an article in **The Monitor**. Mr. Speaker, nobody speaks for all of the people in the Roman Catholic Church. Certainly on several occasions I have had my times disagreeing with certain people who have written articles in **The Monitor** with respect to certain things that have happened in the Province.

The Leader of the NDP, when he stands in his place in this House, as Your Honour pointed out, should be talking about what his opinion is of the NATO station. The hon. member did not do that. As a matter, when he finished his speech yesterday afternoon, he got up and left the House because he did not want to be seen to be voting on that issue. The hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long), Mr. Speaker, today, when the resolution was mentioned in this House, got up from his

place and left the House so that he would not have to vote on this issue. Mr. Speaker, they cannot have it both ways.

They have to stand in this House and tell us what their feelings are and they have to vote on what their feelings are. That is what the people of St. John's East elected the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) for, and that is what the people in Menihek elected the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Fenwick) for, to stand in their places, to make their feelings known, and to vote on the different and various issues.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution. I hope every other member in this House supports the resolution, because, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We have been fighting for years to get our share of defence dollars spent in this Province. This is an opportunity for us to accomplish some of that.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the debate comes to a speedy conclusion and that we get on with voting on this issue so that we can show some support for the people in the district of Naskaupi and the people in Labrador.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this resolution. It is an opportunity for the people of Labrador, in particular, but, as my good friend from Pleasantville has just concluded saying, an opportunity for all of us to share some of the largess involved in an endeavour that is going forward anyway, whether it goes forward in Labrador or in some other part of the world.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we need not take much of our time to talk about this issue in terms of attempting to convince people, because all people in this Chamber, who have not closed minds, have already made a determination on this particular issue. So, Mr. Speaker, I intend for a few moments to use the opportunity to draw attention to another service that this resolution provides the people of Newfoundland; an opportunity to scrutinize a party which has been attempting to pull the wool over peoples' eyes for a long time.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, for years the question was: What is the NDP? Then it was: Why is the NDP? Now, as of five o'clock yesterday the question has gone out: Where is the NDP? Where are they physically today? Where are they on this particular issue? The issue, Mr. Speaker, is a fairly clear-cut one. It is not whether there will be a NATO base, but where it will be.

Thinking of my friends in the NDP, I guess a way of capsuling the problem is in the following: Will Labrador be goosed by the turkeys in the NDP? The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), a man who has already made quite a contribution to this House, I thought, I say to him in all

kindness, he kind of flubbed one little moment yesterday. He tried, you see, Mr. Speaker, to present a button to the members of the House. That was okay, so far as it went, but he was trying to present a button saying, "We support NATO in Goose Bay."

I say to him he should have known that you do not present one button to the NDP. You present two buttons to the NDP. One reads, "We support NATO in Goose Bay," and the other reads, "We do not support NATO in Goose Bay." I would ask the Page, if he would, to put that on the desk of the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Long) who is within hearing of my voice, and eventually will have the courage to come back into the House. The gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), in fairness to him, is, in his district doing some district business. Whether it is something that he suddenly found a reason to do, I am not sure, but he was on a plane out of here first thing this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I must go to Shakespeare for some help, and with apologies to him. 'Friends, Tories, countrymen, I came to praise the NDP, not to bury them.'

I praise their unbounded consistency. Mr. Speaker, is there any group in this entire country more consistent of position than the NDP? As on every other issue, they are both sides of this one too. Now that is consistency. They are on both sides of this issue as they are on every other issue. I praise the NDP, Mr. Speaker, for their unfettered attachment to the near divinity of their very actions. It is no surprise, Mr. Speaker, that they are having difficulty

with this particular resolution. You see, Mr. Speaker, when you are seized by the near divinity of what you do, then, Mr. Speaker, you can find reasons for any actions.

I knew that the gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) had voted for what I thought was the same resolution and then I went looking. I took them and with my friend who normally sits beside me, the gentleman from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), he looked at one copy and I read the other one yesterday and we discovered that lo and behold these are not the same resolutions. This is the problem I say to the Government House Leader, this is not the same resolution at all. No, Mr. Speaker, a very different resolution.

Last June the resolution with a number of "WHEREASES" had two resolutions, "BE IT RESOLVED", "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED". This one you will note, Mr. Speaker, before us now only has the one resolution. So then, what is it the second resolution has left out? If you would understand the reason the NDP is not voting for this resolution, it has to be that they are objecting to the omission of the last resolution. The last resolution says, "that this House of Assembly explore the possibility of an all party delegation to visit several of the NATO countries."

Now that is what he has his nose out of joint for, Mr. Speaker? That is his problem. He wants a trip. I am in favour of his going, Mr. Speaker. Indeed, I would suggest that it be one way.

MR. BARRY:

I am not going on any more trips.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I praise the NDP for their undying fetish -

MR. MORGAN:

I have a feeling Chris Decker is going for the leadership.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, we have lots of time if the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) -

MR. CALLAN:

Who goes on trips as well, fishing trips.

MR. SIMMONS:

Let them play, Mr. Speaker, we have lots of time.

I would like to praise also the NDP for that undying fetish for always doing their homework, Mr. Speaker. Have you ever seen a group of scholars that ever came close to those guys?

Mr. Speaker, for example, the NDP federally, Ray Skelly and Jim Fulton and the boys from BC got up and lobbied the Government of Canada for a nuclear-powered ice breaker to protect the Coast of BC, to protect the North of Canada. Now that was all right, Mr. Speaker, you see. That was all right because it was on the other side and, of course, any fool knows that nuclear fallout cannot cross provincial boundaries. Any fool knows that, especially the fool in the NDP.

The gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), I know he is not here, but he is here in spirit. I am sure he would want to be here for this important decision so I am reading it into the record so that

he can take it and mail it out to all his people. That is why I made this a peon of praise today rather than to in any way denigrate him in his absence.

He was reluctant, he told us yesterday, Mr. Speaker, to vote for the resolution last June. I guess he was. He did not have his instructions last June. But he has had a few months since then, Mr. Speaker, and he has had instructions. God knows he has had instructions. He has had instructions in St. John's to vote for it and he has had instructions in Montreal to vote against it. He cannot say he has had a lack of instruction now.

Mr. Speaker, at another time, when he is in the House, I will give notice that I will be raising the issue of the contempt - I will have to say the alleged contempt - embodied in his statements all the time in the press and here that he has not got his instructions. Beauchesne, May and Maingot have a lot to say about members of the House who are being influenced and admit to being influenced by other people in the way they vote. He might take that one under advisement if he would like to stay in this Chamber very long, I mean, until the next election.

Mr. Speaker, hear those immoral words yesterday. I quote the gentleman from Menihek: "If I had my time back." Will he now take the issues he has publicly supported and categorize them for us? On NATO he says, "If I had my time back." Now, let us take the issues that he supported over the months he has been here. He was against a minimum price of milk. He was against FPI privatization. He was against the FFT issue. He was for - Oh God, he was for

something! Look at that! - increased day care facilities. He was for equal pay. At the time he said it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, would he do us the favour of categorizing all the issues he has spoken on, like NATO and milk prices and FFTs and put them into two columns. I would suggest, for simplicity, he would call the columns the following: Column number one, 'I still stand by them for now,' and column number two, 'If I had my time back.' Where, Mr. Speaker, was he last June when we could have used his sage insights into all the reasons why we should not be doing what we are doing?

He also said, Mr. Speaker, yesterday - and I quote him - "We need more information. Give us more time to study it." Now, Mr. Speaker, remember that I properly praised him earlier for being consistent in all matters. He is consistent here too, consistently wrong. Let us quote, not his words against mine, not his words against the Premier's, not his words against the gentleman from Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), not his words against the gentleman from Torngat (Mr. Warren), who will speak later, let us quote the member for Menihek words against the member for Menihek. Yesterday he said, "We need more information. We need time."

Last year in the House on June 4, when we dealt with this resolution, on page L2693, Mr. Fenwick is speaking and he says, "Mr. Speaker, I can also say to you that I have spent a lot of time looking at the issue from both sides." He is consistently inconsistent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind

of person you are dealing with; that is the kind of party you are dealing with. They will say anything at a given time if they think it suits the mode or the purpose of the moment. The people of Newfoundland are not well served by that kind of double talk.

He says then, "Never mind the federal position, what is a responsible position?" I say to him, the answer is in his question. The answer is in that. "What is a responsible position?" Look for it, five words, "What is a responsible position." The answer is in the question. It is in the smallest word in the question. That little one syllable, one letter word, 'a'. That is the responsible position. I say to him, in his absence, what is a responsible position? Just one position, that is what is responsible, a position. Anyone can be for it, be against it, but for Lord's sake, stand for something, or you just might fall for everything.

He is not going to vote. He has been sent here and he is just going to forfeit the opportunity to represent the people from Menihek. He is not going to vote!

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if I may suggest, Sir, you are a man of fairness, Lord knows - and perhaps you will get the agreement of the House on this - why not for the moment, when we take the vote, if we could agree, suspend the normal rules of the House and let the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) vote twice, once for it, once against it.

The latest Messiah in the firmament of the Neanderthal demolition party is the gentleman

from St. John's East (Mr. Long). He had some interesting things to say too yesterday. He has not quite, I say to him in all fairness - as he nervously sips his coffee out there - I say to him in all fairness and all in kindness he has not quite got his leaders art of being consistently inconsistent down pat. As yet I have not been able to find too many contradictory terms. Now that might be because he lacks the experience - and time will take care of that - but it may be, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you, for another reason.

