

PROPERTY OF NEWFOUNDLAND
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
PLEASE RETURN



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 14

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Friday

16 June 1989

The House met at 9:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER WELLS:
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

About ten days or so ago, I announced the membership of the Economic Recovery Commission and the Economic Recovery Advisory Board, and I indicated to the House at the time they were still not complete. I am pleased to inform the hon. House today that we are now in a position to announce the appointment of the fifth member of the Economic Recovery Commission, and the names of the remaining two members of the Economic Recovery Advisory Board.

All these individuals had been approached before the initial announcement on the establishment of the Commission was made on June 5, but because of certain personal involvements and commitments, it was not possible to announce their appointments with the others on that date.

The fifth member of the Economic Recovery Commission will be Ms. Susan Sherk, who is well-known throughout Newfoundland and Labrador for her work in community development, public affairs and industry. Ms. Sherk worked with the Extension Service of Memorial University for several years,

planning and co-ordinating community development conferences and working with many communities throughout the Province. In 1980 she joined Mobil Oil Canada Ltd. as their Public Affairs Co-ordinator in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, and was well-known throughout the environmental impact hearings that took place. In 1987 she moved to Mobil Corporation's head office in New York, where she became Community Relations Advisor to Mobil's U.S.-based companies and divisions. In April of this year, she joined Michelin Tires (Canada) Ltd. in Nova Scotia as Senior Manager, but will be leaving that position to return to Newfoundland and join the Economic Recovery Commission.

The two members of the Economic Recovery Advisory Board whom I am pleased to announce today are Mr. Ray Smallwood, and Mr. Richard Cashin.

Mr. Smallwood is well-known in the business community as the Vice-President and Branch Manager of Wood-Gundy in St. John's. He was recently a member of the task force of the Newfoundland Stock Savings Plan, and was a founding member of the Board of Directors of the Public Legal Information Association of Newfoundland and Labrador. He has been active in community affairs, and is currently Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Arthritis Society. He will bring to that Advisory Board a great deal of knowledge and experience and advice in terms of investment banking and the availability of funds through the normal business banking services.

Mr. Cashin needs no introduction to anyone in Newfoundland and

Labrador. His work in the fishermen's union movement has been legendary, and he has indeed made a significant impact on the history of this Province. His association with labour has been of such proportions that it often overshadows the fact that he was also a successful lawyer and politician, having represented the riding of St. John's West in the House of Commons during the early 1960's. Mr. Cashin will bring a wealth of experience and counsel to the Advisory Board as he has in many other instances as Secretary-Treasurer of the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour; a commissioner of the Task Force on Canadian Unity; a member of the Board of Governors of the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council; member of the Board of Directors of the Export Trade Development Board; member of the Institute for Research on Public Policy and a member of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, just to name a few.

I should also explain to the House that the delay in announcing the final members of the Economic Recovery Advisory Board was because of the Government's wish to enlist the support of yet another well-known Newfoundlander, in the person of Ms. Nancy Riche, who has distinguished herself in the Canadian labour movement. After considerable discussion and as much as she welcomed the opportunity, because of her national commitments just yesterday Ms. Riche advised me that she was unable to accept the appointment. But she has discussed the matter extensively with other people in the labour movement in Newfoundland and heartily endorses the actions government is taking in this regard.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, let me say that we want to wish those new additions to the Commission itself and to the Advisory Board, well. They are obviously well-known people who have served the public of Newfoundland and Labrador in one form or another, either in the private sector or the public sector, very, very well, and we have no difficulty with any of them in their appointments to the Commission itself or to the Advisory Board.

I still have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is passing strange and, in my opinion, a grave error, that even though recognizing the fact that the Commission itself is not necessarily, nor, perhaps, should it be departmentalized in the sense that there would be various regions and groups recognized or appointed to the Commission because of that fact, I do think it is a serious and glaring omission that there is not anybody on the Commission itself directly associated with labour. I think that is something, in terms of the overall success of this Commission, that is certainly a glaring failure.

I believe equally important is the fact that there is not anybody specifically on the Commission from Labrador. That is also a glaring failure, not that there should be regionalized

representation on the Commission. I understand the Premier's comments on that view, but to have a large underdeveloped potentially economic region of the Province with no direct representation on the Commission, I believe is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, we will just have to wait and see what this Commission brings to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. There was a kind of economic commission which was set up and worked during the 1960's. There was an action group that set up similarly, and worked during the 1970's. Whether this Commission of the late 1980's and early 1990's, a commission that will expend over the next six or seven years in administration and those kinds of costs alone anywhere from \$25 million to \$30 million, will be a worthwhile investment, and whether there will be worthwhile opportunities resulting from that, is something we will just have to wait and see. But in terms of the individuals, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has announced to the Commission and to the Advisory Board here today, we have no difficulty with them and wish them well in the performance of their duties.

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a question today on a matter of extreme importance and I want to ask my question of the Minister of Education (Dr. Warren).

The Minister of Education would be aware, because I wrote him on the matter some sixteen days ago now, on May 30, and I have not yet received a reply to my letter, that there have been numerous advances in post-secondary education in the Central Newfoundland area over the past few years, the past two years in particular, and specifically I am referring to the first year university program offered by the Central Newfoundland Community College to the Grand Falls and Lewisporte campuses. There have been many, many benefits, not the least of which is the benefit derived by the 150 students and parents who attend that campus from six electoral districts. So this is not a politically partisan issue, it is a regional issue that accommodates and effects a lot of people.

I want to simply ask the minister at the outset, is the minister fully committed to the continuation of this particular program?

MR. SPEAKER:

The Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, most certainly the government is committed to even extending opportunities throughout this Province for people who want to take first year university courses outside St. John's.

I have not had an opportunity to review as yet, Mr. Speaker, the total offerings throughout the Province. I do, shortly after the House is closed and I have some time, want to visit and consider with all authorities what is now happening, and then to put before the government and before this House a plan for the 1990s so that

we can systematically extend educational opportunities -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:
- to more and more people throughout this Province. The participation rate at the post-secondary level is disturbingly low. It is appalling that so few of our people are continuing on to post-secondary education.

If you took any age group, Mr. Speaker, for example, the eighteen to twenty-four age group, I would suggest that our percentage is the lowest in Canada. I would argue that in Ontario perhaps 25 percent of that age group is in post-secondary programs. We intend over the next decade to move Newfoundland's percentage to the Canadian average, and we will do everything possible to do that.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Increasing tuition fees by 10 per cent is really helping such a program.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was going to make the comment that increasing tuition fees by 10 percent is not going to help an awful lot, I not think, to see the government reach that objective.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister would also be aware that on this program that I am referring to

there have been already \$2 million spent to improve the facilities out there, new labs and other items of that nature. He would also be aware, and I suppose every member of the House would be aware that the program is working extremely well. The pass rate on those campuses for first year university, is greater than the pass rate at the main campus in St. John's, and greater than the campus in Corner Brook. Therefore, it is pretty clear that the program is working very, very well.

I want the minister to tell me what are the improvements he is committed to that he referred to in his first answer? What improvements is he committed to. What recommendations have been made by his officials with respect to improving the first year university program and facilities?

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

DR. WARREN:
Mr. Warren, I want to pay tribute to the people who are in that program in the Central Newfoundland. They have done outstanding work and we will do everything possible to increase the opportunities for them, to improve the facilities. Unfortunately, I have not had time to assess all of the details of the program but I assure the hon. member that as soon as I do I will report to him and the House about our plans for future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

I would like to ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Since there is a board meeting coming up in Grand Falls, I think on Monday, to look at outstanding issues, and since the minister's own officials have recommended, by the way, an expansion to those facilities out there, to accommodate the students who presently are being accommodated in rented facilities about a mile and a half away from the school itself in an old elementary school, and since they recommended expansion to the facilities, can the minister put to rest rumors that are presently circulating out in the Central Newfoundland area and tell us if he intends to fulfill a commitment for a \$3 million expansion to provide classroom space for those additional 150 students, which was recommended and which was in the system for several, several months, from this year's budget? Can the minister tell me that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat something I said earlier. We are anxious to look at the whole system of the Province. There are tremendous needs in Labrador West, for example, needs that we not met over the last five years. There are needs on the Burin Peninsula, and I am delighted that the government could move to implement a program to extend first year opportunities on the Burin Peninsula. We are going to use technology to do that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

- and I am proud, I am really delighted and I am looking forward to this pilot in distance education as a tremendous opportunity for us. Some planning had been done in this regard. I must say that my departmental officials had done some planning on the Burin Peninsula, but to my knowledge no specific planning has been done in Central and I want to look at the whole Province. I want to look at the total system before we make major commitments to any one part of this Province, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

I have just one final question to the minister and I will make it fairly simple. Can the minister tell the House if the \$3 million expansion that was recommended and was worked on for several months between the administration at the college out there, the Department of Public Works and the former Department of Career Development, the \$3 million expansion that was then committed by the previous administration, has that been cancelled?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure who committed what. I hear about all kinds of commitments day after day. I have been told about commitments. Let me assure the hon. member that we will consider that, but no commitment has been made to extend that program by the government at this point in time.

But we will consider that in considering the total package.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. As the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations is aware, improving employment opportunities for women was a very important priority of the former PC government, and because of that approximately \$500,000 was delegated in the budget last year to start the Occupational Integration Program for Women. In the minister's new departmental estimates, not a dollar, not a single penny, has been budgeted for the women of the Province, insofar as any new initiative is concerned, for that program. I want to ask the minister why that particular program, a very, very good one, a very progressive one, has been killed, or put on hold? Is it another program that falls into the category of re-evaluation? Why this program, a new one just getting off the ground? Women were given an indication that the government was concentrating on getting women into more nontraditional jobs, so does it fall under the heading of re-evaluation? Why cancel this program?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me assure the hon. member for Harbour Main, before I begin to answer his question, that our commitment to women and their participation in the labour force is no less than that of the previous government. In fact, we will do everything we can to move women forward in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:
We shall see. We shall see.

MS COWAN:
I hope that you are watching carefully because, indeed, that is one of your roles as the Opposition. I would be only too happy to entertain questions on women's participation in the labour force as would the hon. Minister responsible for the Status of Women.

To your question then, hon. member, Mr. Speaker, the program is not killed, the program is simply being evaluated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MS COWAN:
One of the things I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, is that I would like to learn from Question Period. I found I learned a lot the other night when we had our interaction during the Estimates Committee session. It is very difficult when people keep yelling things out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MS COWAN:
I would like to be able to respond and then have the hon. member, who is my critic, respond as well and

have some dialogue that might be of some value to both of us.

The program is not killed, it is being evaluated. The evaluation of programs is an extremely important step. So often that is not done and before long people realize they are into a program which they are not particularly happy with, but they have all kinds of employees, all kinds of commitments, that kind of thing, and they are locked into it. And it is very, very difficult to get out of it. We want to have an extremely good look at this program. It may be that we find that it is the answer. We may find that it is not. And I think one of the things that I can offer, as a person who has been very interested in the advancement of women, is that I personally had not heard of the program before I became minister, so I wonder if the promotion of it was adequate, perhaps or was not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

And that may be the only flaw we find, and perhaps it was just because I did not hear the news some morning, I do not know. But I think it is very, very important that we do evaluate this program and then move ahead with it. So once more, if I may, I assure the hon. member that our commitment to women is there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

There is no money there. How can you say that with a straight face? Not a dollar there.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Harbour Main.

MR. SPEAKER:

Thank you, Sir.

I can appreciate that the minister wants to re-evaluate the program, but I would submit to her that it is not good enough to re-evaluate a program unless you have another program to put in place. And I say to the minister it is not good enough to kill the Private Sector Program unless she has another program in place to take the place of that one, because jobs are very, very important in the Province.

Let me ask is the minister aware that 58.3 per cent of all women employed in Newfoundland are in the clerical, sales and service fields? And is she aware that for every dollar earned in the Province by men, women earn fifty-seven point five cents? This is one of the main reasons, as a matter of fact, that the former government brought in the Occupational Integration Program for Women, so that they could get into the more non-traditional, higher paid jobs in the Province. In view of that, why would this particular minister, of all ministers, who happens to be the only woman in the Cabinet of the Province, why would she drop a program before she had another program in place to take the place of that one? It is very, very important that we have another program in place before this very important program, which was brought in by the former government, was actually dropped.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Again, to the hon. member, through you, our commitment is there to women. I certainly am aware, as are all my colleagues, and we all share the responsibility - it is not just on my shoulders or the Status of Women Person (Mr. Baker) for us - and the concern that women do still make less than men on the average, and we are committed to doing something about it. I have already had meetings with the Status of Women person, the hon. minister, and I can assure you that he, too, is concerned. I am not going to and I do not want to speak for him, but I am sure that he too is not prepared to bring in a program after six weeks in office that, again, might not address problems. We have very good people working in the Department of Employment who are already considering and looking at programs so that when we do our evaluation we will indeed know what to look for. And if replacements - I mean modifications, are necessary to that program they will indeed be made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

The minister was prepared to cancel the program. The least she could have done was maintain the

status quo -

MR. RIDEOUT:

While the evaluation was ongoing.

MR. DOYLE:

- while the evaluation was ongoing.

