



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 16

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Tuesday

20 June 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

I would like to welcome some guests to the galleries today on behalf of all hon. members. Firstly, visiting the House of Assembly today and sitting in the gallery is the Right Reverend Russell Hatton, Suffragan Bishop, Diocese of Nova Scotia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Also, Dr. Charles F. Maher, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College of the American International College of Springfield. Dr. Charles was born in Torbay, and is home for a brief visit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Before we begin the routine business of the day, I wonder if the House would agree to send a congratulatory message to the Port aux Basques Mariners who won the Herder Memorial Championship this year, since the House was not open at the time. The Mariners have made history by winning this coveted award for the first time, and by beating the great St. John's Capitals. Also, my beloved Stephenville Jets were unable to do anything this year, along with the Corner Brook Royals.

I think it is worthy of note that the banquet is coming up this weekend, and the Herder will be

presented to them in a formal ceremony. I think it would be fitting if this House could send a congratulatory message. Also, the member for LaPoile is a former president of the Mariners, and he has built that hockey team into a fine hockey team over the past number of years.

AN HON. MEMBER:
With fairness and balance.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Fairness and balance, that is right.

If the House could do something along those lines, it would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, obviously my colleagues on this side of the House take great pleasure in seconding the motion proposed by the gentleman for Stephenville, that the House send appropriate congratulations to the Port Aux Basques Mariners. I know that all of Newfoundland and Labrador is proud of the accomplishments of that team. So are we, and we should duly express our congratulations.

I would also like to take this occasion to suggest that perhaps in the congratulatory message the House should commend the Mariners for having so many winnings, so many parades and so many cavalcades, in which the gentleman who presently represents LaPoile was pictured, and to thank them for his election to the House of

Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I might point out to hon. members that we have no provision in our Standing Orders for these congratulatory messages and other niceties that we participate in from time to time. The Chair, of course, is just directed by the House, but I would point out, maybe to somebody who is working on the appropriate committee, that when we get into parliamentary reform, this might be an idea, that we do make provision for that in our Standing Orders and in the Orders of the Day. It does happen in other Legislatures throughout Canada.

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a brief statement which is more or less a clarification of something I said in the House of Assembly yesterday. I want to take this opportunity to correct an answer I gave to a question. It has been my intention, since being elected to this Hon. House in 1985, to try to be as accurate as I can at any given time, both in my former position when asking questions, and especially now as Minister responsible for the Department of Social Services in answering questions.

Yesterday afternoon, when the hon.

member for the Port au Port Peninsula asked me a question, I gave him an incorrect answer. I said, in answer to his question about an incident which took place over the past weekend down at the Remand Centre, that it did not take place at the Remand Centre but at the Youth Correction Centre, in Torbay. I want to clarify that, Mr. Speaker, and say it did take place at the Remand Centre and not at the Youth Correction Centre. The places are together but in separate buildings, and they perform the same function. I want to go on record as saying I did not intentionally mislead the House, I made a mistake. I will stand by any statement I make, but I want to clarify this at this particular time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess we now know who knew what they were talking about yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, while I do congratulate the Minister for having the courage to come in and do this, I would say to him it is one of those things where, perhaps, the minister's arrogance sometimes overcomes his better judgement. When he is trying to make a statement in this House, perhaps he should curb his arrogance somewhat.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there further statements by Ministers?

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I make an announcement to this Hon. House on a matter of much significance to our Province and, in particular, to the constituents of the riding of Naskaupi, which I am very honoured to represent.

Only a few short days ago it was my honour as Minister of the Department of Environment and Lands to present the budget estimates for my Department. In those estimates I noted that some \$2 million dollars were ear-marked for the destruction of the environmental persistent group of chemicals called "polychlorinated biphenyls", or PCB's, that are of provincial ownership and are located in safe storage in Labrador. As the majority of PCB wastes in this region are of Federal ownership, the Department of National Defense is taking the lead in such aspects as environmental studies and the tendering procedure.

Mr. Speaker, the residents of the Happy Valley/Goose Bay region will be the first in Canada to see the safe disposal of these wastes by technologically advanced mobile thermal destruction equipment that has been in use elsewhere for a number of years and is designed specifically for chemical wastes, including PCB's. A commitment was made to the residents of Happy Valley/Goose Bay that, before this project could go ahead, my Department would enact strong

regulations for mobile PCB destruction by incineration. All proponents would have to adhere to these Regulations as a minimum standard for their mobile PCB destruction facilities. I am pleased to say that my Department has fulfilled that commitment.

Today I have in my hand, and will table in this Hon. House, the Mobile PCB Destruction Facility Regulations under the Department of Environment and Lands Act which were approved by Cabinet earlier this month and which, I understand, appeared in The Newfoundland Gazette dated June 16.

These Regulations complement those drafted by Environment Canada and my officials will combine efforts with Federal engineers and technicians to monitor the operation of destruction units and to ensure regulatory compliance.

Mr. Speaker, these Regulations will ensure safe destruction of the PCB wastes stored in Goose Bay and, of course, any other locations in the Province where such an incinerator may be located in the future. By this action we are today demonstrating to the rest of Canada that Newfoundland and Labrador is prepared to deal with its waste problems in a responsible manner, governed by technological considerations and complete openness with interest groups, rather than defer our problems for the resolution of future generations.

We will continue to demonstrate to our people as well as to the rest of Canada that this Government remains committed to the protection and enhancement of our environment. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to keep Members of this

hon. House, the people of Naskaupi District and communities of Coastal Labrador advised as this project proceeds. Subject to the presentation of more detailed technical information on the specific incinerator that will assure compliance with these Regulations, I will issue an Environmental Certificate of Approval, probably in August, with appropriate terms and conditions that will govern its operation which is likely to proceed in the November to February period.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we do have an environment officer on the site, on station in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. They are generally there on a seasonal basis, but in this particular instance they will likely remain through the period normally expected and through the period for the destruction of PCB's currently stored in Happy Valley/Goose. In addition to that we will also have other environment experts from our department visit on a fairly regular basis to ensure that the Regulations are complied with, and all safe destruction procedures are followed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

I thank the hon. Minister for an advance copy of his statement.

I also compliment the minister on his commitment to rid our environment of 'polychlorinated biphenyls', PCBs. I note this program is dedicated to the eradication of PCBs in the minister's district and environs. I would ask the minister that this program be extended over the next

year or so to include Labrador West and the Island portion of the Province; the less distance these toxins have to be carried to the disposal site, the better.

I would also commend the minister's attention to an article in the June 19, edition of Newsweek pages 56 and 57 entitled Microbes To The Rescue. As the minister is no doubt aware, a common garden septic tank cleanses household sewage through the actions of bacteria. Scientists have now identified bacteria and other microbes that can break down such chemicals as the Herbicide 2 - 4 D and PCBs. Their scientific advances are no longer confined to the laboratory, Mr. Speaker, but have entered the realm of industrial application. Unlike burning, this new method of environmental clean-up leaves little or no toxic residue.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to thank the environmental activists who, over the past few years, have drawn our attention to the seriousness of environmental pollution. These were people who risked being called radicals, who dared to be a Daniel, who dared to stand alone. We owe them a debt of gratitude. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is quickly developing a reputation in this House as the King of Double Standards. Yesterday, I remind the Premier, in questions I asked him, it was not a question of whether his Minister of Forestry and Agriculture (Mr. FLIGHT) has property leased to a Crown corporation, it was not a question of whether the minister renegotiates the lease while he is a minister or even terminates the lease while he is a minister, but the question is the standard of conduct that the present Premier demanded when he was Leader of the Opposition. Now, Mr. Speaker, will the Premier tell the House how he could, therefore, invite a colleague into his Cabinet while a potential conflict of interest existed when the Premier is on public record as having said quite clearly that he could not condone a potential conflict of interest under his leadership?

MR. SIMMS:

A good question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many times I have to say this. Maybe it is my fault, maybe I am not explaining it sufficiently. The thing that raised the question before, when I was sitting on the opposite side of the House, was the fact that a minister, namely, Dr. Collins, who was the Minister of Finance, owned, I do not know, 25 per cent, I think, of a company that rented and negotiated leases and renewals of leases in a building down on Bonaventure

Avenue to the government of this Province.

The position I took, and the standard that I felt was appropriate and put forward at the time, was that the minister should either dispose of the asset or resign from the Cabinet. If he was not prepared to dispose of the asset, he would have to resign from the Cabinet. Now when I invited the member for Windsor - Buchans to join the Cabinet, he told me of the existence of that lease that was originally negotiated twenty years ago, the lease with the Liquor Corporation, and it was renewed in October, I believe, of last year, when the last term started. He told me about that lease and I said to him here are the alternatives open to you: Dispose of the property, and I did not set a time limit, so put the property up for sale or dispose of the property. The lease will not be able to be renewed. It is done and negotiated. There is no direct dealings with government. You were not in government when the lease was negotiated, so there will be no negotiation with government. The lease must terminate, if you do not dispose of the property, or you must resign, one of those three.

Now I have left it to the minister to dispose of the property. He has told me that he is attempting to dispose of the property, which is the course which he proposes to follow. He obviously cannot unilaterally terminate the lease. There is another party to the lease so he could not unilaterally terminate it, and I did not expect that. I expected he would have a reasonable time within which to do it, and frankly even if he went to the expiration of the existing

lease, I would not ask him to resign from the Cabinet, because the lease was negotiated. But he cannot renew that lease or enter into any new deal for a continuation of that lease with the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation, which is an agency of the government of this Province. He cannot do that and remain a minister. If he wishes to do that, he must resign. Now, that is precisely what I asked the former Premier to do with respect to Dr. Collins. I did not ask the former Premier to throw Dr. Collins out of the Cabinet immediately. I said to the former Premier what should be done is either the minister must dispose of the asset or he must be asked to resign, one or the other.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
The record will show clearly that the now Premier did in fact ask the then Premier to seek the resignation of the minister whom we were talking about.

Mr. Speaker, most lease arrangements have a thirty-day cancellation clause. The issue here is the Premier's statement that not even a potential conflict of interest could be tolerated under his leadership. That is the issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Now, will the Premier tell the House, in view of that statement, why he did not say to his

colleague, 'Dispose of the property, exercise the option clause, then I will talk to you about a Cabinet appointment'?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
Frankly I do not know if there is an option clause in it. There may well be. But what the minister told me he would do is he would dispose of the property within three months. This is what he told me he intended to do. I accept that from him. I think that that is entirely reasonable. He will dispose of the property within three months or he will seek to terminate the lease. I do not think that anything else can be asked of him. I think that is honourable and proper behavior. I really cannot quarrel with that. I do not think that that is contrary to the standard that I suggest ought to have been the standard to be followed by ministers.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
It is certainly clear that that is contrary to the Premier's own words, that not even a potential conflict of interest can exist under his leadership.

Let me ask the Premier this, Mr. Speaker: Is the real reason here, is the real fact fact here, that the Premier owed a political debt to his colleague and that the Premier had to pay back the person who gave up his seat for his leader?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Is that not the real change?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
No, Mr. Speaker. It is not the real reason. Let me remind the hon. the Leader of the Opposition about the potential for conflict. The minister is not in any position to negotiate with the government. The lease is in place. He has to follow it. If he cannot terminate it, he is bound by law to follow the lease.

MR. RIDEOUT:
That is not the issue.

PREMIER WELLS:
That is the issue. It is not the issue that the leader wants to present, but it is the reality. The minister is not in a potential conflict because he cannot negotiate a lease. He is prohibited from negotiating a lease and he knows it. If he negotiates a new lease he is out of the Cabinet, and he knows that that is the standard. So there is no potential.

Now, the minister, on his own, has said, 'Look, Mr. Premier, I am putting the property up for sale. If I cannot sell it, I will seek to terminate the lease within three months.' Now, I do not know whether he can even achieve that. If he says to the Liquor Corporation, 'I want to terminate the lease,' and they say no, he may have no alternative but to continue it. However, I do not

know what will happen. I do not want to anticipate that difficulty. He has told me what he is going to do. He has acted entirely honourably and I have no quarrel with it, despite what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition seeks to make of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
The Premier is backing off from his own words now about potential conflict of interest.

Let me ask the Premier this: Is it not a fact that if the hon. member tries to dispose of, or, in fact, disposes of that property today that he stands to gain because there is already a lease in place, and is that not a potential conflict of interest which the Premier said he would never tolerate under his leadership?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
I cannot imagine what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is talking about. The lease was negotiated twenty years ago. It was renewed in October. The new term started, I am told, in October. He was not a member of the House at the time.

MR. WARREN:
No, he gave up his seat for you.

PREMIER WELLS:

That is right. He had the best interests of the Province at heart and he did a good job of it. He is a very principled man.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
The more the Premier speaks, the longer his nose gets.

PREMIER WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to answer the question that if hon. members want. If they want to sit a listen, I will give them the answer to it.

There was no lease. The member was not a member of the House - not a member of the government, he was not even a member of the House - when the lease was renewed last October. So when he told me about it he was given an instruction, and that is precisely the position I took with respect to Dr. Collins. The minister must give up, must dispose of that business or he must resign. He cannot do both. He cannot continue to remain in the Cabinet and negotiate new leases and new agreements and renewals with the government.

MR. BAKER:
Right on! Right on! That is conflict!

PREMIER WELLS:
He cannot continue to remain in the Cabinet and do business with the government.