I am sure my friend from Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) was well intentioned when he talked about the left wing of politics in this Province. If he is talking about the member for Menihek, he has characterized it right when he says the left wing, but if he is talking about the gentleman from St. John's East, I would suggest to him that if he wants to see where he stands, he, the gentleman from Pleasantville, should get well over on the left wing, stand close to the gentleman from Menihek and then take a telescope and look far, far left. On a clear day he might see the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Long).

Yes, Mr. Speaker, he wondered if we were taking him seriously yesterday. He thought the laughter meant we were not taking him seriously. Mr. Speaker, we do not have too many choices. We either laugh at what he is saying or cry about it and we would sooner do the latter. That is what frightens us about it, Mr. Speaker, we do take him seriously. That is what frightens us about the gentleman from St. John's East. We take him

seriously.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), a well-read man, knows great authors and does like Engels and Marx and so on. I think he would agree with me that Karl Marx is getting a rough ride in this House. The gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Long) gives Karl Marx a bad name. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have, as the gentleman from St. John's East said, come together, the Tories and Liberals, we have come together. We have a lot of differences and a lot of things that separate us but, to our credit, we have a couple of things that bind us. The day that those things do not bind us we do not belong here, no matter what our party label.

We have come together on this NATO resolution, yes, because, Mr. Speaker, when it is a straight matter of a choice between economic good sense and socialist pap, I have no trouble getting in bed with the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and he and I have a number of disagreements on many things.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:
Careful.

MR. SIMMONS:
In a political bed. Now they know that our trip to Norway was not all business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Ha, ha!

MR. DAWE:
(Inaudible) Burin - Placentia West, not St. John's East.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, no. I was about to say and I could equally have said about my gentleman friend from St. George's (Mr. Dawe), that he and I have disagreed often, but when it comes to a choice between economic good sense and socialist pap, I suggest he will be on the same side of the argument as I am. That is what I am saying in effect.

I understand that my gentleman friend from Burin - Placentia West is always looking for diversions but I cannot accommodate him at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, I guess the final word of advice I have for the two gentlemen from the NDP is this: there is an old expression that says volumes. It says, and I quote, "If you are about to be run out of town, you can look like the guest of honour if you position yourself at the head of the procession". I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the most the NDP can salvage from this now is a bit of face saving by appearing to do the honourable thing.

They are about to be run out of town on this one and on many others. So I appeal to them, just for the sake of their survival. Mr. Speaker, what would we do without the people in the NDP? We would have to create them, Mr. Speaker, because, you see, they come into this House, and just in case somebody here has not done his homework, and just in case he is being preoccupied by the mail in his office that day or the volume of constituent calls that day, he can count on the NDP to very quickly focus the issue and outline the problem for him. Because, you see, the NDP in no time at all, if you watch them more than an hour, they would have defined both solutions and they

will be taking both. They will be supporting both solutions.

Mr. Speaker, what could be more clear cut than to have that done for you and then you do not have to worry about doing the thinking. You either stand for it or against it. If you are for it, you are siding with the NDP, if you are against it, you are also siding with the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) for putting down this motion a second time. He has done the people of Newfoundland a great service, not only in ensuring that our support has been recorded once again for this economic activity, with its obvious beneficial spinoff in the Goose Bay and the Labrador area generally, but he has also given us that other opportunity, the opportunity to once again transmit to the people of Newfoundland the abominable mug job or con job that the NDP want to do on this issue and every other issue. Let the word go out on what they are doing and let the word go out they are not going to get away with it any longer.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When this debate started yesterday I thought, as elected representatives of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, that all of us would take the opportunity to listen and, if we wanted to express our views, we would express our views. Usually most ordinary Newfoundlanders and Labradorians will express their views and will sit back and listen to the rebuttals.

I must say that yesterday I felt ashamed to be a member of this House and know that two members would come in here and speak for fifteen or twenty minutes and then take off like two scared dogs. That is exactly what they did yesterday, Mr. Speaker. They came in here and the Speaker, in his wisdom, let both gentlemen speak and both of them spoke and condemned jobs in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. When they finished, both of them took off out through the door just like two scared dogs.

Mr. Speaker, last week I dropped a report on the desk of most members here, and I gave it to the member of Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), whose district probably is the most effected by the coming or going of NATO. I might say also that NATO, if it does come to Goose Bay or the military does increase their presence in Goose Bay, not only Naskaupi will benefit from it, but also it will be beneficial in my district. There will be benefits in the district of Menihek. There will be benefits in the district of Eagle River and it will also benefit the Island.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite pleased that a good friend of mine is in the gallery today. He is a businessman from my district whom I think could probably benefit if

NATO were to go in Goose Bay. At the same time, I think governments have to be aware of the environment, wildlife and the health of the people which has been addressed.

I found the Leader of the NDP astonishing. I know, Mr. Speaker, I am not allowed to call a person a liar and I would withdraw the word, but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if ever I can go as close as I can go to saying that the hon. member for Menihek does, in my opinion, go as close to not telling the truth then, Mr. Speaker, I believe I could be correct in saying that.

Let me go back a few days to when the hon. member made a trip to Happy Valley - Goose Bay. When he got up there he prepared a nineteen page report. Let me tell you what he done with this report. He took it down to the Public Library in Goose Bay and presented it as a book. He sort of camouflaged it and hoodwinked the staff in the library. On the plane going to Goose Bay last week I spoke to the person in charge of the libraries in Newfoundland and Labrador and he is concerned that this paper was allowed to be in the library. He is concerned that the hon. member, a member of assumably some intelligence, would take a paper like this and put it in a public library of the Province. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should be ashamed to do such a thing.

Then, on top of that, Mr. Speaker, I will not take the time to go through the whole list here, but on top of that he does not tell the truth. He said he met with the PSAC but that is not the truth. That is a downright lie. The hon. member met with a member

of the NDP Party who attended the national convention in Montreal. That is who he met with.

So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is coming in here, trying to give us sob stories and he is not telling the truth. If he can take a side on an issue, surely goodness he can stand by the issue. Last June he came in and supported the NATO base after an eight hour debate, I think it was. He supported NATO going into Goose Bay and now he decides he does not want to.

How would the hon. gentleman feel if the member for Naskaupi, myself or the member for Eagle River decided to go into Labrador City - Wabush and say, we do not want the Iron Ore Company here in Labrador City - Wabush because they are polluting the atmosphere? What would he say in this House?

Mr. Speaker, if it is within the rules of the House but I would like to ask, and you can probably rule on it in due course, but it is possible after I am finished, I am supposed to close off the debate, that you, Sir, in your good wisdom can wait until the two hon. gentleman poke their noses into the doors and then call for a vote and see what happens? If we can only do that, Mr. Speaker, but then again, we would have to chain them on because here they are against Newfoundland and Labrador gainfully employing people.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the young man from St. John's East (Mr. Long) spoke, and I know he is within hearing distance because there are speakers through the offices, the young man from St. John's East yesterday, a young fellow that in order to go to Labrador probably would not even

know which plane he has to go on. He does not know how to get up there.

MR. BAIRD:

He was never outside the overpass.

MR. WARREN:

As my hon. colleague says, the only way he went outside the overpass was probably going to Montreal, Toronto or somewhere like that, but he was never in Labrador in his life. Here this young gentleman comes in and the first thing he says is nobody in Torngat Mountains wants NATO to go ahead. Then he starts quoting. I must say that the quotes that he took from William Anderson the Third, and the quote that he made from Gary Mitchell, showed concerns. However, the concerns were over what John Crosbie said in Goose Bay. I was there. I was concerned too with the attitude of John Crosbie in Goose Bay.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) was there, and we were concerned about the comments that Mr. Crosbie made. He was told so. Mr. Speaker, these kinds of things we can agree with. But I cannot agree with the hon. member for St. John's East when he gets up and says, "Nobody in Torngat Mountains wants NATO."

I have received a total, Mr. Speaker, in my nine years - and you can go through my files - of one letter from one Inuit person in my district who told me that they do not want NATO to go ahead. That is the only letter that I have received, from one individual gentleman who is completely opposed to NATO.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon.

gentleman quoted from three individual people. Now, the hon. gentleman did not say that there were twenty-eight interveners on the Coast. There were twenty-eight and he only quoted from three. What about the other twenty-five? Why did he not quote from the other twenty-five? My friends, the hon. gentleman is not doing his homework.

The other evening I was reading from **Readers Digest**, a quote from Robert Lucas, I think, which will be most appropriate for the two gentlemen from St. John's East. It says, 'Have you heard about the man who was arrested for running through a wheat field?' The comment was, 'He was charged with going against the grain.'

I must say that the two hon. gentlemen from St. John's East and from Menihek are definitely going against the grain and going against their own constituents. I could tell you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. the President of Treasury Board, (Mr. Windsor), who was in Labrador City this past weekend, that I will do my best, I will do what I can, and likewise all colleagues over here, and likewise, I am sure, the colleagues opposite to me now, so that everyone knows the the way member for Menihek is flip-flopping. He does not deserve to represent people in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, on the radio and television last night - I may not be quoting him word for word - he did say something to the effect that they are not going to make a decision until the party makes a decision. They are not going to vote until the caucus makes a decision. Furthermore, he said, "If I do not

agree with it, I will have to resign." I hope the hon. member for Menihek is held up to what he said last night on television. Because if he does, I have a funny feeling that the hon. gentleman is calling a press conference in Menihek now and resigning. I think that might be one of the reasons why the hon. member has gone to Menihek. Last night on television he said that if we do not agree, he is going to have to resign.