Will the minister explain the reason for the continuation of the Employment Services Division within her department? The Occupational Integration Program for Women is gone, the Private Sector Program is gone, she has laid off staff and reduced salaries by over \$300,000, so this is now the Department of Layoffs and Labour Relations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

In view of this, Mr. Speaker, will the minister tell us how she intends to help the unemployed people of the Province find work in the Province with her department's employment programs gone, being slashed to the bone? How is she going to help the Premier now to bring home those 35,000 people he was talking about? I am talking to people from the Mainland every day and they are interested in getting home in the first draft. I would like to know how she intends to help create employment in the Province, given the fact that her programs are being cut hand over fist?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the status quo was set in place by a government that had seventeen years to act and did not do

anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

In reference to the Women's Program, \$500,000 was allocated and \$150,000 was used last year. I ask you about commitment there. We, in this government, are committed to improving employment opportunities for individuals to develop the social fabric of this Province and the economic fabric, not to balance books by getting people off the Social Services roster and onto federal unemployment schemes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

There are many initiatives that have already been taken, and if anyone was astute enough to observe that, increasing the education budget by the amount of money that went into it is a first step. Education and a well-educated work force is necessary to this Province, and we began this year by putting an extra \$10 million into education. The Economic Recovery Team is a part of the process and my department is a part of the process as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

I have a question for the Minister of Municipal and Provincial

Affairs.

A couple of weeks ago I asked some questions about his knowledge of the state of the streets in the City of Corner Brook. I was very pleased to hear him acknowledge that he has some familiarity with the problems there. In Corner Brook there are fifteen kilometers of unpaved gravel road and thirty-two kilometers of open ditches. The minister acknowledged that he knows about the city's plan to upgrade Corner Brook East. The city now has a Corner Brook East Development Scheme started in the late 1970s, and since then about \$5 million has been spent.

MR. GULLAGE:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order.

MR. GULLAGE:

I cannot hear the hon. member speak. I would appreciate it if some of the members opposite would simply stop talking for a while.

MR. SIMMS:

That is not a point of order, boy. Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER:

It is not a point of order, but I remind hon. members that I was about to rise myself. I was finding it difficult to hear the question being raised.

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am asking the minister about the

Corner Brook East Development Scheme. I mentioned a couple of weeks ago being pleased when he acknowledged some familiarity with the deficiencies in that neighborhood. However, when the minister announced the list of municipal capital funding the government has approved, he did not make any mention of the Corner Brook East Development Scheme.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people who live in that neighborhood of Corner Brook had the same reaction to the minister's announcement as the Mayor of St. Anthony. They thought to themselves, 'There has to be a mistake.'

Now, I was really glad to hear on the news this morning that the minister and the government have corrected their mistake for St. Anthony. Is the minister going to correct the mistake for the Corner Brook East project?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any mistake. Corner Brook, as with St. John's and other major urban areas with large populations, are, as the minister knows, given block funding. It is not identified, per se, street by street, section by section, subdivision by subdivision. That is normally left to a city the size of Corner Brook to decide. Now, I could very well decide if you want me to as a minister, but I do not feel that the Mayor of Corner Brook would want it that way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the minister told me before he met with the Mayor of Corner Brook --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Mayor of Corner Brook will correct the minister's wrong impression there. In fact, the former government specifically funded the Corner Brook East Development Scheme on a ninety/ten or seventy-five/twenty-five basis, distinguished from the regular sixty/forty ratio. The Corner Brook East Development Scheme was always earmarked in the provincial Municipal Capital Works Program over the past several years. This is the first year there has been a difference. The total amount of funding announced for the city of Corner Brook is less than what has been announced the last couple of years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier how he squares the government's failure to make any provision for the Corner Brook East Development Scheme in this Budget with the statements he made to the Corner Brook East Development Scheme Citizens' Committee and the public of Humber East through CFCB and *The Western Star* when he was campaigning last November and this Winter? How does the Premier square that discrepancy?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

There is no difficulty squaring

it, Mr. Speaker. At no time when I was campaigning last November, whenever it was the member referred to, did I say that this Spring, in the first budget, that money would be there. During the recent election campaign, the member made a political promise, to get votes, I suppose. She was largely successful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

She made the promise that the government would put this kind of money into Corner Brook East.

The present administration, Mr. Speaker, during the political campaign, stated its general policy, its commitment to health, its commitment to education, its commitment to municipal services, in the broad provincial area. We did not, at any time, commit to any particular district that 'You will have X million dollars here, X million for Grand Falls, X million dollars for Fogo,' and so on. We stated our broad general policy and we intend to keep that. Now, in due course, the Corner Brook East Development Scheme will be dealt with, when the government is ready to do it. We could not possibly be ready in four weeks to deal with it. We feel no obligation whatsoever to honour all of the promises made by the members opposite during the campaign.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

If we did, we would take \$500 million to meet those specific promises and the Province cannot afford it at this stage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am asking the Premier about the statements that he made when he was campaigning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:

I would like to ask him is he penalizing the people of Corner Brook East because they elected me instead of him?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I want the former minister and the House and the people of Corner Brook East, the people of Corner Brook, in particular, to be aware that my commitment to the city of Corner Brook and to Humber East has not changed one whit from what it was when I campaigned. I will meet every obligation, every undertaking I gave during the campaign. I remind the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that 3,700 people voted for me. They still live there, and I respect and admire each and every one of them, as I respect and admire each and every voter who voted for the hon.

member. It does not matter who they voted for. We are going to run this Province on a proper basis, on a basis of fairness and balance, not on the basis of political patronage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

You can forget St. Anthony one day and fix it the next day, and that is fairness, is it?

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, speaking of fairness and balance, \$2.4 million for water and sewer put into the Premier's district and \$500,000 put into Burin - Placentia West, the largest rural district in the Province. That is fairness and balance, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Is it?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, the largest in the Province. You can check the statistics.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Development, one of the few hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier could pick to put in his Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, the Marystown Shipyard has now reached its lowest level of employment in many, many years. Just six months ago, Mr. Speaker, there were 600 people employed at the Marystown Shipyard. With yesterday's layoff notice there are less than 100,

some 90-odd people, Mr. Speaker.

Some months ago this government agreed to construct two ferries for Bell Island and were in the process, Mr. Speaker, of making a decision to have the Marystown Shipyard design and construct another ferry for Fogo, namely, an icebreaker type of ferry service, Mr. Speaker. Now this government has since then changed that, has rescinded that decision to build the two ferries for Bell Island. So I ask the Minister of Development, Mr. Speaker, would he try to convince his colleagues to have the second ferry for Bell Island started immediately now with the other one, and have the Marystown Shipyard start the design and construction of a new one for Fogo Island as well?

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. With respect to Marystown, we are all very sensitive to the situation there. It carries a heavy debt load. As the hon. member knows the previous government helped with ongoing financial support with respect to working capital guarantees and other matters. This government will do the same. We budgeted \$3 million to help with the interest costs on that debt load.

With respect to the ferry that the hon. member talked about, my colleague, the Minister of Works, Transportation and Services (Mr. Gilbert) had the pleasure of announcing to the people of this

Province that a new vessel will be constructed, I believe May 26 he announced, it to the tune of \$13.7 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

We had already announced it. You re-announced it.

MR. FUREY:

Well, one cannot trust announcements made by the previous government, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

I can say, with a great deal of honesty, Mr. Speaker, that I thought we had the Rural Development and Coastal Labrador Agreements to the tune of \$83 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

But when we came to power, Mr. Speaker, it took all of forty-eight hours to discover that that that was announced during the election. Mr. Speaker, but there was nothing put to ink. There was no agreement signed. The former Premier's signature was not on a piece of paper with the federal minister's signature. So it was an agreement for the purposes of getting them through an election. But I am happy to say that we will be putting that to ink.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

With respect, Mr. Speaker, to the second ferry that the hon. member

asks about, the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation did not cancel, did stop, did not cut off that ferry. What he said was we are prepared to spend \$13.7 million for the construction of one ferry. We will review whether indeed a new ferry is necessary or whether a retrofitting of a previous ferry will be necessary. In either case, Mr. Speaker, Marystown will get the work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The people of Marystown will starve in the bargain.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. minister that not only had the government announced it, but also the Cabinet had approved it, and not the Rideout Administration, Mr. Speaker, but the Peckford Administration. That is how far back approval for the two ferries goes. The MC was put in place, and the one after that rescinded it. And, Mr. Speaker, if these people opposite had not rescinded that motion, cancelled that motion, the union would not be on their way to St. John's today, they would be home working.

Let me ask the minister, then, Mr. Speaker, what other options are available to the work force for the Marystown Shipyard? With the coming of the Hibernia project will the government now consider, and have put in place immediately, Mr. Speaker, plans for the

construction of barges on speculation? This government previously put in place a program to build on speculation, Mr. Speaker, offshore supply vessels when that market was there. Now Hibernia is coming, Mr. Speaker, so will this government today commit themselves to the construction speculation of barges, the huge number of barges that will be used and put in place in Placentia Bay? Will the government now put in place a program to start immediately the construction of barges to create employment?

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, he is asking the minister to commit to speculation, and they would probably have the minister committed on such basis somewhere else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:
But I can tell the hon. member that we are looking at the entire situation at Marystown, Mr. Speaker. We are very sensitive, on this side, to the problems that are down there. In fact, the hon. member knows, I invited him to a private meeting with myself just recently, where we sat down and had a very honest and frank discussion with respect to Marystown. This government is committed to trying to protect all of the jobs in Marystown, Mr. Speaker. It is not going to be easy. But we are not going to do things in a knee-jerk fashion. We

want to study every single option, make sensible and reasonable decisions and do things that are right based on sound economics, not on the kind of economics where \$22 million end up under cucumber tents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The time time for Question Period has elapsed.

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

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

MR. GIBBONS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The questions on the Order Paper with regard to office equipment, personal equipment, furnishings and photographs. I would like to report that my office has spent \$123.75 on a desk calculator and some photographs.

With regard to travel expenditures by the minister and staff, I report that on May 26-27 I travelled to Springdale to a mineral exhibition and trade show, at which I was guest speaker. My air travel was \$311.60. As to a rental car from Deer Lake to Springdale and on to Gander to connect with the airlines, I have not yet received a bill from the rental agency for that. I had no cost for food or accommodation.

The total of all my bills to date is \$438.35.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition signed by some thirty citizens of the Province, people who live in St. John's, Logy Bay, the Goulds, Marystown, Grand Falls, Corner Brook, Doyles, and Happy Valley, people who rushed to get this petition to hon. members after hearing the shocking news yesterday and the day before that the new government has no provision in the budget for improving mammography in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I will read the petition, if I may. It says: "To The Hon. the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador in Legislative Session convened: The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador that the women of Province be given access to modern screening mammography so that breast cancer is detected early and resulting death and radical surgery are minimized. Wherefore your petitioners pray that your hon. House may be pleased to provide the funding for the Department of Health to introduce immediately a province-wide screening mammography program including modern mammograms in the major hospitals and mobile units to serve the rural areas."

Mr. Speaker, the medical

authorities in our Province after having been made aware of the results of the major study about the comparative benefit and risks of screening mammography at the end of last year, now unite in saying that we cannot waste any time in improving our screening mammography equipment and service. This study was released by Health and Welfare Canada to provincial governments only last December. It was given to the Newfoundland and Labrador Deputy Minister of Health at a meeting in Ottawa last December.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I heard the Minister of Health talking to reporters, claiming that the previous government promised a province-wide screening program as an election ploy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I stand before all hon. members and say that the previous government was committed to that program. But it really does not matter what the previous government intended to do or promised during the election campaign. The members opposite form the government now, and they have the results of the major study showing that the lives of women can be saved by putting money in the budget for modern mammograms and having a Province-wide screening mammography program. That is what these petitioners are urging the House of Assembly and the Department of Health to do.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the petition, the prayer of which makes a lot of sense. I would not want to suggest any motives, but I have to give my congratulations to the women who were so swift. I am sure they were totally uncoerced in this extent. The presenter of the petition speaks as if she, all of a sudden, zoomed down on this planet, that she was totally removed from everything that happened in government over the past ten years. The hon. member who presented this petition, and might indeed have gone out and solicited the petition, was in government for ten years. That hon. member sat in consecutive Cabinets for ten years. That hon. member took part in ten budgets. Now, I cannot help but ask what was she doing for ten years if she had all this interest?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

As the hon. member says, people still die because of cancer. Somewhere around 160 cases of cancer will be discovered this year. How many cases of cancer have been discovered over the past seventeen years when this government sat inactive and did nothing about it? That is what I would like to know, Mr. Speaker. Now, there seems to be some confusion on the part of the member between mammography services and an mammography screening program. There does exist in this Province mammography services but not an adequate number. As the hon. member points out, particularly the one in Corner Brook is obsolete. It is fourteen years old, and for ten of these fourteen years the hon. member was representing the Corner Brook area in the Cabinet. Why,

in the name of goodness, did they allow a mammography unit to stay there for fourteen years to reach the point of becoming obsolete? It is sickening to hear the nonsense the hon. member is going on with. We are committed to an mammography screening program. We are committed to it. It is as simple as that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