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

MR. SIMMS:
No points of order until after Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:
Well, it will be a point of privilege, then.

I would just like to inform the House, Mr. Speaker, if it is important to the Leader of the Opposition and important to the House, that I have this morning instigated a conversation with a real estate company with the instructions to sell the building. Everyone knows that in the real estate market in Buchans, the potential to sell that building -

AN HON. MEMBER:
This morning?

MR. FLIGHT:
Yes, this morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, I think I should be entitled, having sat through what I sat through -

MR. SIMMS:
You are only wasting the time of the House.

MR. FLIGHT:
The first weekend in Buchans, Mr. Speaker, after I became a member of Cabinet, I started negotiations to sell the building. It is practically impossible to sell that kind of real estate in Buchans, but I have asked a real estate company to list the property and to sell it. I will tell the hon. members, if it is not done in a reasonable period of time I will terminate the lease, whatever it costs me.

MR. SIMMS:

Why did you not do it two months ago, before you went to Cabinet?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, obviously that is not a question of privilege. It is a prima facie lease and a waste of Question Period. That is what it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. members, I took it to be a point of order. The hon. members I heard indicate that there was no point of order in Question Period, so there ought not be. I made a ruling on that a couple of days ago, and I suggested that there was nothing in our rules of order at that particular point in time, and that is correct. I did say to hon. members that probably it was advisable not to have points of order or points of privilege during Question Period, but that is for the House to decide. The Chair can only call it according to the rules of order, but I rule there is no point of order.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Development. I am sure that the minister is aware as is everybody in this House and

everybody in this - Province, relating to the lack of work at the Marystown Shipyard. There are people leaving Marystown every day travelling to the mainland to secure employment. The shipyard is now probably at the lowest peak it has been in its history.

Yesterday, Mr. Young of FPI announced the company is actually going to pursue the construction of a new shrimp trawler to harvest shrimp in the Northern Labrador waters.

I would like to ask the minister has he had any discussions with Mr. Young or FPI regarding the construction of this vessel at the Marystown Shipyard? Could the minister tell us if Mr. Young has already requested a price from the Marystown Shipyard? Is he aware of any other companies involved?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is talking about the FPI Trawler Replacement Program, which was a program was undertaken in 1987, where two levels of government entered into a 50-50 cost-sharing agreement for the expenditure of \$21 million to replace eight trawlers under the Program.

Well, to date there have been five of these wetfish trawlers replaced trawlers for that particular corporation, and they have deferred and put on hold the further capitalization of another three wetfish trawlers because of the circumstances surrounding the reduction in the Northern cod stocks. So the company has taken the decision to put that on hold at this time.

FPI is currently seeking from government whether or not we are prepared to take the balance from the Offshore Industry Development Agreement Fund, which currently has \$9 million of capital sitting there, and whether we are prepared to look at transferring funding from the three wetfish trawlers to the Northern shrimp vessel that they require to prosecute the Northern fishery.

Mr. Young has had discussions with the Marystown Shipyard and with my department and they have put forward a proposal which we are giving serious consideration to at this time.

I can tell the hon. member that it has had discussion in the Resource Policy Committee, which I Chair, and that we have also looked at the economics of it and the social ramifications, and Treasury Board has looked at it as well. Sometime in the very near future we hope to have a full and open discussion about the Ocean Industry Development Fund in a full meeting of the Cabinet to determine whether or not we want to proceed to put a subsidy in place for the shrimp trawler.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
I thank the minister for his answer, Mr. Speaker.

Let me ask the minister, is this additional funding that FPI is requesting a separate issue from the money that is already allocated for the further three? It is my understanding that

probably FPI would like to have that remain in reserve for the three, and when they are ready to start construction of these vessels they will proceed. Has government been asked to deal with this one as a separate issue? Is there is difference outstanding between the Marystown Shipyard and a shipyard in Norway, and what would that amount be between the two?

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Well, that was quite a flurry of questions, Mr. Speaker. Is there a different funding mechanism in place to deal with the replacement of the three wetfish trawlers for the -

MR. TOBIN:
Do they want this one to be a separated issue from the other three?

MR. FUREY:
No, indeed, Mr. Speaker. I can tell the hon. member that Fisheries Products International has asked us to look at the balance of what sits in the Ocean Industry Development Agreement, that \$9 million cost-shared between the federal and provincial governments equally, at 50 per cent each.

They have asked us to look at the possibility of transferring that from the three wetfish trawlers, that they currently do not need because of the reduction of Northern cod stocks, into the shrimp fishery, which is considered promising.

You know, there has to be a Canadianization Program in place by May 1, 1990. That leaves very little time with them to get out from underneath the lease that they currently have on the Faroese vessel they are currently leasing. So what they would like to do is put in place a vessel that they wholly own themselves to meet the requirements of the new regulations of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. So they have asked us to look at the balance of the capital sitting under the Ocean Industry Development Agreement and transfer that latterly into the shrimp vessel. We are certainly looking at that. We are looking at the economics of it, we are looking at the social consequences, and we want to be very sensitive to a company that this government owns, the Marystown Shipyard.

But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. member that that decision will be made in full consultation with the entire Cabinet. When Cabinet has had a chance to look at all of the ramifications and the total picture, we will make that decision then.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary to the minister would be: Would he not consider leaving that money as it is? FPI has only decided to delay these three trawlers and will construct them at a later date, probably within a year or two years. Would his government not be prepared to deal with this one as a separate

issue and come forth with the money that FPI has requested, which I understand they are asking to cost-share with the federal government? Would the amount that he is asking this government to contribute be in the area of a \$4 million subsidy?

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, we can only deal with the request that we have before us. The hon. member contorts and confuses the issue by saying, 'Is there new money available? Will the Province find a money tree to pick money off and present to FPI in a new subsidy program?' We are not in that position, Mr. Speaker. We find ourselves in a very difficult fiscal position, the position that we inherited. And what we have to do is deal with things as we find them. As we find them, the previous government had put in place, to their credit, an Ocean Industries Development Agreement, cost-shared equally by the Province and the federal government, to help stimulate and create work at the Marystown Shipyard and to help FPI, in its very extensive capitalization, to get these new wetfish trawlers in place.

I can tell the hon. member that I am aware of the proposed bid that Marystown Shipyard gave to FPI with respect to their preliminary cost, what it would cost them to build this shrimp vessel at Marystown Shipyard. And I am also aware, in a ballpark manner, of the figures that are available from the Norwegian shipyards, and

what it would cost them to build in Norway this vessel necessary to prosecute the fishery off our coastline. So I am aware of both bids. I am surprised very much by the differential between the bids, I can tell the hon. member that. And now it becomes a decision for the full Cabinet, recognizing the total picture, the economic analysis, the differential between the bids and the social consequences for Marystown Shipyard. And I say to the hon. member that if we can find a way to deal with this, so that everybody contributes and there is harmony around the board, I would love nothing better than to see FPI build this shrimp trawler at the Marystown Shipyard, which this government owns.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
I have a question for my friend, the Minister of Forestry. I know he has been busy today, but perhaps he might be able to answer this question.

For the last four years the previous government, through the Federal - Provincial Forestry Agreement, had entered into \$10 million silviculture agreements with both paper companies in the Province, Corner Brook Pulp and Paper and Abitibi. So \$20 million has been spent over the last four years in this program on silviculture programs and hundreds of jobs have been created. Can the minister confirm that both

companies have asked the government to undertake a \$5.75 million extended silviculture program again this year?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is right in most of the assertions in his preamble. He will also know that the silviculture agreement that he is talking about with the paper companies ran out last year, and the forestry agreement runs out next year. The forestry agreement is being negotiated now, as he knows, and we have asked the paper companies for an amendment to the four-year agreement to cover this year. The paper companies, as he probably knows, have signed that amendment and it is now a matter of the Province signing the amendment that will just include this year, which is not covered by the agreement because the agreement ran out last year. In due course, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Forestry will be signing that agreement to cover this year and then, hopefully, when we get a new forestry agreement in place, there will be a new silviculture agreement negotiated with the two paper companies. They will dovetail and one will expire with the other.

MR. SIMMS:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
The minister has indicated that the Province will be signing this new amendment. Can he indicate to the House when they will be

signing that new amendment?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

I can say to the minister that it will be signed within the next couple of weeks. As the member is aware, the companies, always being as agreeable as the companies are and as co-operative as the companies are, in very short order agreed with the request of the government and signed the document. However, as the member also knows, to provide the same level of silviculture this year as we provided last year, inflation and everything else increased the cost, so my officials are talking to the companies about the possibility of their contributing a little extra this year even in view of the fact they have signed the documents. The negotiations will determine in the next few days whether or not that will indeed be so. Whether it is so or whether it is not so the agreements will be signed and the silviculture program will continue at the same level as last year and, hopefully, we will get a new federal forestry agreement.

MR. SIMMS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated that in the next couple of weeks or so we will sign this, that my officials are negotiating, talking to the forestry companies and so on. So while they are fiddling around like this, is the minister aware that unless the

government responds to the request of the companies by this Friday it is the intention of the companies to cancel their silviculture program for this Summer and thereby throw hundreds of people out of work? It is because of the minister's lack of effort and lack of initiative in getting back to the companies, instead of dilly-dallying, they are ready to cancel their program by the end of this week. Is the minister aware of that? If he is aware of it, why does he not act and do the proper thing?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talks about the companies pulling out and hundreds and thousands of people being thrown out of jobs. That is the same member, Mr. Speaker, who accused me of being an alarmist a few years ago when I raised a genuine concern.

MR. SIMMS:

This is a fact. Are you aware of it?

MR. FLIGHT:

My officials have been talking with Abitibi-Price and I am not aware - maybe the member might be aware - that Abitibi Price or Kruger will pull out.

MR. SIMMS:

Try to sell your property, my son, and try to find out what is going on.

MR. FLIGHT:

So the member will know I had discussions with my officials this morning on the very issue that he is raising the question on. Both the Deputy Minister and the ADM

are satisfied. They are talking with Abitibi officials. And, no, I doubt very seriously if Abitibi will do anything so precipitous.

MR. SIMMS:
We will see.

MR. FLIGHT:
We will see.

MR. SIMMS:
No doubt about it.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, the silviculture program and our relationship with Abitibi-Price will continue on. Maybe the member would like to see that but he is not going to see it; he is going to see the job continuing, and the kind of relationship we have had with the companies continuing.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to the Minister of Education. It relates to **An Anthology of English Literature: Themes for all Times**, which was supposed to be part of the Grade XI1 curriculum this September. This anthology, which was compiled and edited by Roy Bonisteel and Ron Clarke, has been two years in preparation. Jespersion Press made a successful proposal, I think two years ago, and overall there were about 300 different pieces of English literature submitted and 171 of these were selected. Of course that involves a lot of work with permissions, copyrights and this sort of thing. It was to have

been in the hands of English teachers by June, 1989, and in the classroom in September. On May 12 the publishers received a letter from Ed Jones, who is the Chairman of the English Curriculum Committee, that the text was acceptable and that it met all the specifications. On May 17 they received a phone call to say that thirteen pieces had to be deleted because the language was offensive. I would like to ask the minister, in view of the fact that this text was recommended by the English Curriculum Committee as acceptable, the text was in the hands of the Department of Education for quite some time, and that the requested deletions result in a cost of about \$50,000, will the minister tell this House what happened between May 12 and May 19 to cause the decision of the Curriculum Committee to be overruled, on what basis that decision was made, and by whom?

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

DR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, this was one of the issues that I was briefed on shortly after I arrived at the Department of Education. This is a very important initiative on the part of the department, to have a text developed to suit the needs of our students, custom made in this Province. It is my understanding that this text is an excellent effort and I pay tribute to the editors and all concerned for their work. However, I gather there were some problems with some of the language that was used in the text. It is my understanding that about eleven or twelve of the items contained language which might be regarded as being offensive to some parents, and even to some religious groups in

the Province. My officials examined that and they thought that it was inappropriate that the Department of Education would authorize, for all students, a text that had certain language, the kind of language that was included. I could table the language later on, if you wish, but I do not intend to do it orally. This is not a text that is chosen off the shelf, it is not something that people watch on television, it is not an alternate text: This was meant to be a text read by all students, and my officials suggested that we had to be cautious in the kinds of language that was used in it, and I concurred with their recommendation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

I would like for the minister to tell us if in fact he has read these works himself? If he has read them in context, does he himself consider them offensive? Also, is it the normal practice of his Department for staff members who do not have expertise in a particular area to overrule a Curriculum Committee?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have not read all the items. I said I thought there were about 171 items in it and about twelve were considered to contain language which might be

considered offensive. Since that initial decision was made, and it was not made by the minister, by the way, and what the minister thinks personally is irrelevant to this, because I speak as minister here, I gather since the twelve items were assessed, I think it is now down to six that have to be replaced or adjusted. Six out of the twelve were considered appropriate, and my officials, including my curriculum officials, advise me that these six should either be adjusted or replaced. Now, I apologize, Mr. Speaker, to the students because we wanted to get this text in the schools early. We wanted to get it there for all teachers and students. I apologize for the slight delay, but they have been using the same text for years and this text is going to be there for seven or eight or nine years; we wanted to do it right, and we did not want to offend, not just the parents of any particular group in this Province, who might be offended by some of the terminology used, but many other parents, Mr. Speaker, who want their children to read what is right and not to use this kind of literature in required text.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker, we are talking here about authors like Jules Verne, Ernest Hemingway and Margaret Atwood. I have read those books and there is nowhere that those could be considered offensive under normal circumstances.