His conscience may have bothered him yesterday, you see. His conscience may have bothered him to the point, if he is a really honest individual, that he went to his district, which is the right thing for an honourable member to do, and probably announced his resignation.

MR. DINN:

Do not be so foolish.

MR. WARREN:

Well, it is possible. My hon. colleague here, the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) should realize that we all have a conscience.

MR. MITCHELL:

His skin is too thick.

MR. WARREN:

No, I would like to give the hon. member the benefit of the doubt. Now, if he turns up in the House tomorrow or the next day, then we know that - surely goodness, Mr. Speaker, you must realize too - he does not have a conscience then, if he comes into the House again after what he said on television last night and after what he said yesterday. The man's conscience cannot allow him to represent the people, Mr. Speaker.

He was elected by 2,000 votes, and

those 2,000 people who voted for the hon. gentleman, I would venture to say, 80 per cent of them are in the work force trying to maintain their families. Here is the gentleman saying, 'Look, we do not want any more jobs up here.' So the hon. gentleman has to clear his conscience once and for all, Mr. Speaker.

I am not going to take up any more time because I think we have said enough. However, Mr. Speaker, I am going to recommend to the Public Library Board the rebuttal to the member for Menihek's paper which he put in the public Library Board, which I did not think was fair. I think it was disgraceful for it to be there. I am going to recommend now, seeing that this was allowed to go in there, that a report on an investigation of low level flying and its affect on the Native peoples of Labrador by the Mokami Project Group, Happy Valley - Goose Bay, Labrador, on March 17 go in. I will table this copy, Mr. Speaker. I am going to write to the Public Library Board in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, and I am sure my hon. colleague will do the same, and ask to have this in there too where the people can also read and show that the hon. member for Menihek has not been telling the truth.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting. The Inuit have said that there were twenty-eight complaints registered against low flying and against the NATO people. The member for Menihek - I cannot call him by his first name, God forbid! - asked them to document proof. Up to today, there is one instance, and the pilot of that particular aircraft that was close to Nain is presently grounded because he disobeyed the rules.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to go back. I think this is very, very interesting. I have to quote this. The hon. member said he met with the Ministerial Association. Now I am not all in favour of the Ministerial Association in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. I must say that some of their comments have not been in the best interests of the people of Labrador.

MR. TULK:

You should not mix religion and the state anyway.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) - here I will quote - "Mr. Fenwick met with Father Roache." Now, who is Father Roache? From the front page of the paper today, I understand he is one of the people who has a warrant for his arrest issued.

Mr. Speaker, who else did he meet with?

MR. TULK:

What was he doing?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I understand he was over in the Mealy Mountains where there were some Caribou being killed illegally. Now, I do not know if the hon. gentleman was involved in that or not, but I understand that he has been over in the Mealy Mountains. What he was doing over there, I have no idea.

Now, who else did he meet with? Father McKenna is the Roman Catholic Priest for the Canadian Armed Forces. Although a member of the Ministerial Association, he did not attend to represent their views. Now, those are the two gentlemen that the hon. member met

with in Goose Bay. There are nine clergy, I think, on the Ministerial Association. He met with those two. Then he comes back and says he met with the Ministerial Association and neither one of them expressed their views. So, Mr. Speaker, it is lies, lies, lies, in this paper.

MR. DAWE:

Now, do not get carried away.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. Yes, I withdraw those words, lies, lies, lies. I say they are untruths, untruths, and untruths.

Mr. Speaker, before I close I want to go on record in support of this resolution. This resolution is good for Labrador. It is good for my district. It is good for all districts. It is good for the Island. And for the gall of the hon. the member to ever come into this House again and ask a question about jobs -

MR. GILBERT:

Where did he send them?

MR. WARREN:

The two hon. members from the NDP party -

MR. TULK:

You cannot be sure because you do not know where the hon. the member for Menihek is. We know that the member for St. John's East is against it. I will tell you what, they have a split in that caucus, flip and flop.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I must say to the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) that there is only two that can split. I must say, it is better to see two split in public than fifteen split.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the hon. gentlemen opposite will not accept either one of those two members in their party. I would hope that those two members will not get into the hon. gentleman's party.

MR. TULK:

If they did I would change parties.

MR. WARREN:

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, the boys are getting me carried away.

I want to close by saying I support the resolution and I believe, Mr. Speaker, I beg of you, Sir, if it is in your will and power to do so, you may have to check with Beauchesne, could you kindly, before you call the question, perhaps defer it until the two hon. members from St. John's East and Menihek are in the House.

Thank you.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member - this is just on a point of order, I guess - for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) makes a very wise suggestion, in the opinion of members on this side. I would like to propose, it would probably require some kind of unanimous agreement from both sides, that we reach an agreement that the debate has concluded. But, because of the fact that there are a number of members not in the House whom we would like to see have the opportunity to vote on this very historic resolution in this

debate, we would like to agree that the question not be put now, but that it be put at a more appropriate occasion, sometime in the very near future, whenever that might be. Perhaps, the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) could speak to that.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I just want to make one comment to the hon. gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) before I give unanimous consent. We do agree that we should have this vote when the two hon. gentlemen, let us not say a more appropriate time, when the two hon. gentlemen have either a chance to stand in their seats and go for or against this resolution or otherwise walk out of here. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that I am amused at the vigour with which he goes at this because I believe in his last life he must have been a wolf or the leader of a wolf pact or something.

But we certainly give him unanimous consent that we will conclude debate at this time and that we will have the resolution put when the two hon. gentlemen cannot run away from the place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! It is agreed that the debate is concluded and that this motion will be put to a vote at a later date.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SIMMS:

Motion 2, Mr. Speaker.

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

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to take an opportunity to make a comment, which has no real relationship to the debate on granting of supply, to thank the government side, of course, for their recent support for bringing forward the resolution a second time, or a modified version of the resolution, because it relates so closely to my district and certainly relates to the economics of our Province. I would also like to thank the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) who had a noontime function today, a very nice lunch indeed, which featured food items from our region of the Province and other parts of the Province, and I thank him very much for inviting me to attend. It was a great pleasure to be there. And even though it was, I suppose, a political function, I was there purely as a colleague from Labrador and the invitation was given and accepted in the same light. So I just want to make mention of that.

Looking back over some of the comments made in the debate on the granting of supply, I made some

reference to the fact that generally speaking, by precedent and by tradition, members of this House will take advantage of the opportunities afforded in the debate on supply and the question of supply to make some points, either from a political point of view as an Opposition or for regional points relating to their own particular districts. And I did this and I had the opportunity to make some special references to the Minister of Finance and to make a particular point. I used an analogy which related to him as part of the human body, the prostate gland of the human body, which is very similar to the Finance Minister of any government, not just this government. And in reading it over I realize that the point was probably made more solidly than I even had anticipated in the first case. And I am sure that the minister was not insulted by being likened to a prostate gland. In fact, there are some very good things about a prostate gland, and he could be proud of that kind of a reference.

So I am sure he took it in the light I intended, and the points with reference to our suggested reduction in the retail sales tax from the present exorbitant 12 per cent down to a much more palatable 10 per cent, which would be in the best interest of the people of this Province, of Newfoundland and Labrador, and would indeed, in my opinion and the opinion of many, and certainly in the opinion of the Liberal Party would stimulate the economy in the sense that where you do not have the revenue on the individual items volume sales will increase your overall revenue. That is a precept and a premise of the Liberal Party which we have been promoting for the last couple

of years.

On some of the other issues, of course, that relate to just exactly how a particular administration looks after the finances of our Province, what they do with the money - and that is what the granting of Interim Supply is all about, to pay the bills that they have incurred - you get into considerations about perhaps regional concerns, and you can think of a number up our way.

For example, when you talk about the development of certain fishery resources, there has been probably some attention paid to the potential of inland Labrador waters, and ministers and members who were here are aware of what I am talking about. I am talking about the attempt over a period of years, through funding and so on, to create and develop a whitefish industry in the Lobstick Lake area. Now that has never come about. And there has been some interest, but to a much less degree, with respect to the potential for a smelt fishery, or even a rock cod fishery in the Lake Melville area. I would like to see some greater level of attention focused on the possibilities or the potential of developing a commercial smelt fishery in the Lake Melville area, with some direct benefits, I would suggest, for example, the community of North West River, where a harvesting and processing facility could be set up which would benefit the area generally. My understanding is that an adequate market has been established, or the market is available for smelt, probably more than can be harvested. So there seems to be no shortage of demand. The question is, how can we harvest the supply to meet that

demand. I would like to see some attention addressed to that, as one example. But as you get into your own region, you consider that there are many things that need attention, as they do in other parts of the Province.

I would like to thank the Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn), who is just outside here now, for some of the comments he has been making, some of the actions he has been taking lately with respect to the assessment of housing needs in this Province, which I support. I believe it is something that should be done. The minister will confirm, of course, that we do have quite a bit of correspondence between us with respect to the needs of my particular district. The minister is also aware that this week, on Friday, the Melville Native Housing Association, based in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, will be having their annual meeting and will be officially opening the eight units, which we spoke about earlier, for which funding has been received. I am going to be attending that. I am not sure if the minister is, but certainly his officials will be there from NLHC.