We are not going to enter into another ten or fifteen years of crisis management where you have knee-jerk reactions, as the Minister of Development has talked about. We are going to do this. We are going to do it right. We are going to do it proper. It is going to be available to all the women of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. It is not going to be done for political expedience on the eve of an election. It is going to be done right and proper and the women of Newfoundland and Labrador, and the men, can be assured that this minister supports the prayer of this petition and that I will be glad to follow it through. I am unable at this time to say we are going to do it tomorrow morning, as the hon. member knows since she was in the government for ten years and could not do it in ten years. But I will certainly assure the people of this Province that I will not wait ten years until all the equipment becomes obsolete but it will be done in reasonable time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the hon. member that I view this issue as far too serious to be making cheap, political points about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:

I am glad you agree because that is what the hon. minister has been doing. The hon. minister is perfectly well aware that many things were done by the previous government in the past ten years, but technology changes and it is only fairly recently that we now have the state-of-the-art technology. Five years ago, four years ago, the equipment that was in our hospitals was adequate, but it was state-of-the-art in terms of what we knew. That is one of the areas where, thank God, we do have technological change. Where the former type of equipment that we had very easily missed those forms of cancer which were not able to be detected by manual examination, we now have the kind of equipment that does not. And it was only last December, which is not 14 years ago, that a national study, which reviewed this whole issue, made a report and indicated to governments across Canada that the benefits far outweigh the costs. Now I think that is pretty speedy action on the part of the former Minister, that he was able to actually make, and felt it was so important that he wanted to make that commitment, so that it would be in the public record regardless of the outcome of an election, because now we can do it. Now the Minister has already admitted that the equipment in Corner Brook is obsolete. But I heard him on the air this morning saying that maybe

in a year and a half we will have one mobile unit, like the **Christmas Seal**, which he keeps referring to. I would like to remind the Minister that I have the greatest respect for the **Christmas Seal**, which was a marvelous thing in its time, a Commission of Government response in a time of desperate poverty in this Province, and that was 1940 and it is now the 1990s, and the Minister's response to the health care needs of women in terms of women who may die or suffer unnecessarily from breast cancer, is a 1940s response and a totally inadequate response.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:

Now I would ask the Minister to reconsider. I could not believe the arrogance that was coming over CBC, the sort of off-handed approach to this concern. I would like to remind you that statistically there are 160 women who will develop breast cancer in the next year, and if that breast cancer is not detected early then the chances of those women having to have a radical mastectomy - which, gentlemen, I know you will never have to have, it is not a funny operation - the chances of those women having to have a radical mastectomy or dying from undetected breast cancer are fairly high, and I hope none of those women are not your wives or mothers or sisters.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:

This program is just too important to fool around with. You have a surplus, you are budgeting for a \$5 million surplus. If you put

\$500,000 in the Health budget this year, you could make a very good start on this program, and continue with it the next year and the next year, and we would have our Province-wide mammography screening capability.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, before you call Orders of the day, I would like to have the time to present a point of privilege.

Did you have something to say to the House first?

MR. SPEAKER:
If the hon. gentleman would permit, I just wanted to recognize the final day of one of our staff members here today who is retiring after 35 years in the public service and working in the Legislature. I refer to one of our commissioners, and maybe as I am talking he could stand in the door so all hon. members will know which one it is. One of our commissioners has been 35 years in the Public Service and has been in this job as commissioner since 1983. Today at 12 o'clock will be his last official shift, so on behalf of all members I would like to thank the gentleman for his years of service with the government and particularly for his years of service here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
We wish him a happy retirement.

Thank you very much.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a matter that we on this side consider to be extremely serious and one that should be taken seriously by members of the House. It is a point of privilege. We have raised it at the earliest opportunity considering our wait for the Hansard from Wednesday to get the Premier's comments with respect to the issue, which was available to us late yesterday afternoon. In addition to that, my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, did give notice of an intent to raise a point of privilege. I would appreciate the time to properly present the case. I will try not to take undue time, but I do want to try to present a proper case for Your Honour's consideration.

I will begin by making some references for Your Honour. First of all, I want to refer Your Honour to Beauchesne's new Sixth Edition, that he has so kindly presented us with. Page 12 of Beauchesne, Sixth Edition, paragraph 26, subsection (2), says in part: "A question of privilege is a question partly of fact and partly of law." The law referred to is the law of contempt of Parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I intend to make a case in connection with transactions that have taken place over the past week or so in this hon. House which, with evidence

that I will present, will show that somebody was misleading the House. The case, I hope, will show that that very contempt of Parliament that I referred to initially, will clearly indicate that, because of the actions I will outline that took place, the privileges of members of this hon. House have indeed been breached and are always breached when someone does not tell the truth in response to questions.

When I am finished, Mr. Speaker, I believe you will have no alternative but to determine that the matter is of such a serious nature as to entitle the subsequent motion, which I am prepared to make, to take priority over Orders of the Day; in other words, a prima facie case exists. As you know, Sir, this is pointed out in Beauchesne as well, the Sixth Edition, page 12, paragraph 26, subsection (3). It is not your responsibility to rule whether or not there is a point of privilege. We do not expect you to. That is not your job in this particular situation.

You will also see, Mr. Speaker, I believe, that this is not a dispute as to the facts. This is not a difference of opinion. The facts are found clearly in Hansard. As Beauchesne says, again in the Sixth Edition, page 13, paragraph 31, there are outlines there of many examples of what does not constitute a question of privilege. The example I will present to you, I believe you will clearly see, does not fit into paragraph 31, and that is for a very good reason, because our example does fit as a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, if one reads the House of Commons

Journals, June 19, 1959, pages 582 to 586, you will see that where a member's actions are brought into question a specific charge must be made. I just want to assure Your Honour that I will fulfill that obligation. I intend to conclude my presentation, as I must therefore, with a specific charge.

Let me mention one more thing that this is not a matter for the House to consider, I refer you to Sir John Bourinot, his parliamentary procedure reference book. Hon. members opposite probably never ever heard of him. The Fourth Edition, 1916, pages 135 to 140, clearly indicates many facets of electoral propriety have often been examined by the House, and there are also many examples in Beauchesne's Sixth Edition, pages 19 and 20, paragraphs 64 to 70. I refer hon. members to that as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I shall try to do is simply present the case and the evidence. I will not complicate it. I will be prepared to table any of the information that Your Honour might require but, as I said, most of it is already contained in Hansard.

On June 5 in Hansard, page 338, the bottom of the page. My colleague, the member for Burin - Placentia West asked a question of the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. I will not read the entire question but I will read the pertinent part. "My question now is has government already made a decision to cancel the second ferry for Bell Island, and has an MC been issued to that effect? Yes or no." That was the question.

Answer: The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation: "Mr. Speaker,

no." That is the first bit of evidence.

On June 7, two days later, the member for Burin - Placentia West again asked a question, and the question had to do with the issuing of an MC, and the member talked about the credibility of the minister being at stake here for a very good reason. Here, in part, was the question: "Does an MC exist with items on it dealing with the approval for the first ferry for Bell Island, the cancellation of the second ferry for Bell Island to recover the funding, and was setting up a committee to operate the Fogo Island ferry service? Does an MC exist," he repeats, "cancelling the second ferry for Bell Island?"

That answer by the minister was extremely evasive. I am sure all members will recall it. He did not say anything. He talked about Minutes of Cabinet being confidential.

My colleague asked a subsequent question. "Now, Mr. Speaker, laying it on the table, is there an MC existing cancelling the ferry services?" Mr. Gilbert: "Mr. Speaker, no." So twice the minister said no, there was no such MC.

Now, Mr. Speaker, referring members to Hansard of Wednesday past, June 14, Page 599, the Premier responded to a question from the Leader of the Opposition on the same matter. I just want to refer to the last part of his question. Referring to the MC, the Premier said: "It directed that there be no further work done by Marystown Shipyard with respect to a further ferry" for Bell Island. That was in Hansard of 14 June, two days ago. And the date

of the MC, which is probably pertinent, too, was May 23. That is very important in putting it all together.

So, the evidence is there, Mr. Speaker. Clearly, the Premier has contradicted what the Minister of Transportation said. Anybody who would shake his head and say, 'No, it is not clear,' must be looking through rose-coloured glasses or fogged-up glasses, or something. The evidence is there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the evidence I lay before you with respect to what is said in Hansard is not enough, then it is important to know what the people outside perceive. That is extremely important, too, because we are talking about the integrity and character of the House.

In yesterday's edition of **The Evening Telegram** - Thursday, 15 June - in a story written by Pat Doyle, referring to this particular issue, he clearly says, referring to the member for Burin - Placentia West a couple of days ago asking Mr. Gilbert if there was a Minute-of-Council stopping any financial commitment related to a second ferry, and the writer goes on to say, "Mr. Gilbert said there was not." The Premier, Mr. Wells, said, "The government's position is to proceed now with construction with one ferry for Bell Island, to look at the option of providing some other means of providing a second ferry without the commitment of a major capital expenditure." He goes on to say, "The government has decided it is not going to have the Marystown Shipyard build it right now."

So, Mr. Speaker, there clearly is not a difference of opinion, there is, clearly, a contradiction by

the Premier of what his minister had said in the House earlier. So, in my humble view, Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter. I think the evidence is clear. The minister has misled this House, in my view, and has reflected negatively on the honesty, integrity and character of the House and has shown a high contempt, therefore, of the privileges of the House.

I want to conclude by providing Your Honour with two final parliamentary references, which will make it clear. Members opposite may find it humorous, but I assure them, it is not humorous. It is a very serious matter.

Beauchesne, Sixth Edition, Page 20, Paragraph 69, and I quote: "The Speaker has reminded the House, 'It is very important...to indicate that something can be inflammatory, can be disagreeable, can even be offensive, but it may not be a question of privilege unless' - and I repeat 'unless' - "the comment actually impinges upon the ability of Members of Parliament to do their job properly.'" And, in this instance, the answer received by my colleague, the member for Burin - Placentia West, in my view, does just that.

Finally, the most telling reference, Your Honour, Beauchesne, Sixth Edition, Page 25, Paragraph 97, which I would also like to read for Your Honour and read into the record: "The Speaker has stated: 'While it is correct to say that the government is not required by our rules to answer written or oral questions, it would be bold to suggest that no circumstances could ever exist for a prima facie question of

privilege to be made where there was a deliberate attempt to deny answers to an Hon. Member, if it could be shown that such action amounted to improper interference with the Hon. Member's parliamentary work.'" Clearly, if a minister misleads the House and gives an improper answer, that impinges upon the hon. member's ability to do his job.

So my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is that this is exactly what has happened in this instance.

I thank Your Honour and I thank hon. members for their indulgence in allowing me to present this case. I have done so with numerous references. I have done so with evidence. I have made a charge, as required, and should Your Honour rule that the matter is serious enough to be debated, in other words, that I have made a prima facie case, then I am quite prepared to move the appropriate motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I get to a few of things I have to say about this, I would like to say to Your Honour that in Beauchesne, 6th Edition, paragraph 27, page 12, it says: "A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament." That: "A genuine question of privilege is a most serious matter and should be taken seriously by the House." I would remind Your Honour that there have, in my experience in the House, been questions of privilege raised. There is one memorable incident when a prima facie case of a question of

privilege was established to the satisfaction of His Honour and was dealt with in the appropriate fashion.

I have listened to arguments and read arguments concerning points of privilege. But, Your Honour, I have to say if this is an indication of the kind of thing that the Opposition House Leader is going to do for the life of this Parliament, and raise points under the guise of privilege that are so obviously shallow and so obviously do not exist, Your Honour, we are in for a rough time.

Now, I do not know if this is done simply to hold up proceedings, or if the Opposition House Leader simply does not understand the concept of privilege. There is no concept. The hon. gentleman sat in the Chair, where Your Honour sits now, for a number of years, I do not know how long. He sat here as Government House Leader for a while I would have thought we would understand that a question of privilege, according to Beauchesne, ought rarely to come up in Parliament, but already this is the second one that we have had in a very short time. By 'rarely' they mean it ought to come up perhaps once every number of years. You do not run into points of privilege because they are very serious matters.

I would start, Your Honour, by agreeing that if the action of a member interferes with a member opposite and prevents him from doing his duty as a member of this House, then that is a serious matter. Let us examine the situation and see how anybody's privileges were interfered with.

The issue in question, Mr. Speaker, has to do with an MC. I

would like to go back over the history of that.

On Monday, May 29, the first time that this issue came up, the member for Burin - Placentia West asked a question of the minister in Question Period. He asked, "whether it was his decision" meaning the minister's - "the decision of the Premier, or the decision of the Cabinet to renege on our position and have Newfoundlanders unemployed and the people of Bell Island waiting for a ferry service?" Now this was from Hansard, page 157, May 29, 1989. The answer by the minister is significant "I will tell the hon. member that the decision was made, the decision to provide the ferries for Bell Island is there." No question. "We recognize the fact that a commitment was made to provide one ferry, which we have already given a contract for. As to the second one, it is under study - and the commitment was there -" Then during other proceedings in the House, and not during Question Period, the member for Burin - Placentia West in one of his speeches referred to - and this is just later on the same day, May 29, 1989 - this particular incident in Question Period. The paragraph does not make sense if you read it out. 'And I hope, I say to the Minister of Transportation, Mr. Chairman, that the Government have struck down the MC that dealt with putting two ferries to Bell Island, will be giving the people' - and it should be, I believe, will not be giving; there is something left out - will not 'be giving the people of Bell Island an adequate ferry service.' So there were two issues, providing the ferry service and the direction.