I would like the minister to tell

us whether or not he supports this form of censorship, personally. Does he personally find them offensive? In fact, when is this kind of censorship going to stop? Is the minister, then, going to ask Lady Macbeth to rub out the 'damned spot' that she is talking about? Because it is the same context in which the other words are taken out. Is he going to take David Burney's **David** off the curriculum? Because one of these 'bad words' appears in that poem and it has been on the curriculum for years. Is the minister intending to feed our Grade XII students on a diet of literary pablum from now on?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

DR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that this is an excellent text. It contains many excellent items. I have read the sections that are controversial. The word 'damn' is not considered a problem by my officials in their review of the text. The word 'hell' is not considered offensive, but there are other terms I could table later on that might be considered offensive, not only by the students of parents of a very small group of people in the community, but many parents. I inform the hon. member that there are schools that suspend students because they use those words in class. Are we going to authorize in a textbook, that must be read by everybody, some of these words, some of these items. I am not prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker. I am not prepared to do that. I do not consider that censorship.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I inform hon. members that Question Period had elapsed and not collapsed.

I want to introduce some important people in the galleries before we move on to the next item of business.

Order, please!

I want to welcome to the galleries, on behalf of hon. members, thirteen students, from Kindergarten to Grade IV, with their teachers, Miss Nash and Miss Careen, from The Star of the Sea School, Point Lance, St. Mary's Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I also want to welcome some councillors here today, representing their particular council areas. I want to welcome town councillor Stephen MacKenzie from the community of Port aux Basques. Also, I want to welcome councillors from the Council of Hopedale in the persons of Mayor Garfield Flower and Councillor Flower.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

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

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to table the Annual Report, April, 1987 - March, 1988, of the Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women - Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I do not know what item of routine business we are into now. I understand that Question Period is over, and that we are into Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees, and I suggest that many of the questions we have be reserved for Question Period tomorrow.

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

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

DR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question by the hon. the member for Grand Falls, asking about my expenditures for travel: The total since May 5 is \$528.40, two trips to Gander, and I went alone, Mr. Speaker. So I would like to table these figures.

Petitions

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a petition that I want to present today to the House of Assembly on behalf of approximately forty women in the Province. I am not going to go into reading the prayer of the petition, simply because this petition, or one similar to it, has been presented in the House over the last couple of days, one by the member for St. John's East, and one by the member for Humber East (Ms. Verge). But it does have to do with the mammography screening program in the Province, and it is a very, very serious issue, Mr. Speaker, and one which really deserves the attention of all government members, and indeed, all hon. members here in the House of Assembly. It is an issue that is vital to the women of Newfoundland and Labrador and I feel confident that the women of the Province would not want to see happen here today what has been happening over the last couple of days here in the House of Assembly, and that is that the issue become a political football. That is pretty nearly what has happened over the last couple of days, and the issue, which is a vital issue, a sensitive issue, has become nearly a political football.

Now the women of the Province need and want, and indeed expect their government to be compassionate and to deliver on this very, very vital need that they have.

Let us examine for a minute what the women of the Province are looking for, Mr. Speaker. They are not looking for the government to invest many, many millions of dollars in building a hospital. They are not looking for millions

of dollars to be invested by the government, they are not looking for a major investment at all. What they are looking for simply is a very small investment of approximately \$250,000 or \$350,000, and that is not a large investment when you consider that the Minister of Finance this year is projecting a surplus in his budget. It is not really good enough, Your Honour, that the Minister of Health respond the way he has been responding over the last couple of days. Actually, we have not had any meaningful response from the minister. He has been saying that in due course he will deliver, when it is reasonable he will deliver.

What the women of the Province are asking for is that they be given access to modern mammography screening equipment.

As the member for St. John's East pointed out a couple of days ago, what we had five years ago in the hospitals of the Province was very, very appropriate, it was state-of-the-art equipment for that particular point in time. It was only last December that a national study reviewed the whole issue and did a report which showed that this new type of equipment could actually be instrumental in saving lives by early detection, and this is what this equipment is all about, early detection, if the women of the Province had that type of equipment.

Mr. Speaker, this particular petition should receive the support of all hon. members, and I am referring in particular to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations (Ms. Cowan), who is the only woman in the Cabinet. I am sure that she will be only too

pleased to go to the Minister of Health and say, "Look, loosen up on the purse strings a little bit here. What we need is approximately " - well, I do not know exactly what it is, but it is a small investment, I am told, which could be instrumental in saving lives. I am sure that the Minister does not want to be known in years from now as the Dracula of the health care system, that he wants to establish himself as a good, honest, caring, compassionate Minister of Health.

I would urge him on behalf of these forty petitioners to loosen up on the purse strings and make a real, honest, meaningful contribution to the women of the Province who are looking for this mammography screening equipment.

Thank you, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. WALSH:

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to stand to support the prayer of the petition and also, Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to hear someone speak about the concern as opposed to trying to make political hay out of something, such as cancer, that is crucial and has touched all of us. I reluctantly sat in my place yesterday when the subject came up. Over the last two or three years cancer has touched my family, not once but twice. I reluctantly sat also while I heard hon. members on the other side make political hay out of a situation that is pertinent to all of us. In supporting the prayer I would like for them to take wisdom from the hon. member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford), who said,

"Try to remember the things that we do say in this House because we do not know, one, who they touch or, two, who they affect." And while I listened to the silliness over the last couple of days, I sat here and reminisced a little bit about the fact that immediately after election day I went to Toronto to watch another member of my family dying, who is still doing that. So I compliment the hon. member for Harbour Main for not making a political football out of an issue that is important. Let us not talk about reports that came down in the last six months that simply said 'The new innovations have come forward' and referring to Corner Brook. Let us not forget the fact that the machine has been there for fourteen years and let us say, for the first seven, the mammography machine that was there served a purpose. Let us all accept some responsibility for the fact that two years ago, three years ago, four years ago, and one year ago nothing was done.

I support my Minister, he is looking at what can be done, and his colleagues in Cabinet are looking at what can be done. I ask all hon. members on the other side, if they have such petitions to bring forward, I will be proud to put my signature to it. But, for the love of God and people who are suffering of cancer and dying in this Province, please do not make a political football out of it, and I admire the hon. member for not doing that today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Opposition House

Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

I would like to have a few words to say in support of the petition so ably submitted by my colleague, the member for Harbour Main. I commend him in the way he made his presentation. I commend the member from Mount Scio - Bell Island for the comments that he has made and, obviously, he has struck the nail on the head. It is rather unfortunate that he did not see fit to have a few words with his colleague, the Minister of Health, because while he stood in his place and accused us of trying to score political points on it, the opposite is exactly true. We talked about taking responsibility because equipment has been there for fourteen years and so on and so forth. I refer the hon. member to his colleague's comments on an original petition presented here in the House on June 16, Hansard, page 709. It was not somebody on this side of the House that made reference to that, it was the Minister of Health on his own side of the House, sitting next to him. So having said that I hope that the member takes the Minister of Health aside and has a heart-to-heart talk with him, because what the member for Mount Scio-Bell Island has said is absolutely correct, and that is, Mr. Speaker, what the members on this side have been trying to say truthfully. The member for St. Johns' East, nobody can question her interest in this matter. Certainly the member for Humber East has been a long-standing advocate of this kind of service, nor can anybody question the interest that the 36 names on this particular petition have.

By the way, this petition is not

signed only by women, but by men and women from various parts of the Province: Topsail, St. John's, Grand Bank, Carmanville, Flatrock, Labrador City, Wabush, Stephenville, from all over the place. One of the signatures, Mr. Speaker, is that of the President of the Nurses' Union. Certainly the President of the Nurses' Union would have an interest in this particular matter.

Now, as the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island says, we have all, at one time or another no doubt, been touched by somebody passing away because of cancer. Certainly we would all know somebody who has passed away in that way. It is not a nice thing to see happen. In fact, I have a good friend who is a former member of this House who presently is undergoing a serious situation.

What we are talking about here, Mr. Speaker, is specifically for the Minister of Health and the government to free up a few dollars from their \$5 million surplus which they have -

MR. BAKER:
We do not have it yet.

MR. SIMMS:
Well, you are projecting a \$5 million surplus, I say to the President of Treasury Board. You may end up with a \$20 million surplus. Who knows! But you are projecting a \$5 million surplus.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the freeing up of a few paltry dollars, a measly few hundred thousand dollars, can provide a very important service to the people of this Province. As my colleague, the member for St. John's East, said when she spoke to this petition, Mr. Speaker, to address this question

in an arrogant sort of way and an off-hand sort of way, as has happened, is very unfortunate. I hope that the minister will reflect on the way he has responded to these petitions in the past because I can assure him there are more coming, and for good reason.

I am told that there are about 160 women who, throughout this Province in the next year, will develop breast cancer, and if that is not detected early on there is a very, very good chance of those particular women having to have a mastectomy or, even worse, suffering death.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue. This is not a political issue. We are not interested in making it a political issue. We are interested in supporting the interests of those people who are presenting us with petitions, who are asking us to ask the government to free up a few dollars. Get the Minister of Finance to have a look at the budget. There has to be some funds there. If you are projecting a surplus, you have to be projecting a surplus. Either you are or you are not. You cannot dillydally with it. Even if you were not projecting a surplus, surely to heavens, Mr. Speaker, this matter is of such importance that it requires the Cabinet to have a look at this very, very quickly and very, very closely, because, the sooner it gets on stream, then the more effective it will be.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:
Order 2, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order 2 -- Committee of Supply.

I think the member for St. John's East adjourned the debate.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will now make another attempt to complete my three-part maiden speech, and hopefully I can finish it today.

I think what I have done previously is simply briefly introduce myself and then try and talk a little about my district. So today I will try to get into a little bit more relevance with regard to the budget.

I would like to make mention, though, of the fact that I am very pleased to see that the representation by women in this House has increased by 300 per cent since the last session. We are still a very obvious minority. I think a few more women would add a little colour to the place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:
I hope the leaders of all three parties are going to make good on the commitments they made at the Women in Politics Conference, that they would look at policies and programs that will facilitate the entry of women into politics.

I am very proud, in fact, that our leader, Mr. Rideout, was able to attract the most women to run and, in fact, get most of them successfully through the nomination process and elect twice the number as the government party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:
I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if we have a more balanced representation by women in the House we will also have an improvement in the processes and the policies of government, because it is women who have brought to awareness public issues which were not being adequately addressed, and they will bring to government a different perspective on many of these issues that are very relevant to the needs of women and children in our Province.

I do not think people would have been aware of the feminization of poverty if it had not been for the strong voices of the people in the women's movement; we would not have been nearly as aware as we are of a need for a whole range of support services in our community or for adequate shelter and health care and employment opportunities, or the tragedy of family violence and child sexual abuse, or the need for improved counselling and mental health services for children and adolescents. Hopefully without saying anything against any of the men who are here present I sincerely hope that we will have far greater representation by women in the next House.

While I am on the subject of women and children, I would have to say that this is not a budget that is kind to women and children. It is

not a budget that is kind to the underprivileged or the disadvantaged in society, because it has put a bottom line, a projected surplus on current account, ahead of compassion. And I think that was evident in the debate on the petition that we just had. As laudible as it may be to achieve a budgeted surplus on current account, I would certainly seriously question the wisdom of an inflationary \$100 million tax grab at a time when this Province is reeling from a series of economic bad news. The cost of that achievement, that budgeted surplus on current account, despite what the Government House Leader (Mr. Baker) keeps telling us, is inflationary, because it adds to the cost of consumer goods.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Highly inflationary!

MS DUFF:

Wilson's budget is inflationary, too.

It has an ill-conceived and highly discriminatory adjustment on the RST for children's clothing. Or consider the privatization, which I understand is being considered, of government-owned fish plants and community wharves which are vital in some instances to community life in those areas.

We have seen the firing of career civil servants, the recovery of funds from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, which has got to lead to an increase in the cost of electricity regardless of anyone's ability to pay for it, or the recovery of \$8 million in overpayments from welfare recipients when much of that overpayment has been due to problems in the system and not any

intentional deceit on the part of the people who will be forced to pay.

This budget contains only token gestures towards addressing the real and urgent needs in our Province's social program. We have heard that we are getting forty-five new funded positions for nursing and ancillary staff when there is an identified need for two hundred. We are going to have bed closures at an all-time high, probably at the level of 400 this Summer. And as a St. John's member I would have to say that the St. John's hospitals are particularly hard hit because of the fact that they have the most acute patients. When patients cannot be dealt with in the regional hospitals they come in here, and that puts a tremendous burden on the remaining staff. Forty-seven per cent of patients in St. John's hospitals are not from the urban core.

The government, when they were on this side of the House, made great hue and cry about bed closures and about nursing shortages, but they have done nothing in this budget to correct them when they had a chance to do so. There are only token improvements in the provision of chronic care beds and community support services, and no funding for a badly needed province-wide screening mammography program - none at all, unless the government has a change of heart.