I think it is a significant step in that the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, Naskaupi district, was fortunate enough to obtain a total of twenty-six units altogether. Ten of those will be connected with the senior citizens' home, eight through the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation itself, and eight through the Melville Native Housing Association. So we have done fairly well. However, the minister will also confirm, from the reams of correspondence we have generated back and forth between each other on the subject

of an inadequate supply of housing, that much more has to be done. I thank him and commend him for the comments and the actions he has taken to date, and assure him that I will continue to press, as a member of this House, through the Minister responsible for Housing, for the ongoing consideration of what the needs might be in the future.

With respect to NATO - and that seems to relate to almost everything in Labrador - the increased demand that NATO and the spinoffs of NATO will create on the housing supply will be quite significant - stupendous, perhaps, if all the employment figures come about as we project they might. That will be of concern to me, it will be of concern to the people there, and certainly of concern to the Minister responsible for Housing. I suggest to him that a very, very close look and some projections will have to be made in the very near future as to what the demands might be and how we can supply that demand.

Within the scope of infrastructure in my district, the main things that seem to be of concern to the people of Churchill Falls, for example, is the fact that there is an inadequate transportation system. When I say that, I mean a comprehensive transportation system. They are subject to two commercial flights a week only, and a road that is a tote road at best in the Summer, but maintained, I suppose, to the limit of the funds available by Transportation, which will eventually be a part of the Trans-Labrador Highway.

I would now like to make a suggestion, which I will follow up with some correspondence with

respect to that road and put it on the record that I suggest consideration should be given to having crews of inmates from the correctional centers in our Province, particularly institutions which may not have developed land based rehabilitation activity or activities for the inmates, as long as it does not conflict with private entrepreneurs, do some of the brush clearing and some of the improvements on that road that can be done by a small crew of fifteen or twenty people, perhaps, on a regular basis. We could set up some sort of a road camp system with the proper security. I think that is worth considering because, whereas funding may not be readily available to improve the road between Happy Valley - Goose Bay and Churchill Falls, certainly there are crews, made up from the inmates of the correctional center in Labrador, willing to go out and do some brush clearing. One of the problems on the Happy Valley - Goose Bay end of the road is that it has grown in over the years and there has been no real concentration of effort to cutting back the brush and increasing visibility and removing the safety hazards there.

So I would make that suggestion that, in considering the expenditure of funding on a way to get out of that bind, an idea might be to consider that sort of a proposal. I will follow that suggestion up with some correspondence to the various ministers who might be involved.

Could I ask, Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member's time is up.

MR. KELLAND:

Sorry I mentioned it, Mr. Chairman, but I will address it again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. KELLAND:

Do I have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

By leave, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

If you promise you will not withdraw when I start the next part, okay.

I know that the hon. members across, as I said, when I made the analogy last week with reference to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), they took it in good spirits, so I was thinking about then breaking the anatomy down into several important parts and doing analogies on other members opposite. Unfortunately, I would prefer if the various members were present at the time. For example, following the exchange Friday between myself and the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), I really wanted to get on my feet and do an analogy on him and a certain part of the anatomy. All I was probably going to say is that he does resemble a certain part of the anatomy and it must be damn lonely back there.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, if he is going to speak he has got to be relevant.

MR. KELLAND:

This is very relevant because it is unfortunate the member for

Bonavista South, being in the position he is, has to put up with a lot of crap, and therefore the analogy is à propos, I would say.

Do you accept those parliamentary phrases, Mr. Chairman? Anyway, I will not go on with that.

It does strike me, when we are talking about the expenditure of money, that we do have an interesting situation in Newfoundland where we have an administration which, they say, is dedicated to promoting Newfoundland and Labrador and giving every possible opportunity to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. Still, occasionally we find our government in a position which must be extremely difficult to defend. I am thinking of a subject which has come up in the House a number of different times and may be give you a little bit of a possible scene that may have taken place some time ago when the hon. the Premier of this Province went up to Alberta, and the conversation could have possibly gone something like this, "How's she goin', Peter, b'y? Lard dyin' reeven!" - and out with the hand, because he is very good at that sort of thing

MR. DECKER:

Who is?

MR. KELLAND:

That is the hon. the Premier.

And the former Premier of Alberta looked at him kind of a little askance, and says, "Yes, of course, Brian, Lard dyin' reeven", certainly, I agree." And they shook hands and they made some kind of an arrangement. The hon. the Premier said, "Now, Peter, boy, I will give you \$40,000 - I

got all kinds of it down here, do not pay no attention to what the media tells you - right here, \$40,000 I got for you, and all you got to do is give us a bit of advice from your long experience."

MR. TULK:
Who is that?

MR. KELLAND:
No, no. This is the hon. the Premier is talking now. Hang on now.

"I got \$40,000 and all you got to do is give us a little bit of advice and write four reports a year. The Liberals are too dumb to know whether or not we get the reports. What difference do it make anyway, hey, Pete, boy?"

MR. DECKER:
Yes, nobody will ever see them.

MR. TOBIN:
That is right. You are not very bright.

MR. KELLAND:
Hang on now. This is your Premier talking. He is going to say those things about us anyway. He is saying, "Well, you have to ignore the other party in the House because they might agree with me today and disagree tomorrow, see, Pete," says our hon. Premier. So, anyway, when the conversation was over and the deal was made, the hon. the Premier came back in the House and said, 'With a few expenses, for the mere sum of \$40,000, we got the unlimited expertise of Peter Lougheed,' who just, coincidentally, happens to be a Tory buddy. Let us face it, patronage!

"I got him for \$40,000 and a few expenses." Of course, naturally, the Opposition all jumped to their

feet and howled. Why would they not! Because \$40,000 and a few undefined expenses was a lot of dough.

Anyway, the hon. the Premier weathered the storm here in our House of Assembly and I visualized Peter Lougheed back in his board room talking to his buddies sometime later, in fact in more recent times, when other monies, considerable monies had gone to the firm of which Mr. Lougheed is a partner, a senior member. He was in his board room saying, 'Now, fellows, every time buddy from Newfoundland comes up here, our friend, he always seems to say things like, 'Lard dyin' reevin', b'y', and, 'me son' and stuff like that which seems to work in the outports of Newfoundland because they gave him a mandate the last time he did this. So Lougheed said, 'When he comes up here, anytime you see him, anytime you shake hands with him and he is about to say to you, 'Lard dyin' reevin', how's she goin' me son. I am a Newfoundlander and have all kinds of money for you,' I charge you right now, my colleagues, because it is important to our future, you stick out your hand and shake hands with those Newfoundlanders and you say, 'Lard dyin' reevin', too. You do not have to know what it means, but it seems to me that every time we say it we get something like a \$500,000 of Newfie money, and why would we not take it." That is probably what happened in board rooms up in Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of different things I would like to talk about but I am willing to sit down. I thank the members opposite for the leave they gave me. I am sure if they knew what I was going to say they would not

have given it, but that is neither here nor there. I sit down now still with the opportunity, a couple of times in the future, hopefully get the opportunity to rebut comments by whoever is left on the government side over there. Now that the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) is back in the House, he may want to contribute something and take his traditional two positions on the question.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DINN

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in the debate this afternoon on supply just to point out a few things to the hon. member. I was not going to speak, but the hon. member talked about the quality of the work done by former Premier Lougheed of Alberta and the price of \$40,000. I know he would not be aware, because he has not been around in politics that long, for example, that in former times \$40,000 was not a lot of money. Twenty years ago, I remember, for example, one gentleman who used to operate in this Province, his name was Doyle, and in one fell swoop he was given \$117 million to take off to Europe and parlay a linerboard mill. The hon. member would not remember that, of course, I know he would not remember that anything like that happened in this Province, that an Order-in-Council equivalent to \$117 million was just passed over to one man to parlay a linerboard mill, to go over and see if he could borrow the rest and build a

linerboard mill in a place where studies proved at that time it could not work. The hon. member would not know about that because he has not been involved in politics that long. Nor would he know that in building a refinery at Come By Chance another hon. gentleman was not only given the monies to build a refinery there but every single dollar in that development was guaranteed by a former administration that he would not know about because he has not been around the Province that long, he has not been involved in politics that long. And why would he know about it? It would not be possible for him to know about it. He would not know, for example, that in those times, if that deal on just the Come By Chance refinery alone were not renegotiated - the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) knows what I am talking about, but the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) may not know - that this Province probably - it would never have gone bankrupt, but this Province would have been on the hook, as the hon. member for Twillingate knows to be true, for \$600 million. Not \$40,000 or \$400,000 or \$4 million or \$40 million, but this Province would have been on the hook, if that deal on the Come By Chance refinery had not been renegotiated, for \$600 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, before he gets up to speak, should learn a little something of the history of the politics of Newfoundland. He talks about \$40,000 and speaks in awe of this amount of money going out to one individual, an individual, I might add, who is doing a great job with respect to the negotiations on offshore, in my opinion, humble as it might

be. But when he talks about this \$40,000 that we are paying a former Premier in Canada for his assistance with respect to oil negotiations, financial regimes for negotiations, we on this side think that that is money well spent. But it does not compare, it is a flash in the pan in the centuries of time of Newfoundland, when we consider the other things that have happened to this Province.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this Province never signs a deal on the offshore if it does not benefit the people of this Province, not only now but the hon. member's children and his children's children. I hope that I am never a party to anyone negotiating a deal similar to - we all use it as an example - the Upper Churchill one on the offshore. Because, Mr. Chairman, I can tell my colleagues on this side and all members of this House, that I will not be on this side of the House for one minute, sixty seconds, after ink goes to paper, because it is too important to the people of this Province.