Then later on, on June 1, Mr. Speaker, and this was during Question Period, the same matter was pursued, and the question from the hon. the member for Harbour Main. The member for Harbour Main got into the fray at this point. His question was: 'Will the second ferry, as announced by the previous administration, be built for the people of Bell Island? If it is going to be built, when will it be built? Will the minister tell us?' That was his question.

MR. SIMMS:

That is not relevant.

MR. BAKER:

I will say to the Opposition House Leader that it is very relevant.

The answer from the minister was as follows: 'As to the ferry, Mr. Speaker, we made an announcement, as is well known, and I am sure if the member had listened to the press last week, when I made the announcement about the building of the ferry that is presently starting construction in Marystown, I made a commitment to the people of Bell Island that we, in this government recognized the need for a second vessel for that run, and that we would be making an announcement in due course as to when this ferry will go into construction. I assure the hon. member it is in good hands. Have no fear, we are going to look after it.'

Then later on the same day, in the same Question Period, again in response to a question from the member for Harbour Main. The minister replied 'I have told the people of Bell Island, and I tell the member here today, we are in the process of considering, and we made a commitment to them, that there is going to be a second

ferry for Bell Island.

Then there is another exchange which I will not quote, it is not relevant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, up to the point in question, the exchange in question, and this is the key exchange, it has been established, up to that point, that the minister in his press statements, which I have not quoted from here but he referred to them in his speeches, in Question Period the minister has made clear a couple of things. He has made clear the fact that one ferry is now starting construction in Marystown specifically designed for the Bell Island run. One ferry. He has further made the point that a second ferry will be provided for the people of Bell Island, that there will be a second Bell Island ferry.

MR. TOBIN:

Did you approve it? That is the issue.

MR. BAKER:

So two points: One ferry is being built; there will be a second ferry for the Bell Island service. Then the question from the member for Burin - Placentia West, 'My question now is has - and this is referring to the second ferry for Bell Island. I will read the whole question, just so I will not do him any disservice. The question from the member for Burin - Placentia West is: 'The minister had said on July 1 that there is going to be a second ferry for Bell Island.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

On June 1.

MR. BAKER:

On June 1, I am sorry. 'There is

going to be a second ferry for Bell Island. He has just now reconfirmed what he has been saying, ... My question now is has government already made a decision to cancel the second ferry for Bell Island?' And the answer, Mr. Speaker, was no. It was a totally truthful answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:
It conformed with everything the minister had previously said. There is going to be a second ferry. The second ferry for Bell Island was not cancelled, Mr. Speaker. We keep saying it over and over and over again; the second ferry for Bell Island has not been cancelled. And we have explained the alternative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:
Now that was the question, the second ferry for Bell Island, and it has not been cancelled, there is going to be a second ferry for Bell Island, there is no doubt about that. We are examining the ways of doing it.

Now, I know that members opposite have another point to make here. I know they have another motive here in what they are doing. But, Your Honour, I would say to you that I can, by no stretch of the imagination, ever conceive that what the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation told this House and told the people of the Province was anything but the truth. I cannot conceive of how this can ever -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:
- be interpreted as preventing members opposite from doing their parliamentary duty. It cannot be interpreted that way, Mr. Speaker, and it has to be, according to Beauchesne, an interference with members carrying out their parliamentary duties. It has to be. This is very straightforward, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite can still do their parliamentary duties. The Minister of Works, Services and Transportation has told the truth all the time.

Now then, the Premier indicated that there was a specific MC in existence and I believe he quoted the date or whatever. That MC outlined exactly what the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation had been telling this House for two weeks.

MR. SIMMS:
He said there was no MC.

MR. BAKER:
It was exactly what the minister has been telling this House for two weeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BAKER:
Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe are interested in the truth. They are interested in holding up the proceedings by bringing up a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, that should never have arisen. It is so shallow and so indefensible that it shocks me. If this is what we are going to see for the next couple of months in this House -

MR. RIDEOUT:
You sit back and take it.

MR. BAKER:
Now, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, paragraph 31.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would suggest to hon. members if a point of privilege is as serious as we are saying it is, and I think all hon. members believe that a point of privilege is serious, then we ought to give it serious consideration without the bantering and the babbling that I am presently hearing. The Speaker is trying to listen to the case and to determine whether or not there is a prima facie case, and it is very difficult when I hear the babbling and the bantering that is taking place from both sides.

So, would the hon. the House Leader continue, please?

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to refer to some paragraphs from Beauchesne. Paragraph 31, page 13: "A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of...privilege." In this case I cannot see how there can be a dispute of fact anyway, so it would not constitute a point of anything. The minister has been totally honest in everything he said and there is no interference with the member's rights opposite.

Paragraph 24, page 11:
"Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively...and by Members of each House

individually, without which they could not discharge their functions." I would say to members opposite, and make the point to you, Your Honour, that nothing has happened here that prevents members opposite from discharging their functions. They have been told the truth all along. I have already quoted the reference about the question of privilege that should come up very rarely. It is indeed a serious matter and should not be used in a frivolous way as apparently is the pattern being established by the Opposition House Leader.

Paragraph 92, page 25: "A valid claim of privilege in respect to interference with a Member must relate to the Member's parliamentary duties." That is just underlining the fact that there has to be some interference with the rights of members opposite to do their parliamentary duty. I would say to Your Honour that no such rights have been breached. Everything was done straight and aboveboard. The minister has very clearly explained both in the House and in the press exactly the situation with regard to the Marystown Shipyard.

There is one ferry being built, and a second one will be provided for the residents of Bell Island. Where it comes from is a matter of decision. It may indeed be built or it may involve a refit of a ferry that is now in use somewhere else in the Province. Maybe we will have to then build another ferry for that other area in the Province. That has been amply described, Mr. Speaker. A final comment: No second ferry for Bell Island has been cancelled. There has been no decision to cancel any second ferry for Bell Island.

Bell Island residents will get their second ferry. That was the question the minister was answering at the time.

Mr. Speaker, there was obviously no point of privilege. This is not the kind of matter that should be brought up under privilege. This is a very frivolous action by the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will take that under advisement and come back with a decision a little later, maybe today, maybe on tomorrow, Monday.

Before getting into Orders of the Day I would like to welcome to the public galleries sixty kindergarten students and their teachers, Miss Doreen Williams and Annette Mooney, from Pius X School here in St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome to the galleries a delegation from the town of Gambo, in the persons of Wilson Eastman and Mr. Peter Lush, in the historic district of Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

ooo

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder, before we get onto the order that has been agreed on, if we could ask for agreement on both sides of the

House to deal with the resolution that was presented by the member for Stephenville because of some urgency and some events that are happening today. I would ask the Opposition House Leader for leave for the member for Stephenville to speak to this resolution, one speaker from each side and so on, the usual kind of arrangement between sides. So I ask for leave.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, we have no difficulty with it. We discussed it with the Government House Leader earlier and we recognize the importance of the resolution. In fact, we on this side several months ago took some initiatives on our own in support of the group over there. I believe our colleague, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) will speak on our behalf, following the member for Stephenville (Mr. A. Aylward). Then I understand we will put it to a vote with no further debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First off, I would like to thank the House Leader for the government side, and the House Leader and the Leader of the Opposition for agreeing to give some time to this resolution. This issue for everybody in this House is, I believe, a non-partisan issue provincially, and even for that matter, I suppose, federally. It is a very important issue for not only

Stephenville and Gander but also for the Province when it comes to transportation. On February 1, 1989, Air Canada notified the town of Stephenville and the town of Gander that they would be withdrawing their service from those two areas after forty years of continuous service to the West Coast of the Province and to Gander International Airport. This notification was given without any notice to the Government of Newfoundland and indeed to the federal minister for the Province, the hon. John Crosbie. No notification was given by Air Canada, by their board, or by their local management of this decision. The decision was made, I believe, as many other people believe, without any thought to the economic consequences that it would cause to Stephenville, the Southwest Coast and West Coast area, and also to Central Newfoundland. The airport in Stephenville has been there for many, many years. The Americans came in and there was an agreement at the time to set up an airport and an American base, the reason being because of its good geography and so on, and strategic location. Air Canada was the first airline there. It served for many, many years and provided an excellent service to mainland Canada, especially important for the development of the local economy on the West Coast. Much of the cargo business, the fish export business and so on, was done by Air Canada up until only a couple of years ago. Also, the passenger connections were excellent for creating business opportunities. Companies like Abitibi-Price and other major companies on the West Coast have always relied on the Air Canada jet service to mainland points to be able to bring in their people

and attract development opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, today will be the last flight for Air Canada into Stephenville and Gander. This flight, as I said, has served for many years and has provided a very important economic link. A number of efforts have been undertaken by the government of Newfoundland to deal with this matter, previous to the election and after the election. Those efforts by the previous administration were very much appreciated by this member and, I am sure, by all members of the House, and the former Minister of Transportation. There was money allocated in the Budget to do economic studies, which will now be undertaken to look at the market for the Stephenville airport, and so on. The reason I also speak specifically about the Stephenville airport is that Air Canada came in and announced their withdrawal of service without a replacement for the catchment area for Stephenville and it was the only airport left without a service. A lot of people in our area have felt very let down by Air Canada, whose management, to this point, have refused to consider holding the decision until we could look at some other proposals or some other replacement services. They have refused to do so and have given us very little thought. The resolution, Mr. Speaker, states that we would like the federal Minister of Transport, the hon. Benoit Bouchard, to order the National Transportation Agency to hold a public hearing to Air Canada's decision. This request has been made by a number of authorities from the Province. As a matter of fact, on March 8 the Town of Stephenville wrote a letter to the federal minister.

He has since refused to respond to this Province's request for a public inquiry or public hearing.

We are asking him today to consider that. There have been a number of representations made in the last couple of weeks, again, to get him to respond. Unfortunately, to this time he has not.

The second part of the resolution also asks that Air Canada, still being a federal Crown corporation, be ordered to delay the withdrawal of service or reinstate the service - as of today it will be gone - until the public hearings have been completed. Mr. Speaker, that is what we are asking, and it would only be fair for that to be done.

The National Transportation Agency, which was born out of the former Canadian Transportation Commission, was set up to protect, supposedly, rural areas of Canada from national airlines, and so on, withdrawing services in places that are in desperate need. Unfortunately, it has not been working, Mr. Speaker, and we are asking the federal minister today, as we have been doing for the last three months, to intercede on our behalf. The people of Stephenville and the people of the Province I think are entitled to at least a public hearing, to see exactly the ramifications of such a move.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government have indicated that they want to see Air Canada privatized. I think that is not a good move. Air Canada was set up with a mandate to serve Canada, East and West, and now they are getting out of that, going along

- with deregulation and going where they want to. This is a result of that, I feel. Be that as it may, they have made their plans. We are asking this House - I hope all members will be on side, and I am sure they will - to ask the federal government to intercede on the Province's behalf for the towns of Stephenville and Gander, because we think it a very important matter that should be dealt with.

I appreciate your time. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to congratulate the member for Stephenville for bringing in this resolution. I have been involved in this problem, I suppose you could call it, from the very beginning.

I would like to start my remarks by congratulating the town of Stephenville, and in particular Mrs. Cheryl Stagg, who heads up the Impact Committee in that area, for the work they have done over the past months.

Mr. Speaker, Stephenville, Port au Port, the Bay St. George area, and the whole Southwest corner of this Province has been dealt a very serious blow, because this is a very important transportation link, and with the loss of this transportation link the economy of the area will be drastically effected.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is not only passengers we are thinking about here. We can get out of Stephenville, we can get to St. John's, we can get to the mainland. One of the big problems with this flight is the fact that it had a large cargo capacity, and that the main industry in the Bay St. George area, the Abitibi-Price mill are on record as saying that this will affect their ability to be able to work, because very large pieces of equipment come in at very short notice. In my own district, the fish plant there, Connors Brothers, a national company, has said that one of the reasons that they are situated there is that they can fly fresh fish out of Stephenville. And there are many other companies on the Southwest Coast who use this service to fly fresh fish to markets, not only in Canada but in the United States. As well, Mr. Speaker, the various large companies situated in the city of Corner Brook, particularly I believe one company which deals in heavy equipment at the present time, offers same-day service, which was for components all over the West Coast of the Province where there is heavy equipment. This will pretty well put an end to this particular service.