This budget will fail to stimulate the economy and provide employment. And the human cost of unemployment are devastating, far more serious, in my view, than the economic cost. Because it disrupts family life, you get discouraged workers, loss of

self-esteem and a whole range of related social problems. I would have expected at least some short-term programs, perhaps some creative public-private sector initiatives to bridge the gap while we are waiting for the miracle of the Recovery Team. But instead of that we find the Private Sector Employment Program has been scapped with nothing to replace it. The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Efford) gave us a great lecture the other day about short-term work programs. But I think it is a fact that once a worker is discouraged and out of the work force for two years, the chances of ever gaining full-time, meaningful employment again goes very seriously down. So even if a short-term program provides ten or twenty weeks of work, at least it keeps workers from falling into that horrible cycle of the chronically and permanently unemployed.

I would like to say a few words, too, about municipal government, because that is an area with which I am fairly familiar. And although I must say I agree with the statements in the Speech from the Throne on the need for municipal co-operation in the provision of essential local government services, there are still no details in this budget on the financial implications or to encourage this form of co-operation, which I think they will be necessary.

Also, if you are going to encouraging annexation - municipalities will not want to involve themselves in annexation will not want to involve themselves in annexation if the total burden of bringing services up to an appropriate level falls on the municipality out of its

property tax base. I do not have to tell the minister that the property tax base is a very regressive form of taxation. Money will certainly have to be provided then. We are in a situation in the city of St. John's, with Airport Heights and Kilbride, where it has been very costly to the taxpayers of the city of St. John's to try to bring services up to standard. I am sure that unless there is some well identified incentive program you will not have much success with this whole question of annexation and amalgamation.

I would also caution the minister in this case that the issue of annexation is one that cannot be forced, it can be encouraged but it cannot be forced, and there should be very, very wide consultation with the municipalities. I look at the recent statements in the press about 'supercities' and a time frame of the next municipal election in November, and I would say it is totally unrealistic.

In fact, I am inclined to agree with the Mayor for Mount Pearl, when he said that he feels the minister is just throwing out an idea, putting his foot in the water, to see what the temperature is, and perhaps what he will come in with is something far less draconian, far less dramatic, far less likely to get a lot of press, and perhaps at a later time some more reasonable solution.

I would also caution government not to weaken the momentum toward increased responsibility and the genuine desire for increased autonomy that is very evident at the local government level. Autonomy and flexibility are critical to the principle of

effective local government. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that any new government has a right, and in fact has a responsibility to look for new and better ways of doing things, but I am deeply concerned about the proposal to establish a provincial water and sewer corporation, which appeared, certainly, in the election promises and in the Throne Speech. It is not a new idea and I am not at all sure that it is an appropriate one. No one, of course, would ever question the right of our citizens to potable water and sewerage disposal systems that are consistent with approved standards of public health and safety. No one questions that there are communities experiencing severe problems, but this is a draconian and bureaucratic solution which strikes at the heart of local government autonomy and I feel will certainly result in high cost to small municipalities if the intention is to operate it like a public facility with a uniform rate. The effect, also, I think, of that expropriation on the assets of existing municipalities, which have already paid a fair amount of money out of their property tax base to put assets in the ground, should be given some thought. I know from my own experience with the City of St. John's that we need those assets, they are part of our borrowing ability, and it would seriously affect the cities borrowing power if those were expropriated for some kind of provincial corporation.

Another, I guess, municipal question that I would like to raise in relation to the budget is the fact that the costs for the St. John's Fire Department are going up another \$1 million this

year, and that cost, as I am sure the government knows, is one that is passed on directly to the user municipalities. The City of St. John's being the highest per capita municipality pays a full 65 per cent of that, which is going to amount to something like \$741,000 which the city has not budgeted for. Now, the previous government undertook to do a major study on this question, the Woods Gordon Report, to look at the effectiveness, the efficiency and the cost of the Fire Department. It is very alarming to see that there has been no discussion on what is going to happen with the recommendations of that report. At the same time the costs continue to go up and it may simply be that the government does not really care that much about it because they do not have to pay. And it is an untenable situation when those who do have to pay have no control at all over the expenditures.

There are many, many problems in the area of municipal government. The minister, again, has been talking about annexations and super cities and saying that there are no more studies needed. But it is fifteen years since the Whelan Royal Commission report and we are not only dealing with annexation, we are dealing with the whole structures of municipal governments and which ones are most appropriate. We are dealing with the financing of local government, we are dealing with the appropriate role and mandate of municipal government, and I would think that before any huge changes are made in this system, it might be wise to do one more study to take a very comprehensive look at the whole question of municipal government in this Province and do another Whelan

Royal Commission report. I think that would actually be supported by the FCM or the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Municipalities.

I would also just like to bring to government's attention that the previous government supported very strongly the initiative by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to have the federal government return into the area of municipal infrastructure funding, because the costs involvement in here are in the billions, not the millions, and they are away beyond the ability of any local municipality or, indeed, the Province to pay. So I hope the efforts made by the previous government will be continued by the Liberal Government in negotiating strongly on behalf of municipalities with the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say a few words about the Economic Recovery Commission. I must say at the outset that I have the greatest respect for the members of that Commission, many of whom I know personally. That initiative has received a great deal of praise from government members and criticism from the Opposition, which I expect is not unexpected, as that seems to be the way things go.

I do not want to be critical simply for the sake of being critical, but it would appear to me that the costs are very high, that the results are anticipated to be very slow, and that we have very, very few details.

I think this House has a right to know what the terms of the contracts of those members are. I am reminded of the Action Team of

the Frank Moores government, and it seems that the mandate of this Commission is not unlike that Action Team, to be a facilitator, and that there was a fairly high cost there in buying out some contracts.

I would like to know also what we intend to do with results monitoring. We are told that this is going to perform economic miracles, but I have, as yet, received no indication of how we are going to know if, in fact, those miracles are happening, or if, in fact, the miracles are happening because Hibernia has come on stream or the fishery improves, or because we have a \$3 million a year Economic Recovery Commission in place.

The House Royal Commission Report on Employment and Unemployment was an excellent document. It has certainly provided a blueprint for government, but I would think that it is clearly the responsibility of government to develop and implement the programs that will stimulate the economy and create employment, with as many advisors as they need. I think government has an absolute right to seek advice, but government themselves have to be accountable to this House for its actions or its failure to act, and not to create an expensive duplication of the existing responsibilities of government departments which is not accountable to this House.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of tourism in the Province, I must say that I found this Budget somewhat of a disappointment. I do not wish to be critical of the minister, because I think he himself has been disappointed by the decision of the federal government not to fund a

cost-shared agreement, but I am sure the minister, coming from the district he comes from, is very, very well aware of the importance of tourism in the Province.

But the Budget seems to place very little emphasis on this area. And if you are talking about economic recovery, you do not need an Economic Recovery Commission to tell you that one of the areas that has the highest potential for growth in this Province in terms of economic development is the tourism industry. It is already the fourth generator of our Gross Provincial Product, but we are just at one on a scale of ten when it comes to development of that industry. It is tailor-made for us. It is broad based, it is able to be applied to almost every community in the Province, it is labour intensive, and it fits in beautifully with the kind of philosophy that Dr. House was espousing in his Commission Report.

I would like to know if the government has any intention, now that it has failed to negotiate the \$60 million federal-provincial agreement, of putting the \$24 million, which would have been its cost share, into some programs which would supplement any other types of funding, such as ACOA, which might be available. Because I think if we lose some of the momentum that has been gained in the tourism industry, we are going to set ourselves back. The amount of money that we are spending is a half a million dollar amount in the budget for tourism marketing. The amount of money that we as a Province are spending, compared to what is being spent by Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, who are our closest neighbours but also our closest competition, is infinitesimal, and we will remain

as we currently are, the best-kept secret in the tourism industry in Canada, unless we make some much more serious efforts to both market ourselves and to develop our tourism plant.

The budget, and The Throne Speech, gave very little emphasis to the whole question of environment. It did not indicate that there were any new initiatives. In fact, the budget for the department is somewhat less than last year. This Province has been blessed with natural wilderness and a relatively clean environment, and blessed, I suppose, in some ways with an absence of some of the very serious problems that effect areas in Central Canada. But we still have no regulations to control our ATVs. I think we are still failing in adequate restoration contracts for industrial operations. We still have no returnable bottle legislation. We still have placed no money into recycling operations or to public education on environmental issues. Perhaps the most effective way of doing something about the environment is to try to begin, at least, to educate the public, and that will take dollars and those dollars are not in this budget.

There are two environmental issues of particular concern to the citizens of St. John's, and I think they are very keen issues in my own district, St. John's East. One of them is St. John's Harbour. Now, every time we have tourists who come here and stay at the Newfoundland Hotel, they look out the window and they see about 150 sea gulls gathered around, and they think that it is very cute, at first look. That think it is a conference of Jonathan Livingston Sea Gull and his friends, but it

is not. It is the sea gulls, as everybody knows, feasting on the raw sewage of the whole East Avalon region. This, again, is one of those areas which is way beyond the ability of the municipal government in which that Harbour sits to do anything about without help from the two senior levels of government. So, I would certainly like to see this government seriously undertake to negotiate a federal-provincial agreement for the cleanup of St. John's Harbour and the Humber River, and the various waste disposal sites in this Province, which was committed to by our Leader in his short days in the Premiership. Quebec has a similar agreement which they use to clean up the St. Lawrence River.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the areas of culture and historic resources are very scantily addressed in the budget, and I think not at all in The Throne Speech. There does not appear to be any new funding. Both these areas, which in my view are absolutely critical to Newfoundland, are given very low profile, and it would appear also low priority. They are surfeited on lip service and starved for funds to develop policies and programs. It is motherhood to say that it is important to our pride and confidence in ourselves as a people, I am sick of listening to politicians at all levels telling us how important our culture and heritage are, but they are also extremely important as economic generators, particularly related to the tourism industry. This could be the main platform in our plank to develop a unique situation, a unique positioning for ourselves as a tourism destination.

But they are also, in many cases,

non-renewable resources. We will have no artists here, pretty soon, to give that creative generator to our cultural life. The LSPU Hall, just as an example, which is perhaps the incubator of a great percentage of the indigenous, creative talent in this Province, asked for a tiny grant of \$50,000 to help them get lights for the facility - nothing in the budget. There is less funding for the arts group. There is no increased funding for the Newfoundland and Labrador Historic Foundation, who give grants. The money that is used for that - you are not talking about a lot of money - if it is linked with private sector investment, which it has been, saves our historic resources at minimal cost to government. A few hundred thousand dollars in both those areas, arts and heritage, could have done a tremendous amount both for the economy and for the Province of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, the definition of politics that I learned when I was doing Political Science is that politics is the art of the possible, or the allocation of scarce resources. In the entire history of Newfoundland and Labrador resources have been scarce and the allocation has been difficult. Successive Throne Speeches have gone on twin themes, the economy and to try and bring our people up to a decent standard of living. How we allocate these resources is certainly the responsibility of government and a very clear indication of government's priorities.

Therefore, in summary, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I do not find this budget to be a document of hope and reform. It is not a compassionate budget. It is a budget which puts the balance

sheet before people. The rhetoric and the numbers do not match. It is pregnant with promises like the Throne Speech and the election policies. It appears it will have a long gestation period. Delivery will take place 'in due course' 'when appropriate and feasible,' 'when funds are available.' I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the bright promises will be delivered sometime before Hades reaches zero degrees centigrade. If this is the Wells agenda it is not a liberal agenda. It is a small 'c' conservative agenda that would be worthy of Margaret Thatcher.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:

There is one little psalm which says, "To everything there is a season; there is a time to reap and a time to sow." I am sure everybody is familiar with that. Given the current state of the provincial economy, this Province should have been sown with innovative and creative programs and much needed improvements to our social programs; instead this budget has chosen to reap \$100 million in additional taxes out of the provincial economy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MURPHY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At the pleasure of the Chair, I would ask that I be given leave to inform this hon. House that this week is a week that is set aside for all Canadians employed, Canadian employers and employees,

as Occupational Health and Safety Week. I would like to put on record that this House supports that week and its awareness concept to reduce the carnage and suffering in the work place, and the tremendous costs of industrial accidents in the work place.

In saying that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that obviously I cannot or would not concur with the hon. member for St. John's East. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I congratulate the Minister of Finance who, in such a short time, brought forward such a courageous budget, one that was not meant to be totally without pain, but certainly one that all Newfoundlanders at this particular time need, and the aspirations of going North have now turned around and, please God, we will be positively going South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:

I think I would be a little remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not comment on the tremendous sense of initiative taken by the hon. the Minister of Fisheries. It would seem members opposite would indicate that the cod glut at this time of the year, especially on the Avalon Peninsula, is something that just happened, just fell upon us all of a sudden.

I know the concerns of the hon. the member for St. Mary's - the Capes (Mr. Hearn), and the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) with respect to their inshore fisheries, and I think the hon. the Minister of Fisheries should be certainly congratulated for his foresight in bringing a factory freezer trawler into St. John's to try and handle

that glut, and the additional ship that was sent to St. Mary's Bay.

I think we all realize at this particular point in time that this time last week members in the House were addressing the sad scenario of the lack of cod and the probability of never seeing any more than a couple of hundred pounds in any given time, and now, all of a sudden, we are addressing a glut.

MR. PARSONS:
There is no glut.

MR. MURPHY:
The hon. the member for St. John's East Extern says there was no glut. It was yesterday, I think, a fisherman from Flatrock was told not to dare take his fish out of the water because there was nowhere to process the fish.