Now we can talk about the \$40,000 if you want and that is what this is all about. We are talking about Interim Supply, we are talking about the finances of the Province, we are talking about how monies are spent. It is one that I will have no trouble in taking, none whatsoever. And, Mr. Chairman, I have no trouble in supporting on this side, even though it is difficult, even though we are wrecking our brains over the past weeks and months and, as a matter of fact, years, we have been on an austerity programme in this Province, ever since I have been in politics, certainly, since 1975 and, Mr.

Chairman, it still becomes almost an unmanageable situation to put the finances of this Province together for another year. Every year we do the same thing.

We have to have hospitals and we have to have hospital beds, we have to have senior citizens' homes, we have to have chronic care, we have to have schools, and we have every minister in this government on a daily basis crying for more. I am no less. There is not a day goes by or a year goes by or a week goes by that I am not crying for more money for housing.

Hope Brook has a gold mine. When that was going in I was involved in the negotiations from day one, almost, as Minister of Mines. Hon. members may not know it, but that is not the big bonanza that it may appear to be. Consider that you scoop out a ton of earth, put it into a heap leach for processing, and what you get out of that one ton of earth is .18 of an ounce of gold.

MR. W. CARTER:
Only .18?

MR. DINN:
Only .18 of an ounce. That is approximately, now. That is not to say that you do not hit better zones or it is not more prevalent in one area than another, but on an average basis you are talking about .18 of an ounce of gold for one ton of earth processed.

So I spoke to the gentlemen when they came in and they told us about what they were about, what they had identified at that point in time, and what they figured they needed to get this project into operation. They said, 'Minister, if we have to operate by diesel, if we have to put our

own diesel in there, it may not be a go project. If we go to any other province in Canada' - they have operations in Quebec and in Ontario - 'the government generally provides the power. That is a part of the infrastructure that we expect would be normal.' So we looked at that and in order to put a line in from Bottom Brook to Burgeo, and then a spur line in, the amount that we could attribute to that development would be about \$19.5 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. DINN:

I will just finish that off.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

By leave!

MR. DINN:

So if one considers what we are trying to deal with as a Province, and the monies that are so scarce here, we talked about that, I guess, for weeks, as other things were happening and the assessment was going on with the project and so on, but they needed that spur line, they needed a road and they needed a wharf. It is \$150 million project and they needed so much for processing equipment out there so they went to DIRE - not DREE now, but DIRE - and DRIE had a programme of providing 30 per cent of the dollars required for any new processing equipment in

any province, which meant that DIRE could come up with \$14 million out of the \$150 million.

We provided the power and \$6 million. The reason for the \$6 million was for the spur line and other things that they needed to put the project together, the road and the wharf and so on. Mr. Chairman, if hon. members in the House only knew what we went through to wrench that money for that project because of the other needs that we have in the Province. I have to compliment, for example, the people who supported it - everybody supported it eventually obviously - but the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), who has a terrific burden to put together a budget for this Province, but he came to the aid of the party and supported the project, and so on, as it went along the road. And finally it was approved and it is on its way now. Mr. Chairman, I hope it is a success because I think it is one of five or six gold mines that we could have in this Province over the next ten years, and I will speak a little further on that a little later on. But I do not have to think about it a lot because I have a lot of information as to what is going on exploration-wise in the Province. But I will get onto it a little later on because I know other hon. members want to speak.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, I assure my hon. friend that I am not going to speak at length except to make a

few brief references to some comments made by my friend, the member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn). I believe it was C. D. Howe, onetime Minister of Trade and Commerce, I believe in the St. Laurent or the Pearson Government, in referring to an expenditure, it might have been during the great pipeline debate, said that it is only a million dollars.

The hon. minister I think lived to regret having made that statement.

Now, the minister made a statement a moment ago that I suspect he is going to live to regret having made, when he, in defending the actions of his government in making a rather large payment to the former Premier of Alberta, Mr. Peter Lougheed -

MR. PEACH:

Forty thousand dollars.

MR. W. CARTER:

Four hundred thousand dollars, Mr. Chairman, is the amount, not \$40,000. It was intended to be \$40,000, and that is the amount that we were led to believe would be made payable to the former premier, but when the special warrants were issued then we saw the real story. Indeed, an amount of \$400,000 had been paid to the former Premier's law firm. The Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) referred to that as a flash in the pan. Now, I can tell the hon. member, yes, I say, some flash and some pan, because I tell you, Mr. Chairman, there are people in my district today who would find a lot of better uses to put that \$400,000 to than sending it to the former Premier of Alberta.

He mentioned gold mines. In fact, I am rather interested in some of the figures he mentioned, .18

ounce per ton of earth. It is a fascinating business. The minister, Mr. Chairman, at great length talked about how the government were pressed in order to find money to build roads to this gold mine and to augment funds that were made available to the government for its development by DRIE.

I would like to remind the minister, Mr. Chairman, that we have a great many gold mines in this Province. These mines maybe do not produce gold, but certainly in my district they produce a commodity that is almost as valuable as gold, and that is fish. We have fish plants in communities in my district, Mr. Chairman, where the roads are unfit to travel over. We have fish being trucked over pothole-ridden roads that do very little for the quality of that product. Despite our pleas to the government for assistance to upgrade and pave those roads, the situation remains the same.

So I would like to remind the Minister of Mines that maybe while they are waiting to develop new gold mines that produce .18 ounce per ton, they should pay a little more attention to some of the real gold mines that we have in this Province now that are suffering because of their indifference towards the problems that beset those fish plants.

Mr. Chairman, the minister, in his comments the other day - I believe it was during the same debate - gave an account of the things that are happening in his district. We all know that Pleasantville district is a city district. It is an urban district in every sense of the word. The minister took some pride in announcing -

and I do not blame the minister - that the government, up to that point, had spent \$5.5 million, I think he said last year, on road construction in the Pleasantville district, a district, I might add, that the city council is responsible for, by and large, when it comes to building and maintaining roads and snow clearing and looking after other infrastructure. I would not say there has been \$5.5 million spent on the whole Northeast Coast of this Province in the past three or four years, certainly not in my district.

Last year, in fact, while the minister was boasting of the fact that his urban district has received \$5.5 million for road construction, there was not 5.5 dollars spent on new roads in Twillingate district. Like I said a moment ago, a lot of these roads that need upgrading and paving are the roads over which fish has to be hauled to market and to the processing plants in Twillingate and Comfort Cove and other places from the small outlying areas in which there are small filleting operations.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious that a lot needs to be done. We listened to the members opposite talk about the payments of huge sums of money to Peter Loughheed and others. Again I would like to remind the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), if he were here, that the people of Twillingate district are awaiting, for example, for a chronic care home for the past number of years. In fact they have been promised a chronic care facility now for the past four or five years.

I was rather interested today in the question put to him by my

colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle concerning senior citizens' homes, boarding houses. His Honour recognized me. I intended to ask him a question as to what plans were unfolding, for example, for chronic care facilities in the Province. We all know that there is a great lack of proper chronic care facilities to accommodate our aged citizens who need that kind of care and accommodation. Twillingate has been promised one now, as I said, for a number of years. In fact, last year they were told that they were third on the list. Number one, I think, was the Agnes Pratt Home. That has since been approved. Second, I think, was the home in Bonavista, and that, too, is now being funded and is about, I believe, ready to start an extension. So I would assume now that Twillingate is number one on the list. I cannot seem to get any kind of a commitment from the minister or from the government as to what their plans are in that regard, but I would certainly ask them to make good on their promise. The promise was made in writing, during the last election, that a chronic care home would be provided Twillingate district.

Fishing, of course, on the Northeast Coast of this Province especially, is all-important. We have fish plants on the Northeast Coast that are working at about 25 per cent or 30 per cent of their operating capacity. People employed in those plants are lucky if they can get twelve weeks work a year and get enough stamps to draw unemployment insurance benefits for the Winter. Surely, something can be done there and must be done. The licence to process fish is not a right, it is a privilege that the Government of Newfoundland, on behalf of the

people, give these fish plant operators. I am not convinced in my mind that sufficient effort is being made by the fish processors, certainly the ones on the Northeast Coast, to maximize the potential from the fishing industry in their respective areas. Twillingate, for example, has a large fish processing plant, capable of almost year-round operation. We have a large and well-trained work force in Twillingate, but that plant is lucky to be operating for fifteen weeks of the year. Now, I believe the government must find ways and means of making sure that these plants are given a longer working period and that the people in them are given an opportunity to earn a decent living, rather than to be working for that ten or twelve weeks work to get enough contributions to collect unemployment insurance benefits.

I believe the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, rests over there. As I said, a fish plant operator must be given the facts of life, that a licence to operate carries with it some responsibility. And I contend that, in many cases, they are not living up to that responsibility. I realize that there is a shortage of fish right now. Quotas are limited. But I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that a greater effort must be made by the government to ensure that the fish plants are allowed to stay open for longer periods.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I will conclude with these few remarks, if you do not mind.

MR. J. CARTER:
By leave.

