



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 23

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Friday

[Preliminary Transcript]

30 June 1989

The House met at 9:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, sometime last year the former government created a committee to review the operations of the Public Utilities Board. That committee consisted of the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Gordon MacDonald, Mr. John McCarthy, Director of the Civil Law Division of the Department of Justice, and Mr. Bruce Peckford, who was at that time the Assistant Secretary (Financial) of the Treasury Board Secretariat. The committee did its assessment and filed its report in January of this year.

I intend, Mr. Speaker, to release the report at this time because I think there is a great deal of merit in what is in the committee's recommendations and the government wants to give it full consideration over the next few months with a view to presenting legislation to the House during the Fall sitting to implement some or all of the recommendations. In order to allow for the greatest level of public discussion and consideration of these issues, and to allow all hon. members to consider it, we would like to release the report at this time and sometime over the course of this Summer or early Fall if we have it ready by that time, we will release draft legislation that also can be considered by the

public.

Mr. Speaker, I am also advised that the printers are not quite ready, it will probably be another hour or so before there will be copies for hon. members. But copies will be made available for all hon. members and now I table the report.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am rising under Statements by Ministers to point out that the government has decided to form Legislation Review Committees. These committees will sit at a time convenient to them,, whether the House is sitting, or not sitting and will review legislation in the three areas of social matters, resource matters and government services. These Legislation Review Committees are an attempt by government to make the legislative process more meaningful, first of all to members of the House but, more importantly, to the general public. There are many pieces of legislation that go through this hon. House that are of major importance to the various groups in the Province, and this will provide an opportunity for legislation to be examined prior to discussions in the House so that we never get into the situation where, all of a sudden, because of time constraints or something else, major pieces of legislation get rushed through the House, as has happened in the past, without adequate discussion both in the House and in the general public. So we see a very important function to be served by

these Legislation Review Committees and we think it is important for the proper functioning of Legislature, and it is important for the general public to have a better grasp of what is going on in this House.

I do not have a prepared statement, but I have had discussions with the Opposition on this matter and I would also like to announce today that the Social Legislation Review Committee will be made up of the member for Carbonear (Mr. Reid), Chairman, the member for Humber East (Ms Verge), Vice-Chairman, and the members for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Langdon), St. George's (Mr. Short), and Harbour Grace (Mr. Crane).

The Resource Legislative Review Committee: The member for Bonavista South (Mr. Grover), Chairman, the member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford), Vice Chairman, and the members for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), Mount Scio-Bell Island (Mr. Walsh), and Lewisporte (Mr. Penney). The Government Services Legislation Review Committee: The member for St. John's South (Mr. Murphy), Chairman, the member for Kilbride (Mr. R. Aylward), Vice Chairman, and the members for St. John's East (Ms Duff), Pleasantville (Mr. Noel), and LaPoile (Mr. Ramsay). These committees will operate, in the interim, as the regular standing committees of the House. In the very near future, perhaps within the next two weeks I will ask for a meeting of all committees together, and the Opposition House Leader, where we will go over with committee members further ground rules in terms of the operation of the committees. This is an experiment which has to be done by

leave because it is not covered under our Standing Orders. So I ask permission of the House to establish these committees and I will table the membership.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again the government is asking for more leave, by agreement, and I do not know if this is ever going to end. Anyway, they better get it all in as often as they can because over the next few weeks they will have lots of opportunity to ask for more agreements. In a more serious vein, let me say on this side we certainly welcome this initiative. In fact, I believe it was also a proposal of the Leader of the Opposition when he was Premier, he indicated a number of occasions that this is an initiative he would like to see employed. Certainly, many of us on this side have supported the idea for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the fact that it will give members of the Legislature, particularly private members, more input into the process and, probably more importantly, it will give the public better opportunity for input into legislation.

The only thing that I would stress to the Government House Leader in his deliberations, and perhaps we should even include it here because I would want to make certain that this is possible, is that these committees have the authority to travel, not to excess or anything like that, but that they have the authority to make the decision that if they wish to go to the West Coast or Central

Newfoundland to have a day-long meeting, where the public can come in and have input and make presentations to that committee on any particular piece of legislation, then they should have that authority. So I hope that that is a foregone conclusion, not one that would have to be argued.