MR. PARSONS:
(Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:
I would suggest that it was a scenario not with respect to a trawler or foreign gear going away with the trap, but fish going away with the trap. However, through the foresight and the expertise of the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, that particular situation has been alleviated.

The other day the hon. member for Mount Pearl (Mr. N. Windsor) stood in his place with his great expertise, his chest swelling with pride with respect to the circumstance on the development of the Lower Churchill and he claimed that the hon. the Premier was using the Meech Lake Accord in a way that would have a detrimental impact on the Lower Churchill project, and he said that the stand taken by this government and

its Premier would affect negotiations between Hydro Quebec and this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in listening to the hon. member for Mount Pearl, is it fair to say that until we get a contract with Hydro Quebec, and this government will, we all cheer for the Montreal Canadiens and the Quebec Nordiques? Is this apples and oranges? I mean, do we have to buy clothes made in Quebec? Is that what we are saying? Is that what the hon. the member for Mount Pearl was saying? He talked with great gusto about all the meetings that had taken place on the Lower Churchill project and how they have been ongoing, and he talked at great length about the Upper Churchill contract. I do not think anybody in this hon. House would agree that the Upper Churchill contract was one of significance in 1980s, even the 1970s. But of course, Mr. Speaker, hindsight is twenty/twenty vision. It was March 1927, Mr. Speaker, when the Privy Council awarded that great landmass known as Labrador, a great part of this Province, to Newfoundland, the decision of the Privy Council, of course, was binding. It was binding.

Then, of course, the Government of Newfoundland of the day, not realizing the potential of that great part of this Province, were offered, I think, a sum somewhere close to \$40 million from the Province of Quebec, at that particular time, \$40 million! I go back to this to draw an analogy on what the hon. the member for Mount Pearl, who will now be the critic, I understand, of H₂O, the critic of pure water, had to say. He is not in his place today, he is probably out cleaning

up the acid rain scenario.

However, in 1927 Labrador was worth \$40 million in the eyes of the Province of Quebec. The Newfoundland Government of the day took their time in deciding whether or not they were ready to sell that part of this great Province - they were going to sell that part back to Quebec, because they realized the difficulty in serving all the coastal communities - and when they went back to the Province of Quebec they reneged on their offer, put their \$40 million in their pocket and said, No, we do not think that barren land is worth \$40 million.

So the member stood in his place the other day and ranted and raved about what a terrible deal Newfoundland had signed with Quebec with respect to the Upper Churchill Project. As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, as we look at it in 1989, it was a terrible, terrible deal. Maybe we could have had an escalating mil rate built into it, but that is yesterday. And I draw the same analogy on the Privy Council and the \$40 million.

Then he went on to talk about the deal with Quebec Hydro and the deal with the Province of Newfoundland, not mentioning once the ten years of construction work that went on uninterrupted, and the thousands and thousands of homes that stand in this part of the Province, and in Labrador, because of the construction jobs that were available to Newfoundland tradesmen of that day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:

This government did not kill the

building trades in this Province. Mr. Speaker, people from the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were using their travel cards to flock to Churchill during those days. The hon. the member for Harbour Main remembers it well. Those days are gone. There was no need for double breasting legislation in those days. And not only did he not mention the Houses and the prosperity brought to this Province all over, he also forgot to mention the thousands and thousands of dollars available to Newfoundland carpenters, pipefitters, plumbers, electricians and bricklayers for the education of their children, and which made Memorial the monument it is today. All that was easily forgotten, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:

And then conveniently, Mr. Speaker, there was a gap in the hon. member's presentation when he forgot, as did the hon. member for St. John's East, the Moores years, the double-barreled bang, I called it, over in Point Amor, on the coast of Labrador, and down in Flower's Cove, in the hon. member's district. I was there, working for Teshmont Consultants, when the hon. Premier of the day came with flags and bunting waving, and \$100 million later, the lower Churchill.

I am sure the Hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands was very happy for the Lower Churchill Project at that particular time, if for nothing else but the \$100 million spent by the then Minister of Finance and the Premier of that time, who just happened to be Mr. Moores and the hon. Mr. Crosbie.

MR. TOBIN:

What about (inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:

Here is Heckle, where is Jekyll? Tweedledee and tweedledum. The donut twins. Mr. Speaker, if I may remove myself, I look at the hon. member for Grand Bank educatedly looking at the pictures in the Telegram, he stood in his place the other day, with his hand inside his shirt holding his heart, speaking the aspirations and wishes of the people of Grand Bank and St. Lawrence. Where was he, Mr. Speaker, when Markland went down and Come By Chance followed it? Where was he then, Sir? Where was his heart then? Then the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett), old Noah, who used to move the arks, he is not in his place today, he is the benefactor of the Clarenville Hospital.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Take that back. You are wrong.

MR. MURPHY:

I apologize. In the excitement of my delivery, I was carried away. I apologize to the hon. the member for Trinity North, who is not here.

MR. TOBIN:

I must say, I (inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:

I get carried away like you do, Jekyll.

However, just as another point of information, Mr. Speaker, in June, 1974, the then Finance Minister, who was filled with an urge to rid himself of the BRINCO frock, organized a bond issue of \$160 million US to purchase CF(L)Co from BRINCO. Six months later, the same hon. minister turned around and found \$147,700,000 for

Hydro to buy the shares from CF(L)Co. Today, this government is strapped at 10.5 per cent with that bill. This is the same administration, now opposite, who had the arrogance to stand in their place and, after six weeks, chastise the hon. Minister of Finance for a budget he had no alternative but to bring in -- the same people. They took over after the Moores administration strapped with the same money, but not a word, not a sound about the Lower Churchill, the \$100 million. It is too bad the hon. member is not in his place today, because he may be able to give some clarification on the \$100 million spent.

He talked and rambled on about the engineering study that was done being incomplete. This hon. member knows, Mr. Speaker, where the coring samples from Muskrat Falls and the Lower Churchill are today. I doubt very much if the hon. member from Mount Pearl knows where they are. He accused the Premier of putting a sod, putting a blanket on negotiations between this Province and Quebec Hydro by mentioning the social issues associated with the Meech Lake Accord, 'that one province should not be elevated above another.' Surely heavens, this Province is distinct and unique in as much as that from the tip of St. Anthony to the Bill of Cape St. George and back on to Cape St. Francis, there are 270 different English dialects. If that is not unique, Mr. Speaker, what is? We are talking about a social issue belonging to a very have-not Province in Meech Lake, which is designed to look after one of the have provinces. And the hon. member for Mount Pearl mingles all this in with the Lower Churchill program. I would suggest that the hon. member in his ongoing

negotiations - because the Lower Churchill is not new. The Moores administration with their double-barreled bang, that was fourteen years ago. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new about it. Surely Heavens there must be something more to stand on, or to lean on, or to use as a crutch for the hon. the member for Mount Pearl to say in retrospect that our attitude is breaking down the Lower Churchill negotiations.

MR. SIMMS:
(Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:
Well, Mr. Speaker, martini meetings, and golf club sessions and what have you, over the years, do not bring this Province any closer - the hon. Opposition House Leader makes a small comment. Mr. Speaker, I looked over the other day, when the hon. member for Grand Bank was on his feet - of course, his source of information is the member for Burin - Placentia west - and there was the member for Burin - Placentia West throwing information up to him. Then I looked up and there was the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. the House Leader of the Opposition, and the hon. the member for Harbour Main, and they reminded me of the back window of a 1952 Chev - everybody nodding in unison; Wynken, Blynken and Nod.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:
The Minister of Finance sits there in his place, and so he should, without addressing any of the snide comments that come from members opposite. He does not need to pay attention, Mr. Speaker. He does not need to.

As time goes on, Mr. Speaker, this government will sit down with Hydro Quebec and the Government of Quebec and take a reasonable, rational look at what this Province has to offer. The hon. Prime Minister of this great country has been moving and shaking himself all about the United States in the last five years talking to his other blue-eyed Irish friend - and I am not saying anything about Irish people, why would I? - on the reduction of acid rain.

Just as a point of information, Mr. Speaker, the last great natural resource available in North America, if not in the world, exists in Labrador, and it is clean, tumbling waters. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Upper Churchill was an engineering masterpiece, to say the least, a labour legislation masterpiece - a collective agreement for ten years without interruption, and all those things were forgotten. But now, as the waters leave the Churchill powerhouse and come down towards Goose Bay and Happy Valley, and we see the Gull Island project and the Muskrat Falls and the five rivers that empty down into the Province of Quebec, it is a great and tremendous opportunity for those honestly concerned with the reduction of pollution, the reduction of acid rain, to take part in the development of the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls. It is time for these people to get involved so that we will reduce the oil-fired electric plants that are around, and the coal-fired, and even worse, Mr. Speaker, the possibility of what might happen with a nuclear plant.

In those days again, Mr. Speaker, when all of these plants were being organized and established

and built, oil was two dollars a barrel and coal cost next to nothing. They contribute greatly to the problems of water in this Province and other Atlantic Provinces. So maybe we have a selling package there. This government is much aware of that. This is one of the messages that this government, I am sure, will be bringing to Hydro Quebec, bringing to the Government of Quebec, and certainly bringing to the Eastern Seaboard and the Eastern States.

The hon. member for Grand Bank alluded to megaprojects, this government does not believe in megaprojects.

MR. TOBIN:

Oh, you do not believe in Hibernia!

MR. MURPHY:

Mr. Speaker, Jeckyll, or somebody over there, not long ago mentioned something about who was the then Minister of Industrial Development, and he talked about Hibernia. I remember very well. It was the Hon. Leo Barry, who then served as Industrial Minister on the other side, before he became enlightened.

I remember the press conference extremely well where he held up a little crock of oil which caused Newfoundland to go into hysterics. There were people lining up to mortgage their houses. He held up a little crock of oil, not even a cupful, Mr. Speaker. Can you imagine what would have happened if he had held up a forty-five gallon drum? This is the megaproject that the hon. member from Grand Bank swings over here and talks about to this government. I remember very well the last megaproject in this Province, the one that sat out

there rusting for ten years until, all of a sudden, some company showed up from New Jersey, Cumberland Farms or somebody. Everybody was suspicious. The Premier said, 'Check them out. Get Dun & Bradstreet on the phone.' These people quietly took over Come by Chance, a megaproject that is working very well today. I was a little concerned as a safety professional when they opened up, but today it is working very well and it seems to be providing good, sound, solid jobs for this Province. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if, after seventeen years, hon. members opposite can allude to one single, solitary megaproject?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:

I just said that. Absolutely nothing to do with the refurbishing of Come By Chance. If the Linerboard mill was the second last megaproject, then surely heavens Abitibi-Price would not have another paper mill in Newfoundland today. It was a mistake at the time, but today it is the wisdom of the Tories.

MR. WARREN:

The Linerboard mill?

MR. MURPHY:

The Linerboard mill. I promised the hon. member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) I would never mention in this House again, but the only megaproject these people got involved with in seventeen years is on sale this week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:

And, as I alluded to before, if

they were so convinced that it was such a wonderful thing, then you had the opportunity to buy it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I felt good about it.

MR. MURPHY:

I look at the hon. member for Harbour Main (Mr. Doyle), an iron worker. Yesterday the hon. the member for Humber Valley alluded to a man who wore more coveralls than shirts and ties -- the hon. the member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

Right on!

MR. MURPHY:

And how well I remember.

MR. SIMMS:

Steve Neary is back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:

That hon. member, with his spud wrench, was not worrying about a job in this Province, he was wondering which job he was going to go to; going to the union hall, Mr. Speaker, looking at the board to see which job he preferred. In the Liberal days, Mr. Speaker, that gentleman had five jobs. His counterparts and cohorts in his own trade in that great area of Conception Bay, Conception Harbour, Avondale, Harbour Main, all these wonderful places, are running around today in desperation trying to find a job in their trade.

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY:

You know, Mr. Speaker, without question, Sir, members on this

side understand the Finance Minister's budget. We know that he was left no option. He left no stone unturned. There were some wrinkles in that budget which obviously affect and impacts on Newfoundlanders. However, I would have to congratulate, again, the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Kitchen).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:

What is even more inspiring, Mr. Speaker, is that I had some second thoughts the day the budget came down. As constituents throughout St. John's South and other areas of this Province called me, I was ready to hear some negative vibes. What I have heard to date, Mr. Speaker, has been 95 per cent to 96 per cent admiration for the courage of the Minister of Finance.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Tax the poor! Tax the poor!

MR. MURPHY:

It is not a sense of taxes, Mr. Speaker, I think every Newfoundlander today realizes that the proverbial bottom of the barrel has been reached. The previous administration reached down and reached beyond themselves, and this hon. minister had no alternative but to reach back.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is a good man.

MR. MURPHY:

If we look back over Hansard and look back over Budget Speeches of the last twenty years, I do not think we will find one which predicts a \$5 million deficit -- no, a \$5 million --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Surplus.

MR. SIMMS:
He does not even know what he is reading!

MR. MURPHY:
Excuse me, a \$5 million surplus at the end of the fiscal year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. MURPHY:
Well, the hon. member for Grand Falls, the Opposition House Leader, should obviously -

MR. SIMMS:
You will never get in the Cabinet that way.