MR. W. CARTER:
I will not take advantage of by leave. I was rather intrigued to find the other day that while Newfoundland plants, for example, are going begging, almost, for raw material, the French fishing fleet is given substantial quotas on the South Coast, yet Newfoundlanders who own and operate vessels of all sizes are denied access to those fish stocks. What I am saying in effect is that we are allowing the French, for example, access to the fish stocks on the South Coast - not in the so-called disputed area, but in the 3Ps area - while at the same time we are denying access to Newfoundlanders.

Bona fide fishermen in any other part of Newfoundland who operate boats under thirty-five feet have access to the fishing grounds. On the South Coast they do not have access, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and the Premier must address that problem and make the appropriate representation to Ottawa to eliminate that kind of discrimination.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) we would be delighted to let him have a few words but the normal practice is back and forth. I will try to say something nice about the hon. member, and that might entice him to get up and attack. I could make some

references to the member's outstanding qualities. He is one who is likely to be a major force in the decision that the Liberal Party is going to have to make over the next couple of months. He has certainly been an outstanding House Leader for the party, and I wish to announce here today that I will be supporting him for the position of Leader of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador, if I get the opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, having said that, I tried to keep some notes as members across the way spoke. First was the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), who made some reference today to a luncheon held at the Airport Inn that was hosted by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and friends of Torngat Mountains, at which there were 267 people in attendance to hear the Premier speak, among other things.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier had the crowd very enthused. I am a bit disappointed the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) did not show up. I think that is in East Extern, but surely he could have crossed the border. He may have even run into Mikhail Gorbachev on his way, although I think he has passed him now as far as going left is concerned.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, it was an excellent function. The Native people from Labrador, the Inuit people, were there and performed and sang, and it just made for a delightful afternoon. It was a very pleasant thing and I know the member for Naskaupi was sincere when he made a very positive comment about that.

Then the member for Naskaupi, of

course, quickly changed his tactics. He started off being very nice and pleasant to everybody - what a nice day it was and what a nice luncheon we had. I was trying to follow what he was doing, but it was very, very difficult; he was trying to play act, I believe, a scenario where the Premier met the former Premier of Alberta, or something, at some conference and talked about the deal, so-called, about the \$400,000 that was paid to Lougheed, as he refers to it. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate, but I guess that is the wont of a member not positioned, to give the least amount of information on an issue that you possibly can to the public for fear that the public might understand. The Opposition, as is their wont, want to give the impression to the public that something dastardly had transpired.

For the benefit of the few people who are here today, they should be aware that this matter was raised weeks ago and there were very good explanations given for the cost or the fee that was paid to a firm that Mr. Lougheed is associated with, not to Mr. Lougheed directly. I think the hon. the member for Naskaupi sort of skipped over that part. Of course, it has also been pointed out here that the negotiations involving the offshore are very complex issues and require specialized legal work, and I am told there are none in Newfoundland who specialize in that respect.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I also do not want to pass up the opportunity, while I have the floor, to again make some reference to the debate we held over the past two days on the NATO resolution. I see the member for St. John's East (Mr.

Long) managed to come back into the House. He, obviously, heard -

MR. TULK:

I bet if you called a vote he would scuttle out.

MR. SIMMS:

I have a feeling the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) may very well be right, because he seemed to have scurried out of the House at the earliest opportunity, thinking that we were going to take a vote on the resolution and he would be forced to stand in his place and take a position on that particular issue. But the hon. member will be pleased to know that all other members of this House, from the Liberal Party and from the Conservative Party, were so thoughtful as to defer the vote on the resolution because we would like the hon. member and his leader, his seat mate, to be here and to express, as all of us will have to when the vote comes on that resolution, exactly where they stand. But I am afraid they will not, because I gather his leader has been on the air already saying that they are just going to abstain.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order to my good friend, the member for Grand Falls. I am a degree put out that he so early endorsed another member, who is not his cousin, before I got to him. Apart from that, I rose for another reason, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to give advice to my good friend from Grand Falls through a point of

order. He is about to blow an opportunity to have the NDP vote for those estimates. Because, you see, we are going to vote against them, maybe, for certain reasons that we will be saying. But, that aside, we are only going to vote one way. But he can be assured that, if the NDP are consistent, they are going to vote for and against them. So, if I were he, I would take half a loaf and run. At least you have the NDP partly supporting you on a financial matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

There was not point of order, Mr. Chairman, but obviously -

MR. SIMMONS:

A good point.

MR. SIMMS:

- a very wise bit of advice. There has already been an agreement, an understanding that we will wait until both halves of the New Democratic Party are here before we actually -

MR. TULK:

I understand he is a distant relative of Coaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, really! Well, I am easy.

MR. SIMMONS:

God knows you are easy!

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. the member for Fogo is the only candidate I am aware of who really has aspirations, perhaps. I do not believe the

member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simms) has any further aspirations to lead the Liberal Party, he has been through that.

MR. SIMMONS:

I have aspirations.

MR. SIMMS:

He does? Oh, well, in that case I might have to divvy up my support. I will give fifteen pieces of silver to the member for Fogo and fifteen pieces of silver to the member for Fortune - Hermitage. How will that be?

MR. HISCOCK:

Keep your thirty pieces of silver until next election.

MR. SIMMS:

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I have always had a great deal of interest in watching the career of the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). What has been by-passed in all of this debate over the last week or so, since the disruption -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, I wish the hon. member would be relevant to the debate, but I have to remind the hon. gentleman that perhaps the member for Fortune - Hermitage might have been present in the room where it was not silver that was passed out and taken and run with, but a steak. Does the hon. gentleman remember that, where he took the steak of a gentleman by the name of Edward Roberts, promised him he was going to run for the Liberals, and then a few

days afterward he decided he was going to run for the Tories?

MR. SIMMS:

No. No.

MR. TULK:

Now, you ate the steak. Did you eat the steak or did you not?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, that false accusation has been made from time to time. My cousin, now from Fortune - Hermitage, then from - where was it? I forget now. - Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir - where else was it?

MR. SIMMONS:

Burin - St. George's.

MR. SIMMS:

Anyway, when we met I was invited there by the then Leader, Mr. Roberts, to discuss the possibilities of running.

MR. TULK:

But it is true, right?

MR. SIMMS:

That part of it is true.

MR. TULK:

You ate the steak.

MR. SIMMS:

Of course I did! How stunned do you think I am?

Mr. Chairman, it is not true that I promised him I would run.

MR. TULK:

Oh, yes it is.

MR. SIMMS:

No, it is not, and the member for Fortune - Hermitage can confirm that, I am sure.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, I would be glad to, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

He did not promise in those words he was going to run. He said, 'I am going to run - I just do not know what party I am going to run for.'

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Chairman, it clearly shows then, who made the wise decision, I would say, over the last seven or eight years. As a matter of fact, I did not run then.

MR. TULK:

Pardon?

MR. SIMMS:

I did not run then, I ran four years later.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member gets up on a point of order and talks about being relevant and he brings up all this old foolishness! It threw me right off, Mr. Chairman, in my line of thinking. How much time do I have, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands has half a minute.

MR. SIMMS:

I have thirty seconds. Well, Mr. Chairman, what can I talk about, Interim Supply?

MR. TULK:

That is what you are on.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes. It is important, perhaps, for the people who are watching to know what this is all about. This is a debate on Interim Supply, and that means every member can get up and speak for ten minutes and talk about just about anything they want that is relevant to the hon. member.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, not true.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the minister's time is up.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, I want, if I can, to perhaps take a bit more serious approach to this thing than the one taken by the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands because, quite frankly, I am just about sick and tired of laughing with him.

I want to, if I may, comment on a statement that was made, I

believe, by the Minister of Mines and Housing for the Province (Mr. Dinn). I think he said something to the effect that the finances of the Province are in a strong position. He said he would have no difficulty in supporting the Interim Supply bill because the finances of the Province are in a strong position.

MR. DINN:

I did not say that.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. gentleman does not say it very well. But, let me say to him that somebody on that side has to be consistent. I am glad the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is back; I have to ask him a question on the Fogo Island ferry, the new boat that he built.

We have heard the Premier on television and one place or another saying the Province is bankrupt, that she is gone to the wall, that we are looking at the 'dirty thirties' all over again. The next night we have heard him say, 'No, it is not', 'No, not true.' We have heard the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) predict a deficit of I think it was \$49,000. He ended up with \$53,000.

MR. POWER:

Thousand?

MR. TULK:

I am sorry, \$49 million. You cannot talk in thousands in terms of this government. If you tried to talk about the deficit of this Province in terms of thousands then you had better multiply everything by another thousand.

We have seen the Minister of Finance, as I said, stand in his place and predict last year a

deficit of \$49 million. Now he tells us it is likely to be \$53 million and that in spite of the fact that he has had a windfall in various areas, and we have listed those in the legislature, of something like \$150 million. So, in reality, what he was telling us is that the deficit of the Province should have been, according to his predictions and according to the revenues that he knew he had coming last year, somewhere around \$200 million. Now, that is the kind of strong position, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Mines, the member for Pleasantville, can support, that he will have no difficulty in supporting.

Now, I want, if I can, to put some questions. But the Minister of Finance is not here, the front benches are gone; they have scuttled out of the House at a time when we are discussing something like \$750,000,000 that they are asking for - \$753,000,000, I believe, to be exact. There is not a minister over there who is worth asking a question of except the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power), and I do not have any questions for him. I will have some probably a little later on in the week in Question Period, but I do not have any for him this afternoon. But we are looking at empty front benches. Oh, the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) is coming in. Where is the Minister of Finance? We are discussing his estimates.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

He is at important meetings.