And the other thing is I think the Government House Leader would want to have authority and agreement now to refer legislation that may come up between now and when the House opens again in the Fall. Normally, you would have to give notice of legislation beforehand, but we can do it by agreement. I am sure he just neglected to mention that, but I do think he wants that authority and, in advance of his asking for it, we now indicate to him that we are prepared to give that authority. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, we welcome the initiative and I second the motion to strike these committees.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I first of all intended to announce the committees and get them accepted, and I was later on going to make a motion with regard to the referral of legislation as it becomes available. I will now do that, Your Honour, and move that as legislation becomes available it be referred to the appropriate committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

All hon. members have heard the motion. All in agreement, 'Aye.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Contrary, 'Nay.' Carried.

Oral Questions

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, for the record, I wonder could the Premier inform the House whether or not the government - I assume the answer would be an unequivocal yes - remains committed in every respect to the territorial integrity of Newfoundland and Labrador as it was when we became a Province in 1949, in other words, the Island part of the Province and the Labrador part together forming the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

There is only one way to answer it and that is with, I suppose, a simple yes. But I have gone back and examined the 1927 Privy Council decision and I am not sure that the Southern boundary of Labrador should be as it is. Frankly, I think that whole Quebec North Shore, from Blanc-Sablon West along the St. Lawrence River to the Rivière St. Jean should really be part of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

But, Mr. Speaker, recognizing that the decision was made by the Privy Council some sixty years ago, and that we signed the Terms of Union with that precise boundary of Labrador, it is not really

practical to pursue the acquisition by this Province of that territory along the North Shore of the St. Lawrence west to the Rivière St. Jean at this time. So I remain committed to the integrity of it as it is now.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously we share the Premier's views on Southern Labrador as well. But let me ask the Premier this: Is the Premier aware -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

This is a very serious matter.

- that on April 25 past, the Government of Canada, the Government of Quebec, and a Quebec Indian Band Council signed a framework for negotiations for a land claim settlement that includes a very, very significant portion of Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

The Leader of the Opposition, I think, Mr. Speaker, must be talking about the Montagnais framework agreement. I believe the framework agreement was signed last year, but there was an additional agreement, an interim arrangements agreement.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Interim arrangements, that is right.

PREMIER WELLS:

Okay, so it is not the framework

agreement. The framework agreement was signed last year. The interim measures agreement was signed and that followed on the framework agreement. And that really provides, I believe, for the applications of Quebec law on an interim basis while the negotiations are being provided. I have not yet reviewed the agreement in detail, Mr. Speaker. I have been too busy providing for the proper management of government within the Province and getting the budget through and all of the other things that need to be done.

But I can assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that the officials in my office are aware of it. They are plotting on a map the co-ordinates that are given so as to see what in fact was done, and I will be raising it with the Government of Canada because of the Government of Canada was also a party to that agreement. The Government of Canada, the Government of Quebec and the Montagnais Council signed the agreement. And I will be raising it in due course with the Government of Canada. But it is about as effective, Mr. Speaker, as my agreeing that some group could manage the West End of the Island of Montreal. It would have about the same effect to the extent that it comes anywhere within the boundaries of Newfoundland.

What is unacceptable about it is the affront that it constitutes to Newfoundland and to the people of Newfoundland for any government to pretend to exercise authority or make decisions or enter into agreements with respect to the territory of this Province. That is unacceptable. I can only assume, and I have not dealt with it yet, that whoever signed it on

behalf of the Government of Canada, and I do not know who did, did not know what he was doing.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, yes, the office is attending to it and in due course I will address the matter with the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the fact that the Premier has been busy, but this is a very serious matter and it is certainly an affront to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and the maps provided with the signed interim measures arrangement includes Mealy Mountain, the Goose Bay area, part of the Churchill area, a real significant part of Labrador.

PREMIER WELLS:

Table the map.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I will send the map over to the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Table it.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, table it.

My question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, is this: Is the Premier going to, like yesterday demand that the Government of Canada, which is a signator to this interim measures arrangement, respect the territorial integrity of Newfoundland and Labrador, and demand that the Government of Canada do whatever they have to do to make sure that this interim measures arrangement is declared null and void, and that the

Government of Canada or the Government of Quebec or Indians in Quebec cannot lay any claim to any territory that belongs to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Am I going to address it? Absolutely, not question about it. There is no question that I am going to address it properly. Am I going to panic? No, Mr. Speaker, I am going to address it in the proper way.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Are you going to demand that this be declared null and void, or what?

PREMIER WELLS:

Well, I am going to look at exactly what was done. But, of course, if that is what is represented, but I do not accept what the Leader of the Opposition says; I have to take a look at the details of the agreement. I do not accept what he says that this is agreed to be part of Quebec territory. I do not think the agreement says that.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It is part of the negotiations.