MR. MURPHY:
- be equally complimentary. After all, I think he found, in fairness and balance, that his great district of Grand Falls has a fair allocation from the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, \$900,000. And for the neighboring town of Windsor, which may or may not in the near future be part of that great city of Grand Falls, he should be quite happy with the dollar figures brought down by the hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. HEWLETT:
Green Bay is delirious.

MR. MURPHY:
Green Bay should be delirious. The member is delirious. That member stood in his place and sincerely complained and cried about the 40 kilometers of unpaved road in the Green Bay District, and that is not including the paving up walkways and whatever, when there are 7,000 kilometers of unpaved roads in this Province.

No, Mr. Speaker, it is sad that the hon. member for Mount Pearl and the hon. member for Grand Bank cannot look on this side and see the positiveness of this new, fresh, real-change government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY:
Mr. Speaker, without question, in the few short weeks that this government has had an opportunity to present its programming and hear from our hon. ministers, we see a true sense of fairness and balance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Burin -- Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to entering into this debate. We just had the member for St. John's South, the landslide member, Mr. Speaker, get up here and he tried to justify the hydro deal that sold this Province down the drain. He made reference to the member for Mount Pearl on several occasions, and his involvement in the Meech Lake operation, and what he had to say about it and his work. Let me say to the member for St. John's South that the member for Mount Pearl has made a significant contribution to this Province over the past ten to fifteen years that he has been involved in public life. When the minister for Mount Pearl was in here working, Mr. Speaker, making

these types of decisions, where was the member for St. John's South?

I knew that they attacked the previous leader of the Liberal Party, he was stabbed and bled in public and did all that, but I never thought I would live long enough to see some one from the Liberal caucus come in attack him indirectly, the way the member for St. John's South did today, when he talked about the double-barrel shot. Because it was Mr. Barry who was with Mr. Moores when that took place. I think the fact that was as your leader, the fact that your colleagues, like the Minister of Social Services and others did him in, I do not think that you should participate in it.

The Minister of Social Services, he had the opportunity to answer one question and had to come back the next day and apologize. Confidence, Mr. Speaker. Misleading the House!

MR. EFFORD:
(Inaudible) you.

MR. TOBIN:
When it was put to you yesterday afternoon you came back this morning and did it, that is what happened to you. We will deal with you as time goes by.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's South stood here and said that this was a courageous budget. Yes, Mr. Speaker, indeed it was a courageous budget. I think the courageousness of the budget was pointed out today in a letter to **The Telegram** entitled 'The Liberals and in change.' For the benefit of the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, they should read this. It was written by Mr. E. Duke, MUN student, Single Parent, about

the Liberals and change.

"Mr. Wells, let me take you on a trip down memory lane for a moment. Remember the debate that was held in the Thomson Student Centre gym just before the election? And remember the promises you made to the hundreds of students who attended?... You know, when you promised the freeze on tuition."

Do you remember that, Mr. Speaker, the students who were in the Thomson Student Centre when the Premier was in and promised a freeze on tuition. What has happened to the freeze on tuition? A 10 per cent increase. I have letters down in my file that I got yesterday from students asking me to raise the matter in the House of Assembly. The students in this Province are crying out, they are begging, Mr. Speaker, for someone to do something, to stop creating a stumbling block whereby only the rich in this Province can be educated. We all know the richness of the Liberal Party. We all know, Mr. Speaker, the direction of the Liberal Party. We have all read and listened and heard and saw the Thatcherism and Reaganism, the Conservative philosophies that have swept the Western World. That is the course that this Premier has set us on, Mr. Speaker.

This morning I sat in on the estimates for the Department of Transportation, and I asked a question of the minister as it related to jobs in Newfoundland, the positions that are vacant where people took early retirement in transportation depots throughout this Province. I asked the minister this morning if he could assure this House that every

job in these depots, where the people look after our roads programs and carry out the Winter maintenance, snow clearing and whatever else takes place, that was vacated as a result of the early retirement program would be filled. Do you know that the minister would not make that commitment, that all of these vacant positions would be filled?

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a sad reflection, and indeed a sad admission, when the people in this Province who are depending on the Department of Transportation to get to work, when the people in this Province, Mr. Speaker, who are depending on the Department of Transportation for school buses and all of this - the Minister of Education should be very concerned about this - that in this Province today we have a Minister of Transportation who would refuse to say that all of the depots in this Province would have people there.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services, the apologetic minister who gets a question, misleads the House, goes back and checks with his officials, gets it straight, comes back after he gets the issue straight, Mr. Speaker, and then, apologizing, sets the record straight, maybe he should have his officials sitting with him, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Tonight. Tonight.

MR. TOBIN:
I might not be able to make it tonight.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the

member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member is a real gentleman and an honourable gentleman, but when he says that the minister misled the House he implies that the minister deliberately misled the House. This minister had the courage to come in and say to the House what really happened. He in no way misled the House. He laid out the facts of what did happen, Mr. Speaker, and he is to be commended. I know that the hon. member really wants to applaud him rather than attack him.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, there clearly is no point of order. It is a point of foolishness by the Minister of Development. Obviously he has decided to take up where his colleague has left off now that he has left the House. But if Your Honour reads Beauchesne he will clearly see that nothing the hon. member said about the other hon. member over there is unparliamentary at all. In fact, you can use the word 'mislead' if you wish, and that was all the hon. member said. There was nothing wrong with that. In fact I used it the other day and the Speaker did not admonish me. So I think it is just an attempt by the Minister of Development to interrupt the fine speech being given by the member for Burin - Placentia West while he was just starting to get in full flight. I urge Your Honour to reprimand the Minister of Development and sit him down and tell him to stop interrupting and stop rising on these foolish points of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Minister of Development I will repeat it again. Yesterday in this House there was a question asked of the Minister of Social Services, and it was pointed out to him at that time by myself that his answer was not right, that his answer was not true. This morning he came back, after going and checking with his officials and after they had given him the facts. When the minister is not competent enough to answer the questions, he should realize that he should take it under advisement, go back and check with his officials and then give the answer the next day, not make statements like he made yesterday that were wrong. The answer he gave, Mr. Speaker, was wrong, and the minister had to come back here today and admit that he was wrong. The last time there was a question asked of the Minister of Social Services by the member for Port au Port he had to take it under advisement.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, no!

MR. TOBIN:

Oh, yes. And I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, that that has been answered yet.

So what we have is a minister who takes it under advisement one day and the next time he is asked a question he gives you an answer that is not true. Now, it is time for the Minister of Social Services to familiarization with his department and to get on and do what needs to be done in the

Department of Social Services.

We have a budget in the Department of Social Services. In Youth Corrections, the Department of Social Services has a budget this year approved, total services in Youth Corrections, Mr. Speaker, of \$10,368,700. That is up from the \$8,771,900 that was approved last year. But included in that is capital of \$4,850,000 for the Whitbourne Boys' School that I announced, that this government approved, and before I left Public Works had called tenders for. That is the \$4.8 million that is there. But the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that when you look at what was approved last year in Youth Services, the increase this year, and subtract the \$4.8 million, you will see an actual reduction in the budget for Youth Corrections in this Province. That is the minister who went around condemning the Remand Centre and the Boys' Home, that is now in the School for the Deaf. Let me ask the minister, as well, what his plans are for other closed custody and open custody facilities. Let me talk to the minister about the child welfare budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Do you want answers?

MR. TOBIN:

We will have the opportunity. Do not worry! We will have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker. I just received a note here from my sidekick, and there is no doubt about it there is an awful lot of truth in that note. I will deal with that as we go through.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Communique.

MR. TOBIN:

That is what we have, Mr. Speaker. He is now going to go out and beat the poor of this Province to death to try to get \$8 million back from them, \$8 million in over-payments; overpayments, some of which go back to the sixties, and some of those still on the records are owed by deceased people.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Deceased people?

MR. TOBIN:
Yes. Deceased people and still on the records. Mr. Speaker, who is he going to get to collect this money? Who is he going to get to go out and collect this money? Is he going to ask the social workers, a group of individuals who went to university for five years and got a BSW, became counsellors, and all that, is he now going to make them collection agencies? Is that what he is coming to, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, he is getting counselling from the member for Stephenville, the only member of the previous administration not to be included in the Cabinet, and now he is going to give advice.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Do not bring that up now.

MR. TOBIN:
No, hear me through. I honestly believe that the member should be in Cabinet. I think he is competent and capable and I think he should have been in the Cabinet. Had he not refused to let the Premier run in Stephenville, when the Premier wanted to run in Stephenville when he was then the Leader of the Opposition, he probably would be in Cabinet. And the old Conflict of Interest himself, the member for Windsor - Buchans, he would

not be here. I am sure he would not be here because he would not have been re-elected. I think the member for Stephenville should have been in the Cabinet and it is nice to see him giving advice to a minister, who has to apologize in this House the day after he gives an answer.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the minister that the honourable thing for him to do is to sit down with his colleague, the President of Treasury Board, and ask to have that type of money written off because the people of this Province, the sick and the suffering, cannot afford to pay it. Some of it has been there twenty-five or thirty years, and they should not be expected to pay it. The President of Treasury Board should ask to have it written off. I say to the minister that there is nobody in the Department of Social Services who can say I went along with collecting that money.

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

I was waiting for you to say that.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member just stood in his place, the member for Burin - Placentia West, and made a statement that he did not instruct his people. I will table this, Mr. Speaker. This is a document that he has tabled. It says, 'A clerical staff of the Division of the Social Accounts Division should be assigned to clear up balances of the accounts receivable. This would involve increased collection efforts,

determination of accounts eligible for write-off and preparation of the necessary documentation of the write-off,' given to him by the Deputy Minister while he was minister, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

There is no point of order.

MR. TOBIN:

Let me say to the minister, Mr. Speaker, that that is exactly what is happening today. You are taking the recommendations of that report which said go out and get the money.

MR. EFFORD:

That was tabled.

MR. TOBIN:

Sure, the report was tabled. There was a group hired to do the report, but you are the Minister of Social Services, you are the one who makes the decision. Do not slough it off on nobody else, no committee. Go to the President of Treasury Board and have it struck, Mr. Speaker. The Minister is beating up on the poor of this Province. I can tell you something else, Mr. Speaker, that I doubt very much if the social workers in this Province will accept the instructions to go out and bang on doors and start collecting money from people -

MR. EFFORD:

You tabled it!

MR. TOBIN:

Table what you like -

- people who now cannot afford to

pay.

He never tabled anything for me, Mr. Speaker. The member did not realize that here we are not dealing with stoves, we are dealing with a broader issue, Mr. Speaker. We are not dealing with stoves. We are dealing with the livelihood of individuals, Mr. Speaker, that is what we are dealing with here.

And the Minister should not be beating up upon the poor, he should not be asking social workers to go out and knock on doors and collect money. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister should not be doing it.

Now let the Minister tell us why he has cut the budget in Child Welfare this year. We all know about it, and the Minister of Education should be concerned about this as well. The budget for Child Welfare this year has not been increased. We all know what is going on in this Province, we all know there are people out there crying for counselling because of the abuse and other things that have taken place, and that Minister sits down there, Mr. Speaker, with the Child Welfare budget that last year was \$4,294,000 and this year is \$4,271,000 - that is what that booklet says, Mr. Speaker - that is where they are coming from. There is the Minister who was going to do everything: He has cut the budget in Child Welfare, cut the budget for Youth Corrections, that is the commitment that he got to these people who need the services of the Department of Social Services. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that his incompetence in that department was loud and clear when he had to apologize in this House.

today for not knowing how to answer a question. He did not know the difference between the Remand Center and the Boys' Home, that is why he had to ask the question. Let me ask the Minister as well, as it relates to moving the Remand Center down here, what changes have been made to facilitate that? I know the expert advice, Mr. Speaker. What is getting on with the hon. gentleman? There is such a thing as rules and regulations here. I have been recognized, I have the floor, the Speaker decides, not you. Today you had to get up and apologize for what you said yesterday. Imagine if you were Speaker! He does not even know the rules of the House, let alone the rules of his department, and he has been here for four years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister to answer this sometime. Has the fire escape locks on that old school been changed? Because it is only a matter, Mr. Speaker of the right person bumping them, forcing them open and then they are gone. Let me ask the Minister if he has spent the appropriate money -

MR. EFFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I realize the hon. member is doing the best job he is capable of, and that is not so good. He keeps saying, 'Let me ask the minister; and when he asks me a question I feel that I should answer it, and then when I stand up he tells me to sit down. So I ask the hon. gentleman will he make up his mind? He is either asking me a question or he is not. I will answer every question that is put to me, but, please, if you do not want me to answer, do not say, 'Let me ask the minister a question.'

MR. SIMMS:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. The hon. member is asking the minister questions that could be answered at some other time. So there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Burin -- Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, to be fair to the hon. gentleman we do not expect him to know everything we are saying, and we can understand that. I just got a note that described the hon. gentleman pretty good, 'You would think that the hon. minister is sitting on a hot stove the way he jumps up and down.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know who wrote it, but it is fairly appropriate. There are a lot of other issues and we will have a chance to -

MR. MATTHEWS:

One of his colleagues sent that over, did he not?

MR. TOBIN:

We will get into that at the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker.