MR. TULK:

Important meetings? I hope so. I hope it is getting our credit rating up, for one thing.

Mr. Chairman, the Workers' Compensation Board - the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) is not here either. This afternoon I asked the Minister of Labour a question about three patronage appointments. Now, one of them has taken a new job as, I believe, Executive Director. Mr. Maynard I think has taken a new position with Workers' Compensation. There is still a cost to us. He may very well be able to fill the position, though, so that one, perhaps, you can drop.

MR. MATTHEWS:
How long ago was that?

MR. TULK:
What does the minister of soccer balls want?

MR. MATTHEWS:
Did that happen in 1960? How long ago was that?

MR. TULK:
No, no, that was an appointment by the Premier.

MR. MATTHEWS:
How long ago?

MR. TULK:
And the other two were appointments by Premier Frank Moores, both by Tory administrations.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Oh, that was yesterday.

MR. TULK:
Well, think of the tremendous costs. If the hon. gentleman wants to go back in time, think of what those gentlemen have cost us, just think of the amount of money we have already paid out to them.

But that by the by, we have in this Province two gentlemen who

are perhaps going to receive anywhere in the order of \$200,000 to \$400,000. It is not taxpayers' money directly, no, but the people who employ other people in this Province, like the contractors, have to submit their remissions to the Workers Compensation Board and from that they have to then pay for the workings of that compensation board.

Well, that is money that could have been spent somewhere else. That is money that the patronage practices of this government has cost, indirectly, the taxpayers and the consumers of this Province.

What did the Minister of Labor (Mr. Blanchard) do this afternoon? He gives us the most arrogant answers that you can imagine. He said that how much government paid them is now a Cabinet document. In other words, 'We are going to keep it covered and hidden away. We are not going to tell you. You do not have to know. You will have to trust us. We are not going to tell you how much our Tory buddies are costing the Province. No, not at all! We are going to keep that hidden. Not even under the Freedom of Information can you get it.' That was his answer.

Mr. Chairman, I know you will understand that this is the worst kind of moral and financial corruption that you can see in a government. It is bad enough for a government, first of all, to appoint their Tory buddies in places that affect the health and welfare of people in this Province, namely those people injured on the job and needing Workers' Compensation. That is bad enough!

But then when they have to go and

move them out of it because the board is being restructured, they are unwilling to tell the people of this Province just how much it is going to cost to do that.

MR. MITCHELL:

Are you going to run for the leadership?

MR. TULK:

If the hon. gentleman will make the same kind of donation as the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), it might be considered, but I would not have him for my campaign manager, that is for sure and certain. According to the muff he has made of it down in LaPoile, nobody would want him. The hon. gentleman, as I understand it, has only been in one campaign, and his second one, I can assure him, will not be so successful.

He got elected on the coattails of the Premier, and I want to tell him that his second election will not be as successful as his first one, because the coattails are just about gone and the hon. gentleman has done little on his own to get re-elected in this Province. I have to tell him that anybody at all can be elected the first time, but he should try the second time and he should try the third time.

MR. HEARN:

That is what Steve Neary used to say.

What about me now?

MR. TULK:

You? You never really got elected on your own, but you are doing a fair job as the Minister of Education.

MR. MATTHEWS:

He had the highest majority in the Province.

MR. TULK:

But the coattails of the Premier are still where the hon. gentleman has hung his hat. He has never had to make it on his own. That type of popularity is on its way down.

MR. POWER:

They were my coattails.

MR. TULK:

Yes, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), in spite the fact that in the last little while the Premier asked for his resignation,

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

- and he has told him 'No way,' and I do not blame him because he is one of the better Cabinet ministers over there, and I would suspect that the Minister of Education -

MR. WARREN:

How did I get elected?

MR. TULK:

You would not ask how you got elected, dear Lord of Hosts, after all.

MR. POWER:

The highest percentage of 1982 -

MR. TULK:

Who?

MR. POWER:

- 83 percent, when you guys were getting in by the skin of your teeth.

MR. TULK:

And enough voters that the hon. gentleman could count them all in one poll.

But I want to say to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies he is one of the better ministers over there and that indeed it is probably quite true that the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) did get elected on his coattails.

We are looking forward to seeing the hon. gentleman go for the federal nomination in St. John's East. As a matter of fact, I do not know but I might try to put a few people in to vote for his nomination for the upcoming federal election.

Mr. Chairman, I want somebody on that side, perhaps the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, to stand up and enlighten me as to why it was that the Minister of Labour said this afternoon that he would not reveal - The member for Gander (Mr. Baker) was not here, but can you believe this? - how much the patronage appointments at the Workers' Compensation Board cost this Province.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. TULK:
Perhaps the Minister of Career Development will now stand up and tell us -

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order! The hon. member's time is up.

MR. TULK:

Here he comes, here is my supporter. Is the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands going to answer my question on the Workers' Compensation Board? The Minister of Labour refuses to do it.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman, I will take the question under advisement and pass it on to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) who would like to give a more detailed answer than I could give, obviously, on that particular issue.

MR. TULK:
No, he refused to answer.

MR. SIMMS:
In that case, why did the hon. member for Fogo bother to ask the question again?

MR. TULK:
He should answer, you see.

MR. SIMMS:
But he said he is not going to.

MR. TULK:
It is public money.

MR. SIMMS:
Anyway, to get back to the debate, which is a debate on Interim Supply, Mr. Chairman, I want to outline to the House, if I may, the real importance of getting Interim Supply passed at the appropriate time.

The hon. member for Fogo indicated not too long ago that it might be May sometime before Interim Supply

would be granted.

MR. TULK:

Unless you answer a certain question.

MR. SIMMS:

We have answered just about every question that the hon. member and members opposite have asked. They may not be answered to their satisfaction. If that is the case, there is also a procedure in our Standing Orders which allows them to give notice to the Speaker that they are dissatisfied with an answer and then they can debate it on Thursday in the Late Show. Mr. Chairman, ministers over here have answered the questions to the best of their abilities.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, Interim Supply is very critical and important for a number of reasons. I just want to mention the reason for Interim Supply being requested for the Department of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. TULK:

You are reading Bill Marshall's speech.

MR. SIMMS:

No, I am not. I have not seen Bill Marshall's speech.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, it is important and critical that Interim Supply be approved by the House for the Department of Forest Resources and Lands for a number of reasons. The member for Gander (Mr. Baker), I know, would be very interested in some of these reasons. Part of the funding would be required to operate the Forest Fire Protection Centre located in his constituency, Mr. Chairman. I am sure that the hon. the member for Gander would not want to hold back approval of

Interim Supply funding and therefore put the jobs and the salaries of the people out in Gander in jeopardy.

We have funding in our Interim Supply to provide for normal operations for the three month period up to June. That is the traditional timing that is put forth in Interim Supply by all government departments. Specifically, Mr. Chairman, there are a number of important and urgent reasons why we need it.

One is to deal with forest fire suppression or forest fire fighting preparatory work that is required because the forest fire season last year, you may recall, began in April. It was a very disastrous and serious forest fire season for us last year. The bulk of the funding is required for the summer months, but it is also required in the month of April. That is critical, Mr. Chairman, in order to maximize the suppression or forest fire fighting efforts in those particular months.

Last year, for example, the Department of Forest Resources and Lands spent its total budget allocation by the end of May because of the situation that we had to face last year. We had to, of course, request a Special Warrant.

Mr. Chairman, the normal practice in budgeting for forest fire suppression by the Department of Forest Resources and Lands is to budget for a normal year, because it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to assume that this year's fire season might be as serious as last year's fire season. So the general practice is to request funding for the

normal operations that would be involved in a normal fire fighting season. It involves \$2 million or so, as I recall. That will be done again this year.

Obviously, we need the Interim Supply funding, which is the funding for April, May and June, because those are generally the most difficult months, or certainly they were last year. I know members opposite would not want to withhold approval of Interim Supply funding for forest fire suppression, nor to curtail the operations, as I have said, of the fire training centre in Gander, which plays a very important role in this particular undertaking.

MR. BAKER:

Is that the one in Foxtrap you are talking about?

MR. SIMMS:

No, I am talking about the Gander forest fire training centre. I believe I invited the hon. member to the opening of that facility, did I not? The hon. member was unavailable or unable to attend. I was very courteous to the hon. member. I checked around, first of all, found out he was not going to be available, and then I invited him, knowing that he would not come.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, the other very important thing that we undertake during this time of year would be the insect control programme, or spray programme, as some people say.

I know that this issue is an issue that is very dear to the heart of the member for Gander. I understand he taught biology in high school and ever since he was elected to this House of Assembly

he has become an expert on environmental issues related to the spray programme. But that is a matter for debate at another time.

I have a funny feeling that the member for Gander will find a comrade in the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) when the spray programme issue comes up. I have a funny feeling - I do not know why - I just have that feeling.

So we need funding in our Interim Supply programme up front because we have to order materials; we have to book supplies and chemicals; and, perhaps one of the most important requirements, we have to book aircraft to undertake the spray programme.