PREMIER WELLS:

It may be that what is seen here, and I have to examine the detail of it, is an acknowledgement of the area in which the Montagnais have operated in the past, but it has nothing to do with the area in respect of which the Government of Quebec and the Government of Canada can negotiate with the Montagnais Indians. So it may be

simply an acknowledgement of the area in which the Montagnais operated. I mean, you cannot deny facts of history, there is no sense fighting facts. If that is where the Montagnais operated, that is okay. But that does not give the Government of Canada and the Government of Quebec the right to negotiate in respect of that territory.

I do not think that the agreement says that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question on the same issue to the Premier. I will quote, Mr. Speaker, for Hansard, a copy of the letter that I received from the Deputy Secretary General of the Province of Quebec. It says, "Please find attached as promised a copy of the Agreement of Interim Measures that was signed on April 25, 1989, between the Quebec Government, the Federal Government and the Montagnais Council. I have also attached for your information a copy of a map indicating the territory sought by Le Conseil Attikamek - Montagnais. Mr. Speaker, that is the map that the Premier just got there.

The federal and Quebec governments have signed, and all the signature are on this paper and I will table it. Although it is all in French, hopefully somebody can translate it. It is signed by Georges Bacon, Edmond Malec, Jean-Rock Picard and Marc Dubé, for the Indian Council of Quebec, and signed by Pierre Cadieux and Kim Campbell, ministers from the

federal government, and by Raymond Savoie and Gil Rémillard, ministers of Quebec. Now this is the agreement that has been signed Mr. Speaker.

I want to ask the Premier a question: Seeing that this territory does include the watershed of the Churchill River, and here we are in very exciting negotiations with Quebec on the Lower Churchill and other rivers, would the Premier think that this could be another snag in the whole development of the Lower Churchill?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing is a classic distortion of facts to try and create some controversy, and the hon. member should not really do that.

MR. WARREN:

It is a serious matter.

PREMIER WELLS:

Of course it is a serious matter! But nobody will deny, though not necessarily agree, that that is the area the Montagnais claim they have operated in from time immemorial.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The Government of Canada have no right to even negotiate that.

PREMIER WELLS:

There is nothing that indicates they are negotiating that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, what hon. members are overlooking is that in early 1988 the Montagnais who are claiming

this came to this Province, they came to St. John's, to announce their claim in respect of the territory that is contained within the borders of Labrador. We know that so we are going to deal with that. What the hon. member is trying to lead the Province to believe is that the Government of Quebec and the Government of Canada are up there negotiating with the Montagnais Indians for their rights in respect of this whole territory down to Goose Bay, including the Churchill River watershed, and that is a complete distortion, to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. We have the English version of the agreement, we do not have to rely on the French version. The officials have obtained the English versions, they are reviewing the whole thing, and in due course, and in a proper way, the government of this Province will make known to the Government of Quebec, the Government of Canada and the Montagnais exactly what the situation is and exactly what our position is with respect to it. What the hon. member did not say, in his haste to create a great furor over this, is that when you read the actual agreement, and read the co-ordinates in respect of which they are negotiating, which they have agreed that the interim measures will apply to - I do not know that they are negotiating in respect of it, but they have agreed that this interim measures agreement will apply - in fact it does infringe on a portion of Western Labrador, but nothing like the hon. member is talking about here. When you plot the co-ordinates they have agreed in respect of which the interim measures will apply, it does go into an area. This is what my officials have told me, the matter

is being reviewed now, and as soon as the review is complete the government will take the appropriate steps to respond accordingly. It is well in hand, I can assure the House and all hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would have liked to keep this until the end of Question Period, but it has happened a couple of times and it needs to be dealt with now. I thought the Premier was a little long in dealing with that question, but it was difficult because hon. members to my right were asking questions as he proceeded to answer. When hon. members do that they must expect the person responding to be longer. To help the Chair, and to ensure that the questions are more precise, please refrain from asking questions while the person being questioned is responding.

Thank you.