What about the special child welfare allowance? What happened to the special child welfare allowance this year for service to the mentally handicapped? And now, we will ask you another one. There is another one that has to be asked and answered at the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker, and that is the reduction in money to

various groups in this Province for the training of mentally handicapped people. I will just give you an example. I understand, I have to check it further, but it is my understanding at this point in time that the provincial budget this year for that program was cut back to \$200,000. Now just let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker. Last year alone the one on the Burin Peninsula, the Marystown Board, spent \$180,000, for training of handicapped people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is where it is all coming from. I am sure I have another whole list of stuff, Mr. Speaker, that was supposed to be included in this year's budget for the Department of Social Services. We will deal with a lot of this stuff after.

MR. EFFORD:

Will you be here tonight?

MR. TOBIN:

I am not sure if I will be here tonight, but I can tell you one thing, there will be lots of time, there will be time beyond tonight to deal with your estimates, I can assure you of that, because any man who sat by as minister and saw his colleagues slash that department the way it was slashed this year, Mr. Speaker, there shall be lots of time to deal with it, and to look at the entire budget of the Department of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at this budget, a lot of the funding is cost shared 50-50 by the federal and provincial governments. Last year the government that I was a part of approved a budget of \$121,593,800, that was 1988-1989. This year, Mr. Speaker, it has gone to \$125,752,000, which is

less than a \$4 million increase, but at the same time there is one expenditure which we approved included in this year's budget, for the Whitbourne Home, Mr. Speaker, of \$4,850,00. So when you exclude that there is an actual decrease in the budget for the Department of Social Services. There is included in that a 4 per cent increase for people on social assistance. There is included in it, Mr. Speaker, I suspect a salary increase for the employees. So let the records show that this minister has brought in a reduced budget for the Department of Social Services. That is terrible and he should be ashamed of himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

He is proud of himself.

MR. TOBIN:

I would say he is proud of it, Mr. Speaker. We will get back to that in a few minutes.

There are some other issues that I want to address and that is the hon. Minister of Employment - or Unemployment and Layoffs, Mr. Speaker. That Private Sector Program, I cannot, and I do not think anyone else can go to their districts for a weekend, or anywhere, including the member for Port de Grave, without running into somebody who brings up the cancellation of that program.

Mr. Speaker, I was into a business in Marystown Saturday and the manager of that business came to me and he said, 'There would be three people working in this business right now if the government had not cancelled that private sector program. And he just came from the mail and he showed me a stack of letters he

had from people who were trying to get jobs, and he would have had three people working if it was not for the callous attitude of that government. Old Stove Pipe is hot again, he is soon going to puff.

MR. MATTHEWS:

He is going to backfire in a minute.

MR. TOBIN:

He will backfire in a minute. The Old Stove Pipe is going to backfire.

MR. SIMMS:

And you would not know but he never got on like that over here.

MR. TOBIN:

That is right.

How can this government not approve projects that were going to affect employment in this Province?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Three thousand jobs.

MR. TOBIN:

Three thousand jobs. And how many were rejected last year of all the ones who applied?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Of all those that were put up none were rejected of those recommended.

MR. TOBIN:

None were rejected of those recommended, only one or two?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Two.

MR. TOBIN:

Two. There were two rejected. One of them I am sure the Minister of Social Services is familiar with. There was only one that was rejected. My time is going by.

Will you give me leave?

My friend for Placentia (Mr. Hogan), Mr. Speaker, said yes, no problem. I agree, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOGAN:

No leave!

MR. TOBIN:

And I tell you something. If the member for Placentia stands up in this House and says that you can have leave, I would advise the members opposite to give me leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at some other issues. Let us look at the gas tax, Mr. Speaker, the increase in gas tax, Mr. Speaker. If a person on Social Assistance today has a car and an overpayment, they have to pay to get the car registered, then they have to pay more money to buy gas, and then they have to turn around and accept a 4 per cent increase and pay 5 per cent towards their overpayment. Now if that is not socking it to the poor like it has never been socked to the poor before in this Province, I do not know what it is, Mr. Speaker. It is almost driving the people in Social Assistance.

I remember back in the early 1970s, back in the old Liberal days, Mr. Speaker, if you were on Social Assistance you had to take the license plate off your car, bring it in and give it to the social worker and put away your car for the period you were on Social Assistance. That was in the Liberal days, Mr. Speaker. Bring in your plate, park your car. That is true. Bring in your car, park your car and as long as

you were on Social Assistance you could not drive. That was on the go until this government changed it in the early 1970s, by the way.

And, Mr. Speaker, what do we have today for the poor of this Province? Give them 4 per cent increase, take 5 per cent off for overpayment, tax them to the limit on gasoline, tax them to the limit on their registration for their cars. So what is happening in essence, Mr. Speaker, is that the poor of this Province are not permitted to drive their car again. That is what is happening in a different way, but that is what is happening in this Province.

The message that came from the member for Placentia I will not say publicly, Mr. Speaker, but I can assure you he would know that he has a record and an established, Mr. Speaker, reputation to know if that is true.

Mr. Speaker, let me say on a more serious note, when it relates to the work force of the Marystown Shipyard, I questioned the Minister of Development on it today, and I appreciated the openness, the frankness and the honesty of the Minister of Development. He was fair to me in his answers.

MR. BAKER:
He is always fair.

MR. TOBIN:
Yes, he is a good minister, and so are you, by the way, a good minister.

MR. SIMMS:
Stop exaggerating now.

MR. TOBIN:
That is exactly how I feel about it and I do not mind saying it.

Mr. Speaker, when I went home last weekend and knew that friends of mine, people that you probably know too, people like John Hanrahan, George Steward, Jim Kelly and all these who have gone to Toronto, and people like Henry Brenton and these who have gone off to New Brunswick - talk about outmigration, Mr. Speaker! - who have worked in the shipyard for ten years - I am sure the member for Bonavista South would know some of the people I just mentioned - had to pack up and leave behind their families and the new homes they have built over the last couple of years, all because this government would not approve or cancelled the second ferry for Bell Island, then I ask myself, where is the fairness and balance, when these people have to leave and go. Where is the fairness and balance?

This is a very serious situation, when a government that went around this Province, prior to the election, and talked about out-migration - when I went home last weekend and I talked to one of my friends who said, 'Two more left, gone to Toronto. They cannot stay home, they have new homes built, they cannot lie around, and they cannot wait for this government,' this is why I asked and I begged this government today to do something to ensure that that shrimp trawler is built in Marystown. It is absolutely necessary for the livelihood of the employees. It is absolutely necessary for the economic conditions to be maintained as they have been. So I beg this government, on behalf of the people of Burin - Placentia West and the Burin Peninsula, Grand Bank and Fortune - Hermitage included, if they would have this vessel constructed at the

Marystown Shipyard.

When I say that, Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of a little story. We talked a few minutes ago about what it used to be like to get social assistance years ago, when we had a district manager, who was my boss for a good many years - Fine man! Great gentleman! - who used to have to send telegrams to St. John's. There were no telephones then. He used to have to send telegrams to St. John's to know if he could get approval for whatever he had to get approved then. The district manager could not approve anything then. In those Liberal Government days it was usually the minister and the deputy minister who approved things.

So he sent in telegram after telegram to try to get it approved and he always got one back and one back. So he finally sent in a telegram and he was begging. The last telegram he sent me and it said, 'With reference to the topic being discussed, if you want me on my knees consider me in that position,' and he got it approved. You would have to go down and basically pray, Mr. Speaker, to have it approved.

MR. SIMMS:
Under the Liberals?

MR. TOBIN:
Under the Liberals, oh yes. So if they want me now to pray, to get down on my knees to them and pray to have the shrimp ferry constructed at Marystown, well then I shall try my hand at that, Mr. Speaker. But it is important and I think the President of Treasury Board realizes the importance of it, and I think the Minister of Development does.

So I will ask all of you, when you collectively make that decision, that you make the decision in the best interests of the employees of the Marystown Shipyard. That is very important. I am sure the Minister of Employment, Mr. Speaker, will be there to make sure that there are jobs here for the Marystown Shipyard. I am sure that she is going to do everything she can to make sure that that shrimp trawler is built in Marystown to create jobs. I believe she will. She only laid off half a dozen so far and she was forced to do that. She will get around to creating jobs, Mr. Speaker.

I sincerely hope that the Premier will, as well, see fit because of the urgency. I ask the Premier as well, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that that shrimp trawler is built in Marystown. As I said to the Minister of Development - he was not here, Mr. Speaker - I appreciated his honesty and openness today on that discussion when I asked him a question. He is committed to the Marystown Shipyard and I hope his colleagues have the same type of commitment. That is where we are going to come from.

Mr. Speaker, there are other issues I want to address. The tax on children's clothing, that unfair tax, that tax, Mr. Speaker, if there was a similar tax form for men, Mr. Speaker, can you imagine what the member for Placentia and I would pay compared to the member for St. Mary's - The Capes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:
Now, Mr. Speaker, that would be an

unfair tax. There is an unfair tax being placed on the children of this Province, extremely unfair, and it should not be tolerated. Government should reverse that decision. Government should reverse that decision and the Minister of Finance should wake up. The Minister of Finance should come in this House, some day when he is not having a nap. I think he sat around that Cabinet table, too, when that decision was being made, having a nap, because that is an unfair tax it is not fair to the children of this Province. It is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and no government, no minister should be too big to acknowledge when something is wrong and make the necessary changes.

I ask the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, if he would look at changing that. The minister should really reverse that decision. I am not sure how much money he would save by it, but what is in the budget, that \$5 million surplus, would deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister of Employment is back.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I thought that was the message that the hon. member was sending me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a great pleasure to rise today to speak on the budget. After listening to what I just heard, I think whatever I contribute to the debate will be at least equal, Mr. Speaker, to the contribution made by the previous member.

Let me say that, Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be on the government side of the House. It is a great pleasure to be over here on this side. You see, some of us were in the former House of Assembly, when a number of members opposite, who presently occupy their seats, were the government of the day. Some people do not remember, but the treatment given members of the Opposition by some of those former ministers, as some of us on this side know, was not the friendliest. Some of them were nice, but others, Mr. Speaker, with their big offices, big bathrooms, and big whatevers, and the big tips and the big limousines and the big you name it, Mr. Speaker, expense accounts flying out of your ears, travelling the world like there was no tomorrow -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Name them. Name them.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I do not need to name them. It was in **The Sunday Express**. The thing is, they were at that for a long time but the people of the Province decided that they had to have some rational thought back in government, good, credible ideas.

I listened to the member for Burin - Placentia West, who used to be the Minister of Social Services, and I must tell him of a recent visit made by the new Minister of Social Services to the Bay St. George area about ten days ago,

when the reaction by social workers after the meeting was something of amazement. A number of them said they had never seen anything like it in fifteen or twenty years, that this minister would come in and sit down and interact with them and take their ideas, and to also have an open-door policy where they can call the minister at any time to discuss any ideas they may have. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, when he was finished talking about some of the ideas he was going to bring in, or this administration is going to bring in, they applauded him and said these measures should have been taken ten years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
That was their reaction.

Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Social Services got good reaction wherever he went in Bay St. George. Of course, in Bay St. George two out of the three seats are Liberal, and that would help the cause, mind you. But, still, the minister is very competent in what he does and I am sure that will be shown by the people of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have a case of culture shock on the other side. You see, they are over there when they did not expect to be there. That is the real problem. I know for a fact that some of the people who had been on this side had never seen our former offices. When they walked into those offices that we occupied for such a long time, I will tell you there were a lot of shocked faces.

But, I say to them, Mr. Speaker,

this government is going to make sure that every member is treated equally and will be provided with good services to do their jobs.

That is the way it should be in 1989; it is not 1949 or 1969, or whatever. We are a government that is going to treat people equally, and it is good to see an administration in place that is finally going to do that.

For the last number of years that has been a problem, and I am glad the people of the Province recognized the fact. Just look at what they left us, Mr. Speaker. They are talking about funding this and funding that. Pension fund liability, \$1.5 billion. Thank you, former government for leaving us that. Now we have to figure out what we are going to do with it, and we are going to try to resolve the problem.

The unemployment rate we were left with, Mr. Speaker, is the highest in Canada, probably the highest in North America; in some regions of the Province, definitely the highest in North America. We thank them for that and we will try to resolve it.

Workers' Compensation, Mr. Speaker, a problem I had to deal with on many occasions during my four years in Opposition. We attempted many times to resolve that problem, and we are definitely going to try to do it now. We took some measures to resolve those problems and we are going to keep working on them. But we were left with many problems in the Workers' Compensation system, which we are going to try to deal with.

Hibernia, Mr. Speaker. We thank them for that. Where does it

stand? We do not know, but we are going to try and get it here; we will be working on that. And we are going to tell the people of the Province what we are doing, we are going to tell them how far along we are, and we will tell them what we can tell them. They need to be told what is happening, not what might be happening or what they might want to hear, especially for political purposes. So we are going to deal with the people of the Province who put us here in a forthright manner, give them proper information, and so on, on the numbers of things we will do.

Mr. Speaker, the Hydro talks are the same way. The member for St. John's south gave an excellent speech just a little while ago where he talked about the hydro deal and the background and so on, and the benefits that came to this Province over twenty years ago, and he put it in perspective very well. And a number of us in this House appreciated his comments. But, as you can see, Mr. Speaker, we were left with quite a legacy, and we have to deal with that legacy. And this government, I am very confident, with its competent people, is going to do that very well. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I think we should commend our government on a good job done over the last seven or eight weeks, since we got here. And while we are trying to check all these problems, I think we should give ourselves a round of applause and a thump on the desk here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEWLETT:

Self-praise is better than none.