Mr. Speaker, there is more to it than that as well. Stephenville has a very long runway. The only flights that are landing in Stephenville at the present time are the Dash-8 prop type aircraft. These aircraft do not need as much runway space and, therefore, in the winter time not as much of the runway will have to be cleared. So, Mr. Speaker, if we do not maintain the jet service, then our airport will not be able to be an alternate to Gander. As members are aware,

Stephenville has been the alternate to Gander for some time. Goose Bay cannot be the alternate to Gander because many Eastern Block airlines come into Gander and they could not be rerouted to Goose Bay because of the activities in Goose Bay. As a matter of fact, the thinking is that if the Eastern Block countries have to use another alternate, they will have to use Bangor, Maine, which means the loss of money to the country as well as to the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say, as well, that when we on this side were over there we gave, and I was instrumental in doing that, the town of Stephenville some \$215,000 very quickly once this happened, and I believe that gesture in itself will assure the member that we on this side are totally in favor of this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that deregulation is here in Canada. In some respects I agree with it. But, Mr. Speaker, we must in this country take into account the large distances and the economies of various areas of the country. It is not enough to say that we are going to do this on a cost saving basis. In order for this country to be strong, all parts of it have to be strong. That has been said many, many times and that goes for this Province. But the Southwest corner of this Province has a very fragile economy, and if this is allowed to happen and we do not intercede and do what we can, then I fear for many of the smaller industries. It is not enough to say, Mr. Speaker, that we will lose employees. It is a far greater thing than this. We will be losing much more than just Air Canada employees. What we will be

losing is a vital transportation link with the rest of the country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly support this motion and I can assure members opposite that we on this side support it and we do hope that we can see a resolution to this problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (L. Snow):

Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ready!

On motion, the resolution carried.

Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:

Order 2, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A couple of years ago, **The Globe and Mail** did an editorial on Newfoundland politics and politicians, especially with regard to those who change their political allegiance. As there were a substantial number from many parties, the paper in its editorial referred to politics in Newfoundland as a 'moving business'. It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that same paper does not do a similar analysis of Liberal promises and policies. They would find them hard to pin down. Again, a moving business. Or, I guess from our point of view in Opposition, a moving target.

For nearly fifteen years I served as a political aide to the P.C. Government, and I listened to Liberal criticisms of our government, and Liberal promises if they were elected. I listened to them call us cruel and callous as restraint measures become necessary during the recession of the early 1980s. They said they would be different. 'Elect a Liberal Government and our people will get everything they want, more jobs and lower taxes.' All we had to do was get rid of the cigars and the limousines and the Province would, like magic, be made whole by the Liberals. They are making her whole, Mr. Speaker, a whole lot worse!

Mr. Speaker, the economy in this Province is in no shape for an increased tax burden. If anything, the economy could do with a little stimulation. Instead, we get a \$90 million tax grab from a cold, clinical government. Remember what the Liberals used to say about the sales tax, Mr. Speaker? Reduce the sales tax and stimulate the economy. I remember it. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are lucky we did not get an increase in the sales tax. Parents with large children got a 12 per cent increase in this budget, and just about every other tax and fee was raised.

On education: Mr. Speaker, I remember going up to the University, to the Thompson Centre, to Wednesday lunchtime political forums. The Liberals acted like Liberals in those days, Mr. Speaker. Rumour had it that the University Administration forbade the students to butter their bread on those Wednesdays, because in those days butter melted at the sight of Liberals. The Thompson Centre cafeteria

saved money on electricity and sugar during those days, Mr. Speaker, because in those days Liberals were all sweetness and light.

So what did the Liberals do when they got elected? They raised tuition fees 10 per cent. That is what they did. The next time a Liberal goes to the Thompson Centre he will see lots of buttered bread, because, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, it will not melt any more. The post-secondary students of this Province were sold a bill of goods; they were misled in the Thompson Centre and shafted in the budget.

Let us look at hydro rates, Mr. Speaker. I remember our party being hammered every time hydro rates went up just because of inflation. Now, in addition to inflation, Newfoundland Hydro has been asked to absorb a 1 per cent guarantee fee, plus the phaseout of the Power Distribution District subsidy. This will cost Hydro tens and tens of millions over the next few years. Newfoundland Hydro will only absorb these losses until the next rate hearing and then the people will have to absorb them. I have talked to people who understand both the concepts and the calculations involved here, Mr. Speaker, and they tell me the citizens of this Province are in for at least a 15 per cent rate hike over the next two or three years.

Given everything the Liberals have said in the past, Mr. Speaker, this increase is a betrayal of the ratepayers of the Province. The crowd who wanted to put out the lights at Sprung, will be putting them out in the houses of poor people across the Province. The Liberal colour is red, Mr.

Speaker, and, yes, the people are seeing red.

Look at the Private Sector Program, Mr. Speaker, a very popular program with the small business sector in this Province. The Liberals said the P.Cs had megaprojects on the brain. 'Small business was the way of the future,' they said. People working at real jobs and in real Newfoundland small businesses was what the Private Sector Program was all about. So why axe it, Mr. Speaker? A subsidized job is better than no job, so why take away the subsidy when you have not put another program in its place? What are the unemployed to do in the interim? Marie Antoinette told them to eat cake. I guess the Premier would have them eat Meech.

What about women, Mr. Speaker? We are supposed to be Conservatives, yet every single advance in the field of the Status of Women in this Province is due to us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEWLETT:

The Throne Speech and the Budget Speech gave token reference to women, and now they threaten to take away the Occupational Integration Program. Funding to the arts community was cut back, Mr. Speaker. I guess all those Newfoundlanders coming home from the mainland will bring us back some arts and culture, so we will not have to be stupid and silly anymore.

Health care, Mr. Speaker: Closing hospital beds for the Summer was playing dice with people's lives, but, Mr. Speaker, these days the Liberals are allowed to gamble.

They had no problem closing two hospitals on the Burin Peninsula, Mr. Speaker. I guess that is only gambling with the well-being of PCs. That is fairness and balance, Mr. Speaker.

The Health Minister said yesterday that it was okay for people to use an air ambulance for shopping trips to St. John's, while refusing to fund a cancer screening program. That is compassion, Mr. Speaker. The Liberals promised the moon and the stars. What did we get? We got the soon and the nars, Mr. Speaker - 'some tings will be done soon, and nar a ting is going to be done right away.'

In the district of Green Bay, Harry's Harbour got nar a bit of pavement. Triton got nar a water system. Grand Bank and St. Lawrence got nar a hospital. The private sector got nar a program, and my park got nar a comfort station.

Take the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker - yes, please do take the Cabinet - fifteen dynamos that are supposed to turn the Province on its ear. So far all they have done is turn the Province upside down and shake the money out of the people's pockets.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are not allowed to read that.

MR. HEWLETT:

Copious notes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is supposed to choose his Cabinet from the elected Assembly, but it appears he was somewhat short of talent. We have one Minister of Development in this Assembly, we have a Minister for Employment in this Assembly, and now we have

five more of the same from the university. For the first time, Mr. Speaker, we are hiring our ministers from the public at large. So much for downsizing the Cabinet. So much for saving money. Dr. House must be a brave man. He is not heading a Royal Commission this time. He has to make more than recommendations this time, Mr. Speaker, he has to produce results. He has to produce jobs, he has to create economic activity, and if he fails, the Liberal Government fails. This Commission is supposed to be autonomous and has NLDC as its private bank. I do hope that the pressure on it to succeed will not cause it to wield its power heavily, to bend the rules to the point of breaking them to show partisan favoritism or any of the other faults that are so common with bodies with power.

In setting up this Commission, the Premier has abdicated his responsibility to unelected persons. The Minister of Development has abdicated, the Minister of Employment has abdicated, and that is one way to downsize your Cabinet, Mr. Speaker.

Of course, given the way the Premier has a tendency to pre-empt his ministers in this Chamber, one could say that the Cabinet has been downsized to one. Be it one or fifteen or twenty, Mr. Speaker, there are only but a few good ones over there. It reminds me of the American military recruiting slogan, 'The Few, the Proud, the Marines.' I am also reminded of the immortal words of Winston Churchill after the battle of Britain: In terms of taxes, never have so many owed so much to so few. And, Mr. Speaker, in terms of positive action, never have so

many owed so little to so few.

I thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. HOGAN:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, before I go into my second maiden speech, I am sad to see that my pudgy friend from Burin - Placentia West is not present.

MR. WARREN:

He will be back.

MR. HOGAN:

No, he is gone. He quit when he heard I was getting to my feet.

I would like to thank those members of the House and those employees of the House of Assembly who extended sympathies and wishes to the Hogan and McCormack families on the loss of my sister, in particular the Premier, who honoured her name by expressing publicly the sentiments of members of the House and the staff.

I would also like, Mr. Speaker, to recognize the sympathies extended by the member for Humber East who, I believe, was probably her former boss and was very kind in her remarks and sentiments privately. I would like to thank her for that.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to congratulate yourself and your two colleagues on your election to sit in judgement over us in our conduct. I do not envy you your task. At times, it is like being the keeper of a zoo. However, I wish you well and can assure you of my co-operation, even though I am on a short leash. I have the

Party Whip behind me to keep me in control, and it is difficult at times.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Even with a girdle.

MR. HOGAN:

'Even with a girdle,' he says.

I would also like to comment on the service of my predecessor, Mr. Patterson, who served in this House for fourteen years, albeit it of different political faith. He did tender fourteen years of service, and I wish him well in his retirement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOGAN:

It was with some difficulty, Mr. Speaker, that we sat here for three or four days, I think it was something like six hours, listening to the member for Grand Bank. I would probably call him the Minister of Repetition.

But in his address yesterday he did catch my attention for about twelve or thirteen minutes, and I would like to reiterate what he said in his comments on recreation and sport. It would augur well for any government to heed his words, because for that twelve minutes of his entire six hours, Mr. Speaker, I thought he was most sincere and did have good arguments on behalf of most of us getting into fitness, particularly my friend from Mount Pearl, myself and other members over here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOGAN:

I can realize your difficulty, Mr. Speaker, at times, and

particularly your colleague, the member for Bonavista North. I notice every now and then he gets caught up into who is the House Leader and who is the Leader of the Opposition. We, in this corner here, for identification purposes call them leader number one, leader number two, and number three, number three, again, being my good friend for Mount Pearl who, I must say, I worked with these last couple of days and I found that work very interesting, very constructive, and I was amazed - not really amazed, because I have known him for some time. Sitting on the committee, particularly with the hon. member for Mount Pearl, I found it very educational. I think he transforms when he comes to the House, he puts on his rhetoric suit. But when he goes to the committee, he gets sensible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOGAN:

He is even very kind. He invited the committee to hold their next meeting in Deer Park. We considered it, but we could not afford it.

Another issue, Mr. Speaker, came up yesterday and was brought to the floor by the member for St. John's East, the issue of the cancer research program. There is no one who realizes better than I the importance of such a program, and I caution her and her colleagues not to treat it as a political item, but as something which must be brought into the health program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOGAN:

It is something which must be introduced into our health care program in the Province, and be done with caution and with sensibility, and done properly and done right. I am not trying to be rhetorical in saying that. I know the value of it and I know what it can do and what it cannot do from a layman's point of view. I am not as well versed as my good friend, but I caution them. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I was sickened when I heard my friend, the member for Humber East (Ms. Verge), cry across the floor at the Minister of Health, 'How many women are going to die?' How sick! Probably she was caught up in the frustration and frenzy of the discussion, but I think members should be more cautious when speaking about such sensitive issues, issues sensitive to not only the women of the Province but to all people of the Province. I would respectfully request all members of the House to treat that and other such sensitive subjects with the respect they deserve.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOGAN:

I also sat in the House and listened to a number of my colleagues, on both sides, talk about the fishery. I will not dwell on it, because people who are a lot more articulate and knowledgeable on the subject than I am addressed it very well. I think all who spoke to the issue had very good points and we were on the same track. I do not think there is much difference in our opinions, I think the differences lie in how a fishery program is going to be addressed and implemented. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I found it very interesting and very educational.

Probably I should not say this, coming from Placentia Bay, but I do not know all that much about the fishery, and I will leave it to others in the House to address this all-important matter, something which is the backbone of our economy, the backbone of our future and must draw the full and equal support of all members of the House.

I would like to welcome back my good friend, the member for Grand Falls, Leader number two. I hate standing in the House without him being here to listen to me. In my early days, my first days in the House, he was very conscious of us down here in this corner. I think it was the hon member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) who dubbed us with the name Hogan's Heroes. Of course we have to have a few names for those fellows over there. Like members opposite, we here discuss every now and then -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. HOGAN:
No, no. Warren's Warts.

I did not make up that name, it was my supporters here. So I guess you might see a tag team match one of these days, between Hogan's Heroes and Warren's Warts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HOGAN:
But I do not want to get in the ring with my good friend, the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons).

MR. MURPHY:
There would not be enough room, for one thing.

MR. HOGAN:
There probably would not be enough room.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HOGAN:
We have been in the ring side by side actually, a number of times, but on some of the streets a bit below where we are now, and we fared very well, I think.

I was interested also in speaking of the fishery. In the member's address on the fishery he spoke as a man who came out of a boat. I think I mentioned in my political campaign in trying to get elected to this House, and I tried successfully, apparently, that what amazed me in going throughout my district was that the fishermen in their own way were saying much the same as I am hearing here in the House. I think in one part of a petition or a resolution that was presented here in the House was the assimilation of information into a bank, or into a computer, or into a central file dealing with the fishery. And, I still ask the same question, how many people, how many scientists, how many whoever, really listen to the fishermen and catch that brainpower, that information, that knowledge they have of the fishery. I would say the Minister of Fisheries we have now is probably the most qualified person in fisheries matters to ever sit in this House at any time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HOGAN:
I think even the other side will concede that. He has no easy chore. But I also remind him, and I think the Premier addressed it

somewhere in speaking to one of the resolutions, about having such a collection of information. I say to you, I think the fishermen have to be considered. The member for St. John's East Extern, the Minister for Flatrock, he has to be listened to. What he has as input, and what his fellow fishermen have as input has to be listened to along with the scientists and other experts in that particular area.