The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

I also have a question for the hon. the Premier. Before I ask the question I will declare a personal interest in this question, being a member of the Association of Newfoundland Land Surveyors, so it will not be considered a conflict of interest. It is a fact that the only interprovincial, interstate boundary in North American that has never been physically laid on the ground, or surveyed, is the boundary between Newfoundland and Quebec in the Labrador region. This problem here points out one of the problems that could exist

because there is no exact boundary measured. There is another very significant precious metals fine in the Labrador West area which will, I suppose, over time mean millions and millions of dollars of royalty either to Newfoundland or to Quebec. Both of these problems highlight the fact that there is no actual survey or marked boundary between Quebec and Labrador. Over the past few years the Association of Newfoundland Land Surveyors and the Quebec Association of Land Surveyors have met on this and they are trying to get an agreement between the governments. Quebec has not been too co-operative on it. Would the Premier ask his Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Kelland) if he would meet with the Association of Newfoundland Land Surveyors and get some background on this and try to get some negotiations going again with the Quebec government to see if there is some possibility of having the only unmarked interprovincial boundary in North America marked?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

I do not see the particular significance of meeting at this time with the Association of Newfoundland Land Surveyors. If there is some arrangement to be negotiated with the Government of Quebec with respect to a joint agreement to survey and mark on the ground the actual boundary, that may well be worth proceeding with. I do not see the necessity of meeting with the Association of Newfoundland Land Surveyors at this time, as much respect as I have for that group.

Mr. Speaker, that matter, along with a great many others that the

government has not yet considered, will be taken into account in due course.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

In view of the section in The City Of Mount Pearl Act which states that the council may establish, operate and maintain a fire department, and so forth, which gives the city full authority to own and operate a fire department, in fact not only authority, Mr. Speaker, but the responsibility to do so, and in view of the fact that the previous government gave the City of Mount Pearl permission to build a fire station and gave them permission to purchase two fire trucks, which are on site, will the minister, please, now confirm that he will permit the city to proceed to hire the staff and to establish a fire department to protect the City of Mount Pearl, in view of the fact that a report done by the Department of Justice and the Fire Department of the City of St. John's has confirmed that the City of Mount Pearl does not now have adequate fire protection? Will he ensure this House that he will do nothing to delay the implementation of a fire department in Mount Pearl?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

First of all, I welcome the hon.

member back to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I have written to the City of Mount Pearl in some detail asking them to hold off on any further action towards setting up and firming up a complete fire department, with more equipment and so on, a fire chief and staff and whatever, because I am very, very concerned, even though they have the right to do so, that any one council would decide to proceed on its own to form a fire department with such a large number of people, 22,000 people I believe, and the fact that that fire station has to be co-ordinated with all the other stations in the St. John's area, proper response times have to be maintained and the entire co-ordination has to be done on a regional basis. When I say on a regional basis, certainly in the sense of St. John's - Mount Pearl, as is presently being done. I have concerns about that.

The Clarkson Gordon study on the fire department for the North East Avalon Region has to be dealt with and dealt with reasonably soon, over the next few months. Until a decision is made as to how to properly establish fire fighting services in the North East Avalon, I think it unwise for any one municipality to proceed on its own, and I have so advised the City of Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker:

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

I thank the hon. gentleman for his welcome back to the House. I point out that I have already made a bigger contribution this morning than the Minister of Finance has made since the House opened, so if you want to talk about who is contributing to the House of Assembly!

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a cop-out of the first order. Will the minister please tell this House how he can justify the fact that the City of Mount Pearl is paying about \$500,000 a year more than they need to for a service in the City of St. John's which the Fire Department and the Department of Justice report has already shown is not an adequate service, that the people of Mount Pearl are not getting proper protection, when they can have their own fire department in the City of Mount Pearl, which was approved by the previous government at a cost of about \$500,000 less per year, that the response time can be less than one-half, and that we can have an emergency response vehicle? And will the hon. minister also tell us why he is interfering with an application from the City of Mount Pearl to the Federal Emergency Measures Operation to receive such a response vehicle under the same program as applies to every other municipality in this Province? Why is he taking this action against the City of Mount Pearl? Would he like to explain that to his constituents?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The member quite rightly states

that some of the constituents in Mount Pearl, about one-third of Mount Pearl I believe, are my constituents in Waterford - Kenmount. So I have a vested interest, if you like, in Mount Pearl, needless to say.

Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. member that my prime duty, as the minister responsible for the fire fighting services and facilities in the North East Avalon, is the safety of the people. I have said that to the City Council of Mount Pearl. I have said it in session with them and I have said it in a letter to them. I have cautioned them that I do not want them to proceed any further until we have dealt with the Clarkson Gordon study. There is no evidence that I have seen of an over expenditure, an excess amount needed, \$500,000 as he quotes it.

We are studying the Clarkson Gordon Report. We are making sure that before we bring down a recommendation to the government as to how to proceed with the North East Avalon fire fighting facilities and services, whether it be on a regional basis or otherwise, that we are satisfied, using the report as a guideline, that the proper fire fighting facilities can be put in place, proper response times are maintained and stations are located in such a way that there is no danger to any one municipality.