MR. SIMMS:

That is the way to get in Cabinet, believe me.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, self-praise equals thirty-one seats compared to twenty-one. I will take self-praise any day of the week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

We have competent people over here who are going to resolve problems and deal with the people of the Province, Mr. Speaker. We are going to have problems as we face those problems, and we are going to try and resolve them. And we will do that, there is no doubt in my mind. I must say, Mr. Speaker, there is a sense of optimism over here and a sense of optimism in the Province. Many people have commended the Premier and this government on the new Economic Recovery Commission that has been instituted, a very good move. As a matter of fact, over on the West Coast many people are praising it and saying it is the way to go, and around the province I am sure they are doing the same thing. I think what we see on the other side is envy, Mr. Speaker, because they never thought about it first. We decided what we were going to do and we are going to put these ideas in place and try to resolve the problems. There is a bit of envy, but that is all you can do, Mr. Speaker. It is understandable. They never thought they would be over there. But they are over there, and that is all you can do.

We will accept suggestions, Mr. Speaker, from members opposite at any time for the economic recovery of the Province or any other issue. The only problem is we

might not take every step they want us to take, because some of the steps they took previously did not exactly work.

Mr. Speaker, we intend doing things as best we can. We will make mistakes along the way, granted, but the initiative is here and the energy of our members is excellent.

I think many people have said that this government caucus is probably one of the best they have seen in many years. I think we are going to see some positive changes over the coming weeks and coming years, as we are the new administration for a long time to come.

Mr. Speaker, for a young man from Stephenville who has been in this hon. House four years now, it is a great pleasure to hold up this red budget document, 1989, and see this nice red Liberal wave which has swept the Province now sitting in the House of Assembly. It is a very thick document, I might add, with a lot of good ideas, a lot more ideas than the previous administration's budget speeches or, for that matter, any other document they put forward when it came to good ideas.

Mr. Speaker, when we were in Opposition a number of us used to give them constructive criticism, very constructive criticism, as a matter of fact. We expect the same from the other side and I hope we will get it. If you have a good Opposition, Mr. Speaker, you will have a good government, and if we have a good government the people of the Province will be the beneficiaries of that. So I encourage members opposite to be a good Opposition. But, Mr. Speaker, we will have to sit and wait to see what happens, because,

thus far, we have not seen a whole lot but I am sure it will come.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also say that I thank the people of Stephenville for returning me to this humble abode here, this wonderful place, this House of Assembly, which I think is the best institution you can aspire to. Politics, in Newfoundland especially, is something that is in the blood of a lot of people. I want to say to the people of Stephenville that for their faith in me I will try to do a good job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the great district of Stephenville has come a long way. I must say things are starting to pick up. Only recently we saw Air Canada leave, but now we have a new airline coming in, First Air, as was announced yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

The joint resolution was one of the main reasons.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

This joint resolution was one of the things.

We have a 727 jet service, Mr. Speaker, that will be starting in Stephenville sometime within the next couple of months. I want to give credit to the community committee that was struck in the Stephenville and Bay St. George areas which came to our aid when this proposed disaster of Air Canada leaving was announced.

The people of that area, like the people of Newfoundland and

Labrador, Mr. Speaker, decided to get together, put their energies to work, and put a plan of action together. I must say it is excellent for those people and for all of us in this Province to see, when hard work is put into something, that there is a reward, that you can achieve something as a group. So I commend the people of that committee and the people of the Stephenville area for their hard work and their good faith. The battle is not over. We have to keep lobbying like we always do, but again it is good to see some good news coming through after Air Canada blatantly pulled out of Gander and Stephenville without even any notification or anything else. It is good to see that we have a positive announcement on that.

I have been involved with that committee, as the member for Port au Port has been. He has contributed a great deal to it, as did the former member for St. George's, who was also involved with that. So there was good, non-partisan effort put into this. We are going to continue those good efforts, Mr. Speaker, over the coming months.

Also in Stephenville, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things that I just want to touch on. The Stephenville Festival will be starting its eleventh year within the next couple of weeks, and this government, and members opposite, as a matter of fact, support the Stephenville Festival. That is much appreciated. I am extending an invitation to all members of this House to come to the opening night on July 15th. We are going to be bringing out ministers and many members and so on, and we are going to be starting off the festival in fine fashion. It is a

great tourist attraction which has been built up over the years, and we are going to continue to build that with this government and our Minister of Development, our Minister of Tourism, and our Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the wealth of talent on this side is just unbelievable. I said in my maiden speech, Mr. Speaker, 'unreal'. Well, I have to say it again. The talent over here is unreal. It is just unreal, Mr. Speaker. We have a good government. We are going to be putting forward lots of good ideas, and we are going to see a lot of good things coming.

I heard the member for Mount Pearl talking about Meech Lake and our stand on Meech Lake and how that is going to affect our hydro talks with Quebec. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, if we are going to be frightened off because we are taking a stand for this Province and the future of this Province, then, I think, we have to decide where we are going in the future. The Meech Lake Accord, Mr. Speaker, with this distinct society clause amongst others, needs to be re-evaluated, and I think that is the general consensus of most Canadians in Canada today. We, as a government, have to look at Newfoundland's role in Confederation in the future. I think, myself, the Meech Lake Accord is a disaster recipe, and I think we are going to see things happen in the future that will break down this great country if we let it go ahead.

I think the consensus is building that Meech Lake should be reviewed and be re-evaluated. The member for Mount Pearl talks about all

these negotiations that went on, all these great talks and everything else, about Hydro. I used to be in Stephenville, sitting in my House watching the news, and I used to see the minister come on and say, 'We are that close. We are almost there. Just another month to go.' But they were so far away, Mr. Speaker, I do not even know if they were even in the same room in the last six months. Even if they were, the expectation put to people was politically motivated so that these people, would say, Oh, here they come! Here come the Tories. They are going to get this agreement now. And we are all supposed to be scared to death and everything else. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, for the member for Mount Pearl to get up and say because of our stand on Meech Lake we are not going to be able to negotiate a hydro deal. I think that is just being purely political and is not looking at the reality of what we are going to be dealing with. The Meech Lake Accord is a separate issue. We took a stand on that here in this House of Assembly. As a matter of fact, the present Minister of Development, when we were in Opposition, put forward an amendment for a distinct society clause which would have seen Newfoundland being looked upon as a distinct society along with all the other provinces, which would have made every province equal, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite, who were at the time the government, voted against that; they voted against Newfoundland being a distinct society within Confederation. We know where they are and we know where they are going, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you I am glad I am over here.

We have a lot of work to do: We

have the Meech Lake Accord to deal with, we have hydro talks to deal with, we have mining, and we have educational issues to deal with. We have educational issues which are important in this Province. There are labour issues we have been left with to deal with.

In education we have seen an increase in the budget for school construction this year, an excellent increase, welcomed by many people. We have seen a teacher aid program, which has been needed for many years. We are finally seeing something come together with that. I received some pleasant phone calls, Mr. Speaker, about the need for it and people really appreciate the fact that this government was able to make a move as quickly as they did. You know, Mr. Speaker, that brings me to a point: What I am finding is that people are amazed and they are asking me, how were you able to make some of these moves so fast? I mean, you are correcting problems that have been there for so long.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

We just got here. We are trying to make some changes. We are going to change as much as we can. I know we are good and all that, but you can only do so much with so much time. But, it is starting to happen, Mr. Speaker.

A lot of business people out there are saying this government and this Province are moving, but we have to be given a little bit of time, just a little bit of time. Maybe by next year we will have unemployment down a little farther. And social assistance recipients in this Province will

be treated better; they will have more money in their pockets. Educational issues will be dealt with and we will be working towards new themes for the 1990s. The same with labour relations and development and attracting business. The same with the environment and the fisheries, especially. We have a very confident minister here now, and a new administration that is going to deal with those issues, especially the fisheries issue, Mr. Speaker, and offshore control. We are proposing a Canada/Newfoundland offshore fisheries board which would see joint management of the resource and joint consultation to deal with the problems, an idea put forward by the Premier. I think it is an excellent one, which should be accepted by the federal government. I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that these things were recognized. These are good initiatives, but I must say I have to give a good deal of praise to the Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Courage, conviction, and all of those adjectives I do not think do justice to the gentleman. If I had to face the books he had to, Mr. Speaker, unfunded liabilities, \$1.5 billion, and deficits in this account, and deficit in that account, I do not know, Mr. Speaker, but I think it would be a hard to deal with. But he had done a commendable job in the very short time he has been there, a very commendable job. I look forward to the future, Mr. Speaker. We have a gentleman as Minister of Finance who is taking his job very seriously and is going to ensure that the finances

of the Province are moved towards a level where the financiers of the world can look at Newfoundland and Labrador and say, That Province has its act together. And I think our Minister of Finance is well on the road to putting this Province on the road to recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I must say also this, that the people who have been appointed to the Economic Recovery Commission are excellent. I think they have some great ideas. The Advisory Board which has been put forward, with Mr. Harold Lundrigan as Chairman, it is excellent. I think it is going to come up with some good ideas; the business community working together in an non-political, non-partisan fashion to see if we can resolve our problems.

That idea we came up with was such a good idea, it is really burning people on the other side. I think that is what it is. But that is okay, because we have a lot more good ideas to come. But we will give credit where credit is due, and if they are thrown from the other side, I have no problem with that. We will take it and we will see what we can do it it. We have some good ideas. These are just a few. I can speak for three hours on the budget, Mr. Speaker, because there are so many things we are trying to fix. We will be the first to admit that we are not going to fix them all. We have already admitted it. As a matter of fact, the Premier has being asked questions by the Leader of the Opposition and he gets up and says, We are trying to fix them. But he still keeps asking us, can you do it today? Give us a chance. We are going to do it, but it is a long road, Mr. Speaker. And we are going to make

sure that we work hard, and the people of the Province will have great respect for this government when their concerns are put forward and they are addressed in a straightforward fashion. I have a great deal of confidence in this administration. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the confidence I have is out there also, and in the next election the popular vote for the Liberal Party is going to go right through the ceiling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I remember the former Premier used to get up and talk about how we were going to get wiped out in the next election. We were not going to have a chance; he said they would keep us four or five seats so there would have an Opposition. But how she changes, Mr. Speaker. How the world comes around to see you again. And I tell you it is going to be very interesting to see what happens in the future. I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the Province are thanking their lucky stars that a new government has taken power, with new ideas, a lot of new energy, and none of these old ideas they used to have, Mr. Speaker, and their ways of doing things.

It is unbelievable! Mr. Speaker, we are still discovering things, absolute craziness, that used to go on. It is going to take us six months just to grab hold of the thing. I mean, it was running away from everybody. Now we have to grab it all back to have a look. It is absolute craziness! They are saying fix this today and fix that today. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are going to fix it all right, and when we do the

people of the Province are going to return us again because we are doing such a good job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

And there are a lot more Liberal budget speeches to come, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that right now - bright red! I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, why people can have confidence, and then I will adjourn this debate: The last budget speech of the former administration, does anybody know what the picture on the front cover was?

AN HON. MEMBER:

I remember it well.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The Sprung greenhouse, Mr. Speaker, was the picture on the former budget speech.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are kidding! You are kidding!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Oh, yes. Oh, yes! Held up, Mr. Speaker, for all to see. There it is, right there. That was the shining star of the former administration, held out, Mr. Speaker. The hon. former Premier talked about the technology and talked about fifty-two of them, all over the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I hate to sit down, Mr. Speaker, but I will adjourn the debate until the next day. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to advise hon. members that the Estimates Committees are proceeding well. This evening the Social Services Committee will meet here in the House to examine the Estimates of the Department of Social Services.

Wednesday morning, at 9:00 a.m., the Resource Committee will meet to examine the Estimates of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture.

Wednesday in the p.m. there are two Committee meetings: the Department of Justice will be examined in the House, and the Department of Finance at the Colonial Building.

On Thursday evening Municipal Affairs will be the Department under scrutiny in the Estimates Committee, in the House.

This is the schedule. I think this will take care of one three-hour session with each Department. That is what that in effect will do.

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, Wednesday, June 21, 1989, at 2:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

June 20, 1989

*Tabled by Hon.
Minister of
Education 20 June '89.*

ORDER PAPER 11/89

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14TH, 1989

QUESTION # 22:

MR. LEN SIMMS (GRAND FALLS) - TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION TO LAY UPON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

AN ITEMIZED LIST OF EXPENDITURES INCURRED BY THE MINISTER, HIS EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT OR ANY OTHER MEMBER OF THE MINISTER'S PERSONAL OR DEPARTMENTAL STAFF WHO MAY HAVE ACCOMPANIED HIM SINCE MAY 5, 1989

ANSWER:

SINCE MAY 5, 1989, I HAVE MADE TWO TRIPS TO GANDER AS FOLLOWS:

MAY 6, 1989 - ST. JOHN'S TO GANDER TO SPEAK TO THE NEWFOUNDLAND HOME & SCHOOL ASSOCIATION - TOTAL COST - \$269.20.

MAY 10, 1989 - ST. JOHN'S TO GANDER TO SPEAK AT THE OPENING OF THE NEWFOUNDLAND & LABRADOR ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES - TOTAL COST - \$259.20 -

I WAS NOT ACCOMPANIED BY ANY OTHER PERSON ON EITHER TRIP.