A little bit about my own district, Mr. Speaker: I think probably the most significant thing in the district at the moment apart from the fishery, and, I guess, equal to the fishery at this particular time, is the closure of the plant at Long Harbour. Two hundred and ninety people, I think, is the number given of those being put out of jobs, but there are a lot more. At any given time, any day of the week, probably except Sundays, you will find anywhere from 350 to 400 people working at that site not on direct payroll of A & W, but with contractors and other people on the site. A trucking firm here in St. John's makes their entire living on it. There are offices in Donovan's Industrial Park that operate solely on the business they do at Long Harbour. The Long Harbour plant is a very integral part of the economy of this Province, and certainly of the Avalon Peninsula. Its employees work throughout Placentia Bay, in Trinity Bay, as the speaker knows, in Conception Bay down in my hon. friend's district, everywhere.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Not in mine.

MR. HOGAN:
I think everyone wants to get on the bandwagon down at this end

this morning. But, they are making a good contribution. They have learned industrial skills and industrial discipline, and the discipline of just living and getting along with others. They have been there for 20 years. They are on councils, they are in fire brigades, - I was going to say they were in the Girl Guides, but they are not - they contribute to every organization, the social fabric of the community. I think it is up to all members of this House to encourage government to leave no stone unturned to address that problem.

Now, Long Harbour is not the first time that such an economic catastrophic thing hit our area. Argentia phased down in 1969 and that also affected the same communities, the same area, and there was very little done. There was an Argentia Task Force which I, in time, came to call the Argentia Task Force; it did nothing. It did nothing! It was in existence for a couple of years, and there was not very much done since to recognize the potential of the development of Argentia. I certainly hope that the Long Harbour thing does not follow the same route. Argentia is sitting out there, as my good friend from Mount Pearl can attest to. I must say, when he was the pertinent minister he did pay attention, a lot more than other people who are around in that day. It has potential as a port, and I have been trying to sell it for years as a port. It has a harbour, it has an airfield. Except for the Argentia access road, which my good friend, the Minister of Transportation, is going to fix up next year for me in its entirety - I hope he is not here to deny me. But anyway, he is going to look at it.

MR. DOYLE:

The roads (inaudible).

MR. HOGAN:

Yes. That was going to be implemented in 1991. I think, it has been moved up a year, thanks to the minister over there, who - I do not know if he is nodding in the affirmative or if he is going asleep - is agreeing.

The area of historic Placentia has much to offer to the tourist trade. On that I will tell a little story on tourism I told the Minister of Development the other night at the Estimates Committee meeting. There is a house in Placentia called the O'Reilly House, once owned by the famous Magistrate O'Reilly of Placentia district. For four years the local Historic Society worked on that particular house and not one single shekel, not a penny, not a dollar went into that project from the Province, not a dollar. It was done by people working on the so-called LIP grants or Canada Works projects or whatever you want to call them, or training programs, and volunteer work, Mr. Speaker. I say to the Minister of Development and the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs - I had some discussion with the Minister of Provincial Affairs on it - that there has to be something in the budget, when they get around to it, to address valuable tourist attractions like that.

I visited the site, as a matter of fact, with some people just last week who came over here from the U.K., from Scotland. They were at the Oil Show, and they wanted to visit Argentia which they did. It was one of these days, Mr. Speaker, when you could not see the length of the car, so they did

not get to see very much, and it was one of these days when Argentia showed its value for the Americans; they went there, I guess, to hide in the fog.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOGAN:

I did not mean that in a derogatory fashion.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Then why did you not tell us?

MR. HOGAN:

Keep your wit to yourself.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point I was making was that although they lost interest in Argentia, I took them to the O'Reilly House and they were fascinated that a small jewel could be in the middle of a community, not promoted, not supported, and not the main attraction. Of course, it was only open a week and people were really flowing through it. These visitors from Scotland took pictures, and when they left the district, Mr. Speaker, they were talking more about the tourism than they were about the port of Argentia. I argue with anyone that probably the future of the Placentia intertown area rests in the tourist industry. With Marine Atlantic increasing their activity into Argentia, hopefully with a year-round service visitors to this Province will come and visit the Placentia intertown area and stay, and leave their butts behind.

As a matter of fact, this little project, which has no input provincially at all, is now employing five people full-time for the Summer, four students and one adult, the kind of packages we probably should be getting more

and more involved in. I look forward to the Minister of Development and the Minister of Provincial Affairs paving the road to some sort of fiscal responsibility to be directed towards such projects throughout the Province.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that each and every district, each and every little town in the Province has points of interest which can attract many, many tourists.

Though Argentia, Mr. Speaker, employed many, many Newfoundlanders, it went down the tubes. When it went down the tubes, one of my pet peeves, since realizing it some eight or nine years ago, is that many of the people who terminated over there and who went into retirement, some of these people have been deprived of benefits.

As you are well aware through the press, and so on, I have been urging the federal government and the minister responsible, the Minister of Health and Welfare (Canada), to become more and more involved. These people were deprived of those benefits because of the negligence of their employer in instituting such things.

Another part of my district, Mr. Speaker, the Western end of it, which borders on your own, relies heavily on the fishery. That was articulated earlier in this session. The fishery is very important to the community of Southern Harbour, very important to the communities of Fair Haven and Little Harbour, and even to the community of Long Harbour, where there are still a good many fishermen.

An interesting statistic I might throw in here related to the Long Harbour plant is that out of the 107 families in Long Harbour, 109 people were employed at the plant, probably some of them gone into retirement now.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fishery is very important to Southern Harbour, Little Harbour and Fair Haven. I am sure the Minister of Fisheries recognizes the inshore fishery as being the lifeblood of those three communities, which depend wholly and solely on the inshore fishery; there is no other work for them. It is therefore very important for the people in that part of my district that the fishery succeed and that this government do everything it can in promoting the fishery and listening to the inshore fishermen.

There is, Mr. Speaker, for example, a fish plant in Little Harbour. I am not sure if I have it right, because I am still digging into it, but the fish plant there, I understand, is owned by the Province. I do not know if it is owned by the Department of Fisheries or the Department of Public Works, or by whom, but it is owned by government; they are paying the light bill and paying for the upkeep of it. That plant has been empty now for three or four years. The fishermen in Little Harbour would like to use that fish plant and cannot get to it. As a matter of fact, during glut times, when the fish plant is lying there dormant, they are throwing away their cod and other fish. This is an item which the Minister of Fisheries is now addressing, and as soon as the House becomes less busy, we hope to visit there and get to the bottom of just where it stands. I

think the licence for it is being held by a group who do not even live in the district, who actually live far away from the district, and we cannot even find out - at least, I cannot at the moment, because of other circumstances - just what the disposition of that licence is and how it would apply to the people of Little Harbour.

Fair Haven, Mr. Speaker, is a very small community, very remote from the Trans-Canada, has twelve kilometers of highway, eight of which are paved, four unpaved. I am looking forward to my good friend, the Minister of Transportation taking care of that over the next couple of years.

I also suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the very important caplin fishery means a lot to the livelihood of the people of Southern Harbour, Little Harbour and Fair Haven, the three main fishing communities. At this time of year, the caplin season, they, like other people, cannot find a market for their fish. Again, I leave that to the people who are more articulate, and I am under the guiding light of my good friend, the Minister of Fisheries, who was also, at one time, the federal member for that riding. He will guide me and bring success to that part of the district. We are going to be visiting it very shortly, Mr. Speaker.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to be a member of this House and to be associated with the gentlemen I have worked with to date. Again, I go back to what I said earlier, that I think we should address the business of the country and the business of the Province in a sensible, businesslike fashion, and be cautious when we address sensitive

subjects in the manner in which we do.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your tolerance, and I wish you well in your future endeavours.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before I recognize the hon. the member for Mount Pearl, I would like to welcome to the gallery Mr. Gary Renouf, President of the Chamber of Commerce in Stephenville, and Mr. Ray McIsaac, Chairman of the Long Range Community Futures in Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, in relation to the issue that we debated earlier briefly, Air Canada pulling out of Stephenville, let me add my support, since I happened to be in Stephenville on the day that that was announced and there was a great public meeting held, as my colleague opposite will recall, and Mr. Barrett, in fact, the former Minister of Development and Tourism, and I were both there taking part in the great democratic exercise which was going on at that time. We both took the opportunity to attend that great public meeting, which was a very emotionally charged meeting, one, obviously, which showed clearly the emotions and the concerns of the people in the Stephenville area, and we both spoke and supported the efforts that the Committee and the people

of Stephenville and area were undertaking. I took the opportunity to point out at that time the implications of Air Canada pulling out of Stephenville are far-reaching, indeed I had the day before spoken with some people in Port aux Basques, who will lose very, very much from a financial point of view because of exchanges of fishing crews from Nova Scotia to vessels operating out of Port aux Basques, for example. There was one individual alone, basically he operates a taxi or a small transportation business, who was going to lose, he estimated, at least \$20,000. That is just one individual I had happened to speak to. So the implications of Air Canada pulling out of Stephenville are far more widely ranging than just the implications on the people of Stephenville and Corner Brook. And I realize the emotions between Corner Brook and Deer Lake and Stephenville, but let me assure you that the people of Corner Brook are totally onside with the people of Stephenville in this particular venture. They need that service as well, and I think they indeed could be brought onside as a good ally.

Mr. Speaker, let me deal with the budget for a few moments. First of all let me say that this budget will certainly go down in history. It will be remembered as the one singular budget in history that totally lacked ingenuity and imagination. Absolutely no new mechanisms, no new concepts, no initiatives to try to deal realistically with the problem with which government was faced. And I appreciate the problem that this government faced when it came into office, and did not have a great amount of time to deal with it, I will give them that.

The Premier misleads the House when he says that when he came to office they were facing a \$90 million deficit. Yet he also says that there was nothing done in preparing the budget. They had to start from scratch. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was absolutely and totally untrue. There was a tremendous amount of work done. What the Premier was referring to was that we had taken the budget to the stage where we were now coming to the hard decisions. All the easier decisions were made, all of the smaller cuts within departments were made, all the bleeding had been done at the Treasury Board level, and the Planning and Priorities level, and we now were faced with making those final decisions dealing with the \$90 million deficit that we had at that point in time. That is not to say that there was going to be \$90 million deficit, but we had to make those decisions that were remaining. And that is what the government did.

And I would say, Mr. Speaker, this budget, as we found in going through the Estimate Committees, that not a great deal was changed within the departments; very little was changed of these particular subheads in the departments. Again, I say they did not have a lot of time to deal in great detail, but I did not see a lot. In fact, some of the departments almost appeared exactly as if we were debating our own budget. There may have been one or two things changed here and there, but they did deal with some of the major items, obviously. And what they did do solved their \$90 million problem by implementing \$95 million of increases in taxes, and by taking \$40 million in addition to that out of the pockets of people who

pay electrical rates in this Province.

That is how they solve their problems. That is the imagination they show. They had a problem so they made a great, huge tax grab. That is the bottom line in this budget, Mr. Speaker. Then they attempted to blame all of their financial problems on the federal government. I have never seen a budget speech that took four pages to lambaste the federal government and say that everything that happened here is because of the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the pie chart that is in the budget, you will find that the percentage of revenue, where the money comes from, from the federal government has decreased by less than 1 per cent, just slightly over 1 per cent. Forty-six point zero per cent of the total budget last year came from the federal government, and 44.8 per cent this year comes from the federal government. Now, how, in light of that - this is right on the back of the summary, and it is in the budget document itself - could this government stand up and say that therefore all of the financial problems are because of cutbacks in federal financing? Mr. Speaker, that is a cop-out of the first order.

Let us look at the sorts of things that were done. First of all, and foremost, Mr. Speaker, it dealt with taxation on children's clothing. Now, this was the most heartless mechanism that they used in this budget. They say that that is going to take \$5 million out of the pockets of taxpayers. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that removing that exemption on taxation on children's clothing

will take \$14 million off the backs of young people in this Province. That is how much they have raised from that measure. The total increase in retail sales tax will be \$40 million. That is how much they are gaining.

MR. BAKER:
Wrong.

MR. WINDSOR:
It is absolutely true, and I will document it if the President of Treasury Board wants me to because I can do it, I have it. He can sit there and say, 'Wrong,' all he wants but he cannot change the facts. The facts are there.

Mr. Speaker, I agree there was a problem with that mechanism of giving exemptions on clothing using the MCP card. I can give you a list of abuses. The minister and the President of Treasury Board have their examples, I am sure, and everybody in this House has seen abuses of that tax exemption. There is nothing that upsets people more. It is not taxation, it is people abusing taxation, people getting away without paying their taxes. There is one thing I learned in my time as Minister of Finance and as President of Treasury Board, that it is not taxation, it is fair taxation that is important. People who get away from taxes by manipulating the system, that is what people are concerned about. People did not like going into a store and seeing somebody else passing out their child's MCP card. I know of one example of a businessperson in this city who had a suit tailor made for himself and gave his son's MCP card and got an exemption.