Now, in the meantime, I do not want any municipality to proceed on their own. Even though you are right, they have the right to do so, I am asking them not to do so.

Now, as far as the emergency response vehicle is concerned, because the budget is not

finalized we have made no decision on fire fighting equipment at all. We have requests from all over the Island. We have not responded to those requests.

MR. WINDSOR:

It has nothing to do with it.

MR. GULLAGE:

It has a lot to do with it.

So to say that I have denied a request is not accurate. I have not responded to the City of Mount Pearl in any fashion as far as an emergency response vehicle is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I will give the hon. gentleman the benefit of the doubt. He is misleading the House. I am sure he is not doing that intentionally. I wish I had a copy of the letter with me this morning which he sent to the City of Mount Pearl last week telling them that he had interceded with the Emergency Measures Organization. That has nothing to do with your 75/25 fire equipment program. It is under the Emergency Measures Organization, a different program. No provincial funding.

Now, what right does the minister have, Mr. Speaker, to interfere in a valid application from the City of Mount Pearl to the Emergency Measures Organization?

I want to say to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker, that the report shows very clearly that the City of Mount Pearl does not now have adequate fire protection. The Clarkson Gordon report

confirms a study that was done by Gar Pynn and several others which says that the City of Mount Pearl -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

No. If you want the same fire protection as downtown Bronx, which the gentleman who did that Clarkson Gordon study is trying to give us, if you want to go from having seven people respond from Brookfield Road in about fifteen to twenty minutes or do you want to go to seventeen people responding from Mount Pearl in six minutes, not thirty-four people, which is what the Clarkson Gordon Report wants to recommend, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about adequate fire protection here.

What is being suggested by the City of Mount Pearl is equivalent to the City of London, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:
I will finish my question.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Two points I want to make here to the hon. member. On two occasions he spoke without my recognizing him, but I know it is a serious topic and I know the hon. member is interested and eager to his question off. So I just remind the hon. member to wait until I recognize him before the hon. member speaks.

Secondly, he is on a supplementary and should proceed to get to the question quickly.

MR. WINDSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I apologize for being too anxious this morning.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Three times in a row. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I simply ask the minister - I want to put him on notice that if there is a serious fire and a death in Mount Pearl and something happens as a result of his slowing down the implementation of that fire department, he will be held responsible - will he not do anything to stop the City of Mount Pearl from having their own fire department, will he not do anything to force them into a regional government without the approval of the people of Mount Pearl through a plebiscite?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, in no way am I slowing down anything. What I am doing is following the correct process that I think should be followed in this instance because of the importance of it.

Getting back to the response vehicle, I thought the hon. member was referring to a request from the City of Mount Pearl for additional fire fighting equipment, an additional vehicle. In fact, if the station is to be established, they would need another piece of equipment which would come under our program. However, if he is talking about

the emergency response vehicle, all I have really cautioned them about is I do not want them to proceed in firming up and establishing a full-fledged fire department, with a fire chief and staff and so on, until we deal with the Clarkson Gordon Study.

Now, as to the danger to the people of Mount Pearl, we still have a fire fighting service in existence. The St. John's Fire Department is still operating. You can say that the Clarkson Gordon Report does not speak to the problem, but it certainly is a comprehensive study that has been done and we are using that as a guideline only to proceed to make a recommendation to government as to how we should proceed in this region.

All I am saying to Mount Pearl, all I have said to them is I do not want you to firm up and continue to purchase equipment, hire staff and so on, in isolation to the fact that we have a fire department in existence right now, with staff in existence right now and services in existence right now. We have to respect that and deal with that and make a decision on this region before we proceed with setting up fire departments in Mount Pearl or elsewhere.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WINSOR:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. The minister has announced that five year plans

for municipalities have to be in by the end of August. At the same time the minister has shifted opinions on whether there is going to be amalgamation or regional services. He has an aura of confusion in the municipalities. He tells us we have a list of municipalities that are slated for amalgamation, yet he tells the communities to do up five year plans, communities that might not exist at the end of August. Can the minister now table the list and tell the communities what exactly he has in store for them for this year?