Mr. Chairman, the other important reason why we need Interim Supply funding is for tree planting and nursery activities. They are usually concentrated as well in the months of April, May and June. There are silviculture projects being undertaken and more to be announced. The \$1.3 million special programme I announced a few days ago is among them. There are many projects in the districts of members opposite.

MR. BAKER:

Is there one in mine?

MR. SIMMS:

I cannot recall if there is one in Gander, but they are certainly in the districts of other members opposite.

If members opposite threaten to hold up Interim Supply funding, then there is a likelihood and a possibility that we will have to scrap the plans for those silviculture projects.

MR. BAKER:

Do not threaten us now!

MR. SIMMS:

Well, the hon. member may think that I am only kidding but I am not, because that work is usually undertaken in the months of April, May and June. The funding in Interim Supply for forestry, as with all other departments, is for the months of April, May and June. We have to have money up front to arrange for contracts for some of these projects. The department will undertake some and others will be done by contractors. We have to make arrangements for transportation and equipment required during those particular three months.

Mr. Chairman, those are just three very important reasons why we need Interim Supply approved by the end of the fiscal year, which will be next Tuesday, March 31, I believe. Hopefully, between now and then, over the next few days that we have, in addition to the last few days, members opposite will have had adequate time to ask questions that they wish to ask of the amounts that have been put forth in the Interim Supply Bill, and hopefully they have had them answered to their satisfaction and to the best of the abilities of the ministers who will be answering the questions.

I point out, of course, that Interim Supply is not an unusual procedure or process. In fact, it is introduced every year. At the House of Commons in Ottawa, as I recall, they put through Interim Supply in three or four days for billions and billions of dollars.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, once the race opposite gets off the ground, it is off the ground to a

certain extent with the leading candidate, in my opinion, the former Leader of the Opposition still leader of the Liberal Party, incidentally - I do not know if members are aware of that, by the way. The member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry) is still the leader of the party.

MR. BUTT:

And a front room Liberal.

MR. SIMMS:

And a front room Liberal. His campaign, obviously, is taking on the proper effect now. He is campaigning against back-room politics, the back-room boys. I think that is a very good way to undertake his campaign.

MR. POWER:

Except in the Liberal Party there are more back rooms than there are front rooms.

MR. SIMMS:

What happens in the back room of the Liberal Party is a lot of back stabbing.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, is his time up?

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island is off to a great start. He has gone ahead of all the other candidates. He is way ahead in the polls, by the way. The CFCB poll this morning, I understand, was 67 per cent support for the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask you, why would members opposite want to get rid of a man who has 67 per cent

support on the West Coast? Why would they?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
They all want to be Leader.

MR. SIMMS:
There must be other reasons for it. And it would not be fair for us to -

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. minister's time is up.

MR. SIMMS:
By leave, Mr. Chairman?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No leave.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to thank the minister for some of his comments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BAKER:
The arse is falling out of her.

MR. BARRY:
On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, we have a hole in the floor here.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island would like to order one chair.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well handled.

I would like to thank the minister for his explanation of what is supposed to be going on at this particular time in the House of Assembly.

MR. SIMMS:
It is very important.

MR. BAKER:
I would also like to thank him for his comments with regard to the importance of the Supply Bill being passed. He did a marvellous job of explaining these two points. The Interim Supply Bill that is being debated, unfortunately this afternoon, is being debated without the presence of the one minister who should be here during this particular debate, and that happens to be the Minister of Finance.

Now, I understand that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) is, in effect, standing in for the Minister of Finance, but I would suggest that he is a very poor stand-in for the Minister of Finance. In actual fact, the Minister of Finance is the only Cabinet minister who can properly answer a number of questions that I have asked in the Interim Supply debate, and because he is not here, perhaps the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) should have scheduled something else for this time and put off Interim Supply for a day, until the Minister of Finance could be in the House to answer some very important questions.

MR. TULK:
They do not have anything else

ready.

MR. BAKER:

They probably have nothing else ready. That is the problem, and that is why we are hearing a lot of speeches concerning everything but Interim Supply. Some of the questions I asked a few days ago the Government House Leader attempted to answer. Now, the Government House Leader is just as much in the dark as the assistant, assistant Government House Leader when it comes to financial matters.

I asked a number of questions about bond issues, I asked a number of questions about changes in the Public Accounts of this Province, and with the exception of one brief little interjection from the member for St. John's North (Mr. John Carter) there was not a single shred of acceptable rhetoric coming from the opposite side to help explain and answer the financial questions that I asked.

If the game is to talk and talk and talk and not have answers to questions concerning finances, if that is the game that we are into so that we run over our time limit and we run out of time in terms of the budget debate, then I suppose I am unwittingly playing a part in that game.

Even though the Minister of Finance is not here, I would like to make some comments with regard to budget preparations. I hear that we are getting a budget pretty soon, and the Interim Supply Bill is part of that budget, it is to release part of the money from that budget so that it can be spent by the various departments. 'Budget preparations are underway. We are going to have a budget soon', is what is

being said in the news.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that there are budget preparations underway, I know because every now and then I see the face of the Minister of Finance on television and he is talking in terms of how bad things are. He has a very friendly face and that friendly face is telling the people of this Province things are bad.

The Premier says the Province is bankrupt. Well, the Minister of Finance said, It is not that bad, but things are really bad. And every now and then you will see slipped out into the press for public consumption 'Retail sales tax is going to go up to 14 per cent.' You know, it is an interesting little game. Over the next few days there will be rumours spread by gentlemen opposite, put in the press by gentlemen opposite to try to create the impression in this Province that we are in for the worst budget you ever saw in history.

This is the budget preparation that is going on. That is where the Minister of Finance is this afternoon, perhaps. That is the game that is going on. Then, when the budget is brought down, no matter how bad it is, no matter how much it shows the incompetence of members opposite, the people of the Province will say, 'Oh!' - a sigh of relief - 'Thank heavens the retail sales tax did not go up to 14 per cent,' and so on. The members opposite are playing an interesting little game: Prepare them for the worst. Then, when it is not the worst, they will say, 'Thank heavens, what a wonderful bunch of gentlemen.' We understand all that kind of thing.

So that is the kind of budget preparation that is going on at the present time, Mr. Chairman. It is a game and, as I say, I am part of it. We are all part of this little game, but as long as people in the Province realize what is going on, then at that point it all becomes rather silly.

What should be in the minds of gentlemen opposite, I would propose, is how best to use what limited resources we do have. Because I will agree that things are not good, and we do have limited resources in this Province. So how best to use what limited resources we do have? I would like to use an example, Mr. Chairman, if I may, to make my point. If, perchance, someone from outside the Province were to come to government, or to the Minister of Finance, or to the Premier, or whatever, and say to them, If you were to spend ten dollars on a particular item that is of good to the people of this Province I will give you an extra hundred dollars to go along with it, it seems to me that that would be a good use of the ten dollars. To spend ten dollars for something that is of good to the people of the Province and to get another hundred dollars coming into the Province because you spent the ten dollars seems to me a tremendous gain, Mr. Chairman. It is a tremendous gain if by spending a small amount of money you get a larger amount.

Municipalities in the Province, for instance, have been using this. They have been spending their 40 per cent on their roads money and getting 60 per cent from the provincial government. So, in a municipality, it is good and wise financing to spend some municipal money to get a larger

amount from the provincial government. So one would think it would also be wise spending for the provincial government to spend a small amount of money to get a larger amount.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you might wonder what I am getting around to. What I am getting around to is simply this: A small town in this Province has managed to obtain from the federal government a grant of \$100,000. Now, then, that grant of \$100,000 is contingent on that small town being able to get \$25,000 or \$30,000 from the provincial government. If the \$25,000 to \$30,000 from the provincial government is not forthcoming, then the \$100,000 goes back. So it would seem to me to be very wise financing for the provincial government to spend its \$25,000 or \$30,000 to get \$100,000. That is wise financing.

However, Mr. Chairman, I suspect that is not going to happen. What is going to happen is that the town of Benton, which has this \$100,000 federal grant, is going to have to send that back. They want to start a sewer system and, over a period of three or four years, put in a sewer system. At this point their situation is desperate. It is the fastest growing town in Newfoundland. In the last year there has been an increase of over 20 per cent in the new houses in the town. They have a water system, Mr. Chairman, which, I am told by government officials, in three or four years is going to start sucking the sewage that is floating on top of the ground there. So, within that three or four years, they feel they should be able to install a proper sewerage system.

All the engineering work is done, all the estimates are done, the drawings are all done. It is going to cost a lot of money for them, maybe \$1 million, or \$800,000. Over a period of three or four years, using a small amount of provincial government money and a large amount of federal money, we can give them their sewerage system. Yet, I suspect very strongly, and I have supporting letters from the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) to bear me out, that they are not going to get their \$25,000 or \$30,000 to get a start on that sewer system.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. BAKER:
By leave, Mr. Chairman?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Two minutes.

MR. BAKER:
Two minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Leave has been granted.

MR. BAKER:
I would suspect that this money is not forthcoming. Now, Mr. Chairman, to the people of Benton that is a serious problem. To the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Department of Environment and the Department of Health, it is going to be a disastrous situation four or five years down the road. Unfortunately, hon. members are not going to be there four or five years down the road and some of us are going to have to put up with this kind of unconcern for the people of this Province, especially for the people in the

small towns of this Province.

Mr. Chairman, I know I have been speaking by leave. I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to it referred and has direct me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Motion 1. Question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
That motion is withdrawn.

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

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