I, myself, when I was Minister of Finance, doing my one-day shopping

a year, just before Christmas, buying some clothes for my wife, the young girl asked me, "Do you have a child's MCP card so I do not have to charge you tax?" There were at least twenty people standing behind me. This poor girl obviously did not recognize me. She did not recognize me and I said, "My dear, you are just giving me a short trip to resignation, and, no, I will not do that." I reprimanded her and told her.

The President of Treasury Board shakes his head because he estimates \$5 million that he would be losing. I will tell you I disagreed with the officials and I proved them wrong. You were losing at least \$14 million, and that could be conservative.

What I would have done, Mr. Speaker, though, is not take the \$14 million from the children, I would have dropped retail sales tax a nickle, 1 per cent. It is approximately the same amount as what you would have made.

On clothing you could have done this. You could have dropped the retail sales tax on all clothing to 8 per cent. That is what I would have brought into this House were I reading the budget three weeks ago, sales tax on all clothing of 8 per cent so that everybody is being treated equally, but without taking more money out of the pockets and off the backs of children. That is what has been done by this budget.

PREMIER WELLS:

Would the member permit a question?

MR. WINDSOR:

Absolutely, as long as I am given leave afterwards.

PREMIER WELLS:

Would the former minister explain why he would do that when he read the budget last year?

MR. WINDSOR:

Because, Mr. Speaker, I was appointed Minister of Finance, I think on January 27 of last year, and I brought in the budget about a month later. We did not have the analyses. The Minister of Finance is not here, but I ask him to check with the officials downstairs. I ask him to check on his desk, because when he walked into his office there was a binder on his desk of analyses of possible tax measures. A binder about that thick that was done, and I left it there. I wish the heck I had taken it with me now. It was very useful information. But I left it there. What it was was after we went through that budget exercise last year, and the Leader of the Opposition's question is a valid one, Mr. Speaker, every time I questioned the officials as to what would happen if we did this, they would say we do not have the data, we need to check that out, we have to monitor that over a period of time.

You ask the Deputy Minister of Finance, and he will tell you that the day after I read the Budget Speech last year, I walked in and said, "Now we start next year's Budget Speech. All of those questions I asked that you did not have the answers for, next year when I ask you, you had better have them ready." And he did, to his credit, and did it well. It is an excellent document. Maybe the Premier has seen it. He nods his head. Maybe he has seen that document. It was a good document that gave you some sound information to make good financial decisions on. It is there in the department. That is why I did not

do it last year, because I did not have the information to do it on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the next big item, and the government tried to hide it away as not being a tax grab but it is, is on hydro rate increases. Thirty million dollars will be added to the cost of electricity in this Province because government is no longer going to subsidize PDD.

You could say that the \$30 million previously was paid by government, therefore it came out of taxpayers' pockets. Indeed it did, and it is still going to. But you have not lowered the taxes by \$30 million and said, "We will cut back on sales tax or personal income tax by \$30 million and we will eliminate that subsidy on PDD, and you will pay the same amount of money through your electricity rates." You kept your \$30 million in taxes and added another \$30 million through hydro rates because of PDD, and another \$10 million by charging Hydro a guarantee fee on the funds that this Province guarantees for hydro. I considered that last year. I looked at it and asked, "What for? It is another tax. It is a clever way to try to hide \$10 million. The government in the Budget Speech said we are going to ask Hydro to absorb this and maybe they can absorb it this year. But that is being misleading, too, because hon. members opposite, and the minister knows full well, that Hydro is controlled by the Public Utilities Board. When they go to a hearing, be it this year, or next year - In fact, they are going in three months time. They have to go.

PREMIER WELLS:

No.

MR. WINDSOR:

They are not? You cancelled that. You do not need it now because you have another \$40 million coming in. But when they do go, all of these things will be reflected in the application to the Public Utilities Board, and electricity rates will increase, and Newfoundlanders will pay \$40 million a year: \$20 million this year, \$30 million next year and \$40 million the following year, because you are phasing out the PDD subsidy. Anyway you can cut it, there is an additional \$40 million coming out of the pockets of rate payers for electricity and that is a tax by any other name, Mr. Speaker. That is precisely what it is. It amounts, by the way, to \$80 for every man, woman and child in this Province. Eighty dollars a year, \$320 for a family of four, \$25 a month on the average for every home in this Province. That is what that increase in hydro rates means, \$25 a month.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There will be screams.

Yes, they will hear the screams. But they will go through Newfoundland Light and Power, and it is a clever way to suck \$40 million out of the people. That is about the only imagination that this budget shows. It showed imagination on how to get \$40 million out of the people. I was impressed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying, this 10 percent increase in tuition fees! Mr. Speaker, I will not spend a lot of time on this, because this government will live to regret that. The young people of this Province will let them know what that means. There is a quiet revolution building up

out there among the students of this Province, the post-secondary students. This government will get the message in due course. In due course, excuse the pun, but this government will get the message from the young people of this Province of how they feel about that 10 percent increase in tuition fees.

Mr. Speaker, the government took another \$10 million on tobacco taxes. Tobacco, liquor, these are the easy things to put taxes on, particularly for those who no longer smoke, such as myself. There is nothing worse than a reformed smoker and I am one of the worst. And, I do not mind admitting it.

PREMIER WELLS:

You are very self-righteous.

MR. WINDSOR:

I am very self-righteous when it comes to smoking. I recognize an individual's right to smoke but not to blow it down my lungs.

The Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, stood in his place and said, smokers in this Province must bear a fair share of the cost of health care in this Province so he takes \$10 million from them. But he also takes \$3.5 million from the people of St. Lawrence and Grand Bank, the people of St. Lawrence have the biggest lung problem, and have experienced the biggest lung problem in the history of this Province. Why could he not take \$3.5 million of those \$10 million that he took off the lungs of smokers and help the people of St. Lawrence and Grand Bank, Mr. Speaker? There is the

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

Now, Mr. Speaker, personal income tax. Let me refer to a little article - God help me, I am quoting The Sunday Express, may I be forgiven. I read an editorial by Mr. Wangersky. I do not have the date on it. Yes, October 5, 1988. My secretary was alert enough to stamp the date on the back. It is called 'Chasing business away.' It says, 'You cannot attract business by making it more expensive to do business here than anywhere else. Taxes and transportation costs make Newfoundland the most expensive place in Canada to make a living in business.' Now, nothing could be truer. I agree entirely. Yet, this government has, in its Throne Speech, the message that says we are going to attract more business to this Province, we are going to put emphasis on small business in this Province, they shied away from the megaprojects, and now they are coming back and saying these are pretty important things, you know. They have now started to realize that maybe the big opportunities here are the Hibernias of the world and the Lower Churchill, if the Premier does not scuttle it, these sorts of things. And, the NATO Base in Goose Bay. These are the megaprojects that can have significant economic impact on this Province. They have started to waffle a little bit now. Before, never mind the big projects. That is not the way to develop this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They are falling apart over there in only six weeks.

MR. WINDSOR:

They have started to take back water on that, as they have on just about everything else. So,

to do that, what do they do? They increase personal income tax. They are going to take another \$20 million out of the pockets of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, 62 per cent now of the federal rate. We thought that 60 per cent was the point of no return, that is it, we cannot go past 60 per cent, that is a magic number and we should never go apast 60 per cent of the federal rate, but now we are gone to 62 per cent. Mr. Speaker, I stood in this House a year ago and defended the fact that we were not the most highly taxed people in Canada. At that point in time we were 1.02 per cent of the national average overall taxation when you consider municipal taxation, health taxes, school tax, and all the rest of it we were 1.02 per cent of the national average. Saskatchewan and Quebec were much higher than us. Because of subsequent budgets and subsequent tax increases we slipped down to about 99 per cent of the national average. This government has now put us back up again - I think 101 was the number in the budget. They have now put us back up again. They did not like us being second or third. They wanted to get us out in front again as the most highly taxed province in Canada and they have succeeded, Mr. Speaker, and succeeded very well. They stant up as I did and say, well, taxes might be high but we are not the most highly taxed. No, Mr Speaker, but we have the lowest ability to pay because we have the lowest per capita income so that is a cover-up. That is the fact of the matter.

Gasoline tax, Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that the Minister of Development - oh, he is gone. He went sneaking out again. I cannot believe that the Minister

of Development would be part of increasing the gasoline tax. With the efforts that he spoke about, and spoke so eloquently in the Estimate Committee two nights ago, and I think with a lot of sincerity, I think he really wants to do something for the tourist industry in this Province and how he can be part of a government that increases personal income tax, that increases corporate tax, that increases taxation on gasoline, on cigarettes, on alcohol, all of the things, Mr. Speaker, that impact on a tourism package. When a tour operator in the United States is putting together a tour package he looks at two things. Obviously, the attractiveness of the package and, secondly, the cost. Can he market that package?

We have one disadvantage inherent, Mr. Speaker, and there is not that much we can do about it, unless government wants to address it, take the bull by the horns, and eliminate the transportation costs of getting to Newfoundland, because that is our big impediment. People from all over the world come to see Atlantic Canada because the government of Canada markets Atlantic Canada. They will not do any marketing for a province per se, but They have broken Canada down into regions. The hon. chicken down there knows what I am talking about. They have broken Canada down into regions and the region that they market is Atlantic Canada. If you go to any of the embassies around the world you will see literature on Atlantic Canada. They do a good job of promoting tourists to come to Atlantic Canada, and they will fly into Halifax International Airport, and they will go to Prince Edward Island and they will go to New Brunswick

and see Nova Scotia. And they say, 'Newfoundland is a bit far away and it is a bit expensive, we have seen three out of the four Atlantic Provinces so let us not bother,' and we lose out every time. I am glad to see the Minister of Tourism back. That is why every time this Province has to do its own marketing. Tourism is still part of the Department of Development - Rural, Northern Development and anything else that happens to be around that nobody else will take.

SIMMS:

Lost in LDC.

MR. WINDSOR:

Lost in LDC. Oh, I am coming to that.

So, Mr. Speaker, whenever a tourist operator is putting together a package with Atlantic Canada, he will now be scared away because of the cost of gasoline, because of the taxation on food in restaurants - 12 percent is a negative impact because of the cost of cigarettes, alcohol, all of these things, because of tax on rooms, on accommodation, which some provinces do not have I ask the Minister of Tourism to address this over the coming year. If he is ever going to develop tourism in this province, we have to address that inequity. It is a clear, clear disadvantage that we have trying to compete, we have enough difficulty now in competing because of our geographical location and the cost to get here.

Mr. Speaker, then there were \$4 million taken on driver's licenses and registrations. I guess you had to take it somewhere. And there was a range of other fees, and they did not spell those out. I happen to have a list of some of

those fees, not this year's unfortunately. I have not gotten this year's, my mole has not given me the list for this year. Watch out! The mole is probably going to be shot.

But I do have a list of the proposed fee increases that we looked at last year and rejected most of them, although we implemented a couple last year. This year it does not tell us, just says a variety of fees will be increased and permits will be increased. We will find out. I saw the Liquor Licensing Board, for example, had to bring in - I stand to be corrected - I think \$300,000-\$400,000 extra on permits and fees. Identification for young people, Mr. Speaker. I suspect that I.D. cards will go up for young people, \$5 will go up to \$10. A one-shot deal but again, on the backs of young people who go in to get an ID card to prove they have now reached legal age. These are the sort of sneaky little things that are laced throughout this budget.

The sneakiest of all, Mr. Speaker, we identified in the Estimates Committees. It jumped out at us as we started looking through subheads. I said that most of the subheads did not appear to be changed too much from what we had drafted up before the change in government. But the one which is very obvious, Mr. Speaker, is in Purchased Services and Professional Services. These are easy ones to cut, too, because there are no jobs involved, there are no individuals out there in the community who are expecting to get a certain block of money and now all of a sudden are not going to get their block of money, so you can do that painlessly - except when you have to go do the

job. I am concerned for the Minister of Development because he and I share the same concern for development in this Province.

I said to him the other night in estimates, I am concerned he does not have the money there to hire the professional consultants and get the studies done that he will need to get done in order to help people develop this Province. He will not have what he needs. All through every department - I have checked it - Professional Services and Purchased Services have been cut down. So I am concerned about that because I think that these were legitimate expenditures. I am more concerned, Mr. Speaker, because we will see where they are when the final revised figures come in in next year's budget. I would suggest to you that Purchased Services and Professional Services will be right back up where they should have been. So all it is is manipulating the numbers in the budget.

They probably cut \$5 million or \$10 million off of the projected deficit by doing that, \$50,000 here, \$100,000 there, \$200,000 somewhere else, and maybe more. These consultant votes were quite substantial and they are fairly expensive pieces of business. But I will say to you, Mr. Speaker, that they will, indeed, spend that money because they will have to spend the money, and then it will be, "Oh, it was a study we did not know we had to do." I can see proliferation and the Special Warrants coming into this House over the next twelve months. These hon. ministers will eat the words that they said when they were over here saying, "What are all these Special Warrants about?" They will have to bring

in Special Warrants to do some of those things.

How am I doing for time, Mr. Speaker? Have I got ten minutes left?

MR. SPEAKER:
Two minutes.

MR. WINDSOR:
Two minutes?