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, letters are prepared now, as a matter of fact they are ready for my signature to go out to all of the municipalities advising them, which I have already done in this House, that August 31 is the date that we would like them to consider as a deadline, if you like, to have revisions to their five year plans or ten year plans, or whatever, revisions to those plans, if they are going to make any. If they are going to change their plans in any way, have those revisions into the department by August 31. We can then have our officials, have the committee, prioritize the list, so hopefully by October or November we can announce the capital works for 1990. That is the intention. That is what I have stated. And I would think that the municipalities involved will do that.

In respect to the other part of

the question, as far as amalgamations are concerned, yes, we are prioritizing the list down further. I do not believe we are going to go anywhere near to 170 communities, it might be 150 or it might be 120. We want to be sure, before we proceed to sit down with all the mayors and councils involved, that we, in fact, are intending to proceed and to discuss amalgamation if these communities are the ones that are viable and on a priority basis should be done.

MR. SIMMS:

Are you going to table that list?

MR. GULLAGE:

Yes, I said I would.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

When? When?

MR. GULLAGE:

It is not finalized.

We are still in the process of doing that. You can understand you just do not simply take a list of 170 communities; with the detail and the study and the time, the meetings it takes to make sure that amalgamation is the proper thing, everything has to be looked at. We have to look at the tax bases of the various towns involved. We have to look at their debt. We have to look at their plans and decide whether or not amalgamation should be recommended and should be discussed with these towns. So we are in the process now of doing that. And as soon as we decide on the final list, we will be advising these communities, we will be discussing it with them on an interim basis to start, discussing with the mayors and councillors involved the idea of amalgamation, and then proceeding

from there with dialogue that we hope will bring about amalgamations throughout the Province in a large number of communities. I do not think it is going to be 170, but certainly a large number of communities will be recommended for amalgamation, many of which, by the way, have already expressed interest to me, have come to me and said that they are interested in becoming amalgamated.

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The minister alluded to the fact that he has considered financial considerations with this. Could he now tell the House exactly what kind of financial plans are in place when we consolidate two or three communities, since all communities share unequally in their debt load?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, we have various communities side by side throughout the Province that have different mil rates, different poll tax, different water and sewer rates levied, and so on. We have to look at that, we cannot ignore that. When we are talking to the communities involved, we have to be sure that when we are discussing amalgamation, discussing the idea of their going together, we can talk to them about their mil rate, talk to them about their debt load, talk to

them about common facilities that they may want, such as a fire hall in one case. We may have three communities with three separate fire halls, and they would certainly have three separate town halls, I would think. So we have to discuss the idea of where the potential single town hall would be, where the fire hall should probably be established, and what should be done with the other facilities, whether they should be turned into a community center or whatever. So there are many implications, and we want to be prepared before we go out there to talk about these various aspects of amalgamation, not just go out there and not know anything about the towns involved.

MR. SIMMS:

Forced resettlement all over again.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

I have a question for the Premier about the Hughes Public Inquiries into the response of the criminal justice and the child welfare authorities to complaints, particularly complaints about child abuse at Mount Cashel in the mid-1970s.

One of the first moves of the new government was to strip the commission of the power it was given in its original terms of reference to make recommendations about compensation to victims. Now, we understand that the government has denied a request by Shane Earle and other victims for payment of legal fees for them to

be represented by counsel before the Inquiry.

How can the Premier justify the interest of victims being ignored in these ways? How can the Premier call himself fair and liberal and treat victims in this way?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Without any difficulty at all. It is a matter of making sure that the commission had the right power to explore everything, including the administration of the department of which the member was formally a minister, which was not included under the former government's proposal, which was just an Inquiry into the Mount Cashel claims and the involvement of the Department of Justice in Mount Cashel. We broadened it to provide for an inquiry into the extent to which the operation of the criminal justice system - any part of it; the Department of Justice, the courts, the police or anybody - failed the public of this Province in catching at an early stage the kind of child abuse that took place, and seeing that the people involved were apprehended and prosecuted. So we broadened it to give greater powers, not constricting them.

We did eliminate the invitation to the commissioner to make recommendations with respect to compensation. That is an entirely different matter and it is a matter for the application of the criminal injuries compensation law, it is a matter for people who are injured exercising their normal rights under the law through the court system. So those things are already in place.

so that was why that was done.

Secondly, with respect to the question relating to the refusal to provide financing for counsel for persons who claim to have been victims, when we set up this inquiry we asked it to report in ninety days. We do not want it to be going on forever and have the interests of the people concerned long forgotten by the time the report is done. We want the commission to get on with it and do the job as quickly as possible.

Also, we want it to do the job of finding out all of the facts and making them know to everybody. Then if any individual who was a victim of this kind of abuse has a right at law, they can take that claim through the courts in the ordinary process. Those individuals do not have to have the right to be present at the inquiry, every individual have lawyers paid for by the government of the Province to cross-examine every witness who comes before the inquiry. That is why the member when she was minister, appointed two very competent people, Mr. Powell and Mr. David Day. Anybody who has practiced law in this Province knows the reputation for competence and ability of Mr. David Day and the sincere concern of the individual about matters of this nature and knows that he would do a good job.

So it is not necessary to provide for any individual victim having the right to have lawyers at it. They have the right, if they want to, to be there, but the government does not need to pay for it. Those lawyers who are there will do a more than adequate job in making sure that every aspect of it is brought out. We do not need a battery of lawyers.

The government cannot afford the cost of it, to begin with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Question Period has now ended.

Order, please!

Because the Chair discourages hon members from raising points of order during Question Period, I myself do not want to rise during Question Period if possible. During the Question Period hon. members may recall that the Opposition House Leader, from his seat, said, 'A point of order.' Now, the Chair should not respond to questions from a member sitting anymore than any other member should respond to a member sitting, but it was an important point and I thought it should be raised.

MR. SIMMS:

I did not raise a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I thought I heard a point of order coming from somewhere.

MR. SIMMS:

I said something was out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Out of order? Okay.

That is what is prompting the Chair to now respond, because it is an important matter for the decorum of the House. Again, it was difficult for the Chair to sort of get from the statement by the member just what was being said, but I will point out to hon. members the point I am trying to make. Beauchesne, 481, says: "It has been sanctioned by usage that a Member, while speaking, must

not: (c) refer to the presence or absence of specific Members." I have no idea what the Minister of Provincial Affairs meant when he was welcoming the member for Mount Pearl. It might have been that he was so glad to see him in the House that he welcomed him back, or it might have been some reference to his absence. If that were the case, that is not supposed to happen, and I just remind hon. members that in the future no reference should be made to an hon. member's presence or absence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:
Motion 1.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe I have a few minutes left to finish the great budget speech I was giving in praise of the great Minister of Finance of this Province a number of weeks ago. It was most unfortunate that I was cut down in mid-flight, Mr. Speaker. I had to leave it but at least I now have a few minutes left to conclude my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the budget that we brought in, the first one of the new Liberal administration, is one that, I think, will help set the pace in the future for the Province in the next few years. It is one that we had to put together rather hastily but, of course, even with the haste with

which it was put together it has still proven to be a very worthy document with which to move ahead in this Province. The Minister of Finance and his officials, along with the Cabinet, have done a commendable job in bringing forward the document. There are some things that we all do not like to see, but there are a lot more positives, Mr. Speaker, in this budget than we have seen in a long time, and in a number of areas, including education, which I think has gotten a very high priority, along with health care and a number of other issues.

I think, too, Mr. Speaker, that it is going to give confidence to a lot of the business people in the Province who are trying to develop businesses, and a lot of young entrepreneurs are going to be, hopefully, starting businesses and are very interested in doing so. That is an area I think we got to promote more, to see young people getting involved in starting their own business enterprises. There are a number of measures that we will be undertaking, over the next year or so, to see that that happens. The federal/provincial agreement on youth signed last February had some initiatives which are now being looked at by our government, and hopefully we will see the establishment of some new measures to help youth in the Province who are in need of, Mr. Speaker, assistance and advice, but they are the ones who are going to help create the economy in the future, so we have to give them confidence and put in place some programs that are appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for them.

I want to touch, Mr. Speaker, in my last few moments, on a couple of issues touched on by the Opposition in the area of health

care, a lot of work to do in health care. A lot of repair work to do. It is never going to be like you would want it to be, I suppose because of the economic situation, but we got a number of things that we want to undertake to do.

For example, the Sir Thomas Roddick Hospital in Stephenville serves the Bay St. George Region of over 35,000 residents, and their X-ray machine is just about gone, or on the blink, that thing requires over \$300,000. In my discussions with the Board in the last few weeks, I have come to find out that the machine is something like thirteen years old. One of the things that bothers me about that, Mr. Speaker, is that the machine should have been replaced before this. Now, we are to the point where it is down 50 percent of the time or gone completely. So that is an example of addressing an immediate need that has got to be done. The problem is that it has been let go for such a long time that it creates problems in the immediate, which, if there were long-term planning in health care, Mr. Speaker, and better long-term planning, we would not have those immediate, short-term emergencies arising. I think that the pattern has been, unfortunately, in the past few years, not to replace the facilities where the need exactly was, but was more along the lines, unfortunately in some cases, of where the representation was in Cabinet and so on. It is most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, because there are places that have needs, and it does not matter what the political stripe is, those needs should be addressed, I think that is an example that should have been addressed a few years ago. This

government will undertake to do that, and do that as quickly as it can.

I took note also, Mr. Speaker, of the comments made by one of the hon. members opposite, talking about heavy equipment truck driving training, and it was a good point well made. There is a program in the Stephenville Crossing area which has been in existence for quite some time, and has a very long waiting list. But one of the things pointed out to me by headquarters of the Western Community College, the Stephenville Campus, is that they have had two pieces of equipment purchased since 1969. All of the equipment is over 20 years old and, therefore they are training people on machines that are quite inadequate.

MR. MURPHY:

That is not safe.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Not safe, as the member for St. John's South points out.

That was pointed out to me; again, a need that should have been addressed ten years ago and now has to be addressed. It is most unfortunate. We are going to undertake to do that. Those types of things have got to be undertaken so that the programs that we offer in our community colleges in the Province will have adequate resources. I think this government is going to undertake to do that in a manner that is based on sense, based on need. In the past I have seen too much of this business of, say, three districts, two government, one opportunity, and the decision always was, Well, let us not do anything with that opposition district, even though doing it

would help the other two, but let us put something in the government districts. Hopefully, things will be done on a regional basis, Mr. Speaker, that will help local economies.

Because whatever happens in Stephenville helps St. George's or Jeffrey's or Port au Port, and whatever happens in Port aux Basques helps Cordroy Valley, and whatever happens in St. John's helps the Avalon, and so on and so on. We have to help the regions.

I think the Economic Recovery Commission and the team that has been put in place is a very good idea. It calls on people who have been involved in development in the Province and put forward the royal commission report calls to help us in partnership to resolve and to put a plan in place with the problems in the long-term. I think it is a very commendable effort that this government has undertaken and I expect that we are going to see some positive results.

Mind you, we do not expect to solve the problems overnight, but with the amount of immense progress that we made in our very short time, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that it brings a smile to my face that at least we have been able to resolve some of the problems that have existed for quite a long time. We have a lot of work ahead of us, and very heavy responsibility to undertake. The members of this new government are very serious. We want to do it, we are very serious about it, and we are going to address these problems and be as straightforward as we possibly can be, and try to give the answers as best we can with the information that we have. That is

commendable, and we have been doing that. When we come back in the Fall session, you are going to see it even more, you are going to see a machine that is so well oiled that it is going to be very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to stop. What interests me, what is going to be very interesting, Mr. Speaker, is that we have just started to gel, and I cannot imagine what is going to happen to the Opposition within the next three or four years, as we get the thing rolling. You know, we got to be careful, Mr. Speaker, because in Atlantic Canada we have 58-0 in New Brunswick, we got 30-2, I believe, in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia is coming our way. We have just started here and we have done an excellent job. The Premier got us here. Now, there will be some Opposition here next time, I suppose, but with the job that we are going to be doing I just do not know how the electorate is going to be able to choose otherwise, I really do not. I mean, right now they are out there saying, 'wow,' Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The member's time is up, and he seemed to end with a good line.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. Mary's - the Capes.

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

If the member had to stay on his feet, I certainly would have given him enough time to finish. I presume he said all he was going to say. He was running out of things to say and began to praise the government. He started off,

in fact, by praising the Minister of Finance, and I must say to him we did not come to praise him, we came to bury him. Certainly we will do that over the next - I was going to say a couple of years, but there is strong speculation, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman who sits in the chair of the Minister of Finance may not be there very long, so we may not get a chance to bury him, he may be buried by his own. Because a lot of the yon members have mean and hungry looks and are not happy with the performance of the Minister of Finance.

The member who just spoke ended up by praising the government, the tremendous job they are doing. He must not be listening to what is going on in the House, certainly he is not reading the press or talking to the people, because if there was ever a group of people who disillusioned the populace of Newfoundland, they who sit yonder. Never before in the history of any government have people been let down so much by a non-performance. The great commitments that were made, the multitude of promises that were made are not being fulfilled. The commitments have been broken and, more especially, the promise of honest, clean-cut government has dissipated.

The Premier himself came into his seat based upon a commitment of fairness and balance. Too many people are asking right now, Is this Liberal government going to be like the one we had years ago, when there was very little fairness and balance? I will give him an example. I suppose I should save it for question period on Monday, but I will