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me address the Economic Recovery Team. Now, here is a prime subject, the Economic Recovery Team. The Premier makes great to-do about the fact that he has reduced his Cabinet. Both in quantity and quality, Mr. Speaker, he has reduced his Cabinet. But he has reduced the numbers in Cabinet to fifteen.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Be nice.

MR. WINDSOR:
I am being relatively nice.

'Reduce the numbers in Cabinet to fifteen and save all this money.' Mr. Speaker, have a look at the ministerial votes in this budget and see how much money is being saved by eliminating a number of ministers. It is not there.

A minister's salary is about what? Thirty thousand dollars a year a minister receives over and above his sessional pay. About \$30,000, I think, a minister receives. So he eliminated five or six ministers - that is \$150,000 to \$180,000 - and on some staff he might have saved \$250,000, being generous. So he takes \$3 million and hires five more ministers and calls them an Economic Recovery Team. He gives them a free hand. They do not

operate under the auspices of Cabinet. They do not answer to Cabinet. They do not have to go in every Thursday morning and answer for their actions. They do not even have to answer to the Premier. He says, 'They will answer through me but they have autonomy so they do not have to explain to me what they are doing.' Do they operate under The Public Tender Act, Mr. Speaker? Will they hire their staff through the Public Service Commission or is this a blank cheque for \$3 million for administrative purposes that we have given these five people and paid them \$75,000, instead of \$30,000 for the Commissioners, and we do not know yet how much the Chairman is receiving. Has anybody heard that? I have not heard yet his figure, but I understand it is \$75,000 for the Commissioners. A \$3 million budget. Now, he says he eliminated five ministers. He put in five super-ministers.

Where does the Minister of Development stand now, Mr. Speaker, that his mandate has been taken away from him and given carte blanche to an Economic Recovery Team who answers to nobody, who does not answer to this House? What is his mandate now and how will he interact with the Economic Recovery Team? Where do his officials stand? He has some extremely capable people in the department. I know them well. They are extremely capable, professional people, technical people, giving him good advice. Is this Economic Recovery Team now going to hire engineers and economists? Is that what is going to happen now? We are going to duplicate all that.

What is the Department of Development now doing? What

happens now when an entrepreneur comes to Newfoundland and says, 'I have \$300 million that I want to invest in this Province'? The Minister of Development says, 'Well, that is lovely but I cannot talk to you. Go see Dr. House.' How do we deal with that, Mr. Speaker?

What mandate does the Economic Recovery Team have to access financing programs that fund, that attract entrepreneurs to help them put together the whole financial package? And how does that get back into the Department of Finance and to the Minister of Finance, who has the ultimate responsibility if government guarantees are going to be required? And we know the Premier's position on government guarantees. The Minister of Development told me the other night, well, you know, we have to use government guarantees. How do we attract industry? How do we help industry if we do not guarantee some loans for them? And we know the Premier says, well, maybe we will not honour them. So industrialists are shaky now about applying for guarantees from this government, because they do not know. The financial community is shaky. They are not so sure that a guarantee from this government is worth the paper it is written on any more. That is how they are proposing to develop this Province.

There is the situation we are faced with, Mr. Speaker. Where does an individual go when he or she wants to make an investment in this Province that will create economic activity, that will create jobs, that will perhaps develop some of the untapped resources of this Province? And the Tourism Industry is probably one of the greatest untapped

resource in this Province at the moment.

These are questions, Mr. Speaker, that obviously -

MR. SPEAKER:

I remind the hon. member that his time has elapsed.

MR. WARREN:

By leave!

MR. WINDSOR:

Can I get into one more topic? Can you give me five minutes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave!

MR. WINDSOR:

No problem, Mr. Speaker. I will have another swipe at him another day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. Minister of Social Services, I would like to welcome to the gallery thirty-five Grade IX students with their teachers, George Adams and Ray Chipman, from St. Peter's School in that great community of Upper Island Cove.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had a great speech prepared for this morning, but I realize now

that we have something else to do in the House. The hon. the House Leader has asked me to adjourn the debate for today, so I will present my great speech on Monday afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We will all wait in great anticipation. I appreciate the fact that the minister does not like to get two or three minutes into something and then have to stop, so we will thinking all weekend about what we are going to hear Monday in debate.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to ask for leave of the House to revert to Statements by Ministers. There is a statement that should have been made a little earlier but was not ready. Members opposite have a copy of the statement, and it refers to something that had to be done by this weekend. I have discussed it with members opposite, and we are asking for leave for the minister to make his statement now and have the usual response.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SIMMS:

I have seen a copy of this statement and we are just absolutely delighted to have the opportunity to respond to it. We, obviously, give leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker and members of the House of Assembly. I apologize for the slight delay in making the statement, but I had one other meeting to conduct this morning and that meeting has led me to make this statement.

After careful consideration and cooperation by the Labrador Community College, by Memorial University and other government departments, I am delighted to announce today the implementation of a First-Year University Program for Labrador West in January, 1990.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

What a man! What a minister! Welcome to the '90s.

DR. WARREN:

Welcome to the 1990s.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, on June 1, I announced a delay in implementing the First-Year University Program in Labrador West until September, 1990. After that announcement, meetings were held with various groups from Labrador West, and a commitment was made by both the Premier and by me to assess the feasibility of other possible options that could be pursued to facilitate the introduction of the program at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Speaker, based on a complete review of the time required to procure and prepare adequate physical facilities in Labrador West and to recruit and hire qualified teaching personnel, as well as other support staff and services for the region, it is the collective view of government officials, the University and the

College, that January, 1990, is the earliest possible date that an acceptable quality First-Year University Program can be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, by beginning the program in January, 1990, the college can offer the first semester from January to April and the second semester from May to August, thus giving students from Labrador West the opportunity to complete a full, first year program in time to begin their second year of studies in September, 1990.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, in order to introduce the program as early as January, 1990, rather than September, 1990, as previously anticipated, Government will have to embark on a fast track schedule that has been recommended by its consultants and receive the full cooperation of the various agencies and groups involved. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that this cooperation will take place and I thank all parties in advance for their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, work has already begun on arrangements for introducing the program, and, even though we have given ourselves a very tight timeframe by agreeing to a January, 1990 implementation date, both my officials and I are satisfied that a quality program can be operational in Labrador West by early January, 1990.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
Now, we will hear the truth.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, if it is possible to
drink poison and be happy, the
government have just done it. The
government have been beaten and
forced into submission by the
people of Labrador West, the
member for Menihek, and all groups
involved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
The minister himself, Mr. Speaker,
has been humiliated by the Premier

MR. SIMMS:
That is right. In the back rooms.

MR. RIDEOUT:
- in the back rooms, in front of a
delegation from Labrador West:
"But, Phil, why did you not tell
me this? Phil, these are not the
facts that I was aware of."

Mr. Speaker, this is backwater of
the highest degree, but thank
goodness the government had sense
enough to make the right decision.

The only thing good that can be
said about this, Mr. Speaker, is
that this admission of failure
today on government's part does
not exonerate the Premier for the
commitment he made in Labrador
West, it does not exonerate the
minister for his commitment, it
does not exonerate the government,
it just shows a government that is

backsliding and sends to the
people of Newfoundland and
Labrador - watch them smile, Mr.
Speaker, as they walk past the
graveyard.

MR. SIMMS:
And squirm.

MR. RIDEOUT:
And squirm.

It sends to the people of
Newfoundland and Labrador a very
clear signal. I hope that signal
is read loud and clear in St.
Lawrence, and I hope it is read in
Grand Bank. It was read in St.
Anthony, when they forgot to
include St. Anthony in the capital
works program.

MR. SIMMS:
Oh, that was just an error.

MS VERGE:
What about Corner Brook East?

MR. RIDEOUT:
In Corner Brook East the signal is
this: Come in, beat-up on the
Premier, beat-up on the minister,
kick-up a racket and we might
reconsider. That is what has
happened here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The Speaker was out and I expect
this was a special concession. We
are now back to regular Orders of
the Day.

Has the Government House Leader
apprised everybody of everything
he wanted to? Are there no
further announcements from the
Government House Leader?

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, there is a request
from across the way about the
Committees on Monday.

The Social Services Committee will
meet here in the House on Monday
evening at 7:00 p.m. to review the
Estimates of the Department of
Social Services.

That is what was passed to me. I
had thought there was nothing
until Tuesday. However, I have
been informed that on Monday there
is that Social Services Committee
meeting, so I will advise hon.
members at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House
at its rising do adjourn until
tomorrow at 2:00 p.m. and that
this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising
adjourned until tomorrow, Monday,
June 19, 1989, at 2:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

June 16, 1989

Harvard

EXPENDITURE REPORT

Office of the Minister of Mines & Energy

May 5, 1989 - June 15, 1989

Part A: Office Equipment, Personal Equipment, Furnishings and Photographs:

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>PURCHASED @</u>	<u>PRICE</u>
1	Desk Calculator	Radio Shack	22.95
24	Photographs	Lane Photography	100.80
			<hr/>
			123.75
			<hr/>
			<u>SUBTOTAL PART A</u>
			<hr/>

Part B: Travel Expenditures of Minister and Staff accompaniement:

<u>DATE</u>	<u>DESTINATION</u>	<u>STAFF</u>	<u>PURPOSE</u>	<u>EXPENSES</u>	<u>PRICE</u>
May /26&27	Springdale	0	Mineralex 89	Travel (Air)	311.60
			Guest Speaker	Rental Fees (car)	N/A*
				Parking	3.00
					<hr/>
					314.60
					<hr/>
					<u>SUBTOTAL PART B</u>
					<hr/>
					438.35
					<hr/>
					<hr/>

Total Expenditures for this Reporting Period

* Invoice has not been remitted by Rental Agency to date.

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
First Session - Forty-First General Assembly

Hon. Thomas Lush, Speaker

Mr. Lloyd Snow, Deputy Speaker

Mr. Percy Barrett, Deputy Chairman of Committees

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Mr. K. Aylward, (Lib)	Stephenville
Mr. R. Aylward, (PC)	Kilbride
Mr. Baker, (Lib)	Gander
Mr. Barrett, (Lib)	Bellevue
Mr. Brett, (PC)	Trinity North
Mr. Carter, (Lib)	Twillingate
Ms Cowan, (Lib)	Conception Bay South
Mr. Crane, (Lib)	Harbour Grace
Mr. Decker, (Lib)	Strait of Belle Isle
Mr. Dicks, (Lib)	Humber West
Mr. Doyle, (PC)	Harbour Main
Ms Duff, (PC)	St. John's East
Mr. Dumaresque, (Lib)	Eagle River
Mr. Efford, (Lib)	Port de Grave
Mr. Flight, (Lib)	Windsor-Buchans
Mr. Furey, (Lib)	St. Barbe
Dr. Gibbons, (Lib)	St. John's West
Mr. Gilbert, (Lib)	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Mr. Gover, (Lib)	Bonavista South
Mr. Greening, (PC)	Terra Nova
Mr. Grimes, (Lib)	Exploits
Mr. Gullage, (Lib)	Waterford - Kenmount
Mr. Hearn, (PC)	St. Mary's-The Capes
Mr. Hewlett, (PC)	Green Bay
Mr. Hodder, (PC)	Port au Port
Mr. Hogan, (Lib)	Placentia
Mr. Kelland, (Lib)	Naskaupi

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
First Session - Forty-first General Assembly

-2-

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Dr. Kitchen, (Lib)	St. John's Centre
Mr. Langdon, (PC)	Fortune-Hermitage
Mr. Lush, (Lib)	Bonavista North
Mr. Matthews, (PC)	Grand Bank
Mr. Murphy, (Lib)	St. John's South
Mr. Noel, (Lib)	Pleasantville
Mr. Parsons, (PC)	St. John's East Extern
Mr. Penney, (Lib)	Lewisporte
Mr. Power, (PC)	Ferryland
Mr. Ramsay, (Lib)	LaPoile
Mr. Reid, (Lib)	Carbonear
Mr. Rideout, (PC)	Baie Verte - White Bay
Mr. Short, (Lib)	St. George's
Mr. Simms, (PC)	Grand Falls
Mr. A. Snow, (PC)	Menihek
Mr. L. Snow, (Lib)	Trinity - Bay de Verde
Mr. Tobin, (PC)	Burin - Placentia West
Ms Verge, Lynn (PC)	Humber East
Mr. Walsh, (Lib)	Mount Scio - Bell Island
Dr. Warren, (Lib)	St. John's North
Mr. Warren, (PC)	Torngat Mountains
Premier Wells, (Lib)	Bay of Islands
Mr. Windsor, (PC)	Mount Pearl
Mr. Winsor, (PC)	Fogo
Mr. Woodford, (PC)	Humber Valley

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
First Session - Forty-first General Assembly

-3-

Hon. Clyde K. Wells	Premier
Mr. Baker	Executive Council
Mr. Carter	Fisheries
Ms Cowan	Employment and Labour Relations
Mr. Decker	Health
Mr. Dicks	Justice
Mr. Efford	Social Services
Mr. Flight	Forestry and Agriculture
Mr. Furey	Development
Dr. Gibbons	Mines and Energy
Mr. Gilbert	Works, Services and Transportation

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
First Session - Forty-first General Assembly

-4-

Mr. Gullage	Municipal and Provincial Affairs
Mr. Kelland	Environment and Lands
Dr. Kitchen	Finance
Dr. Warren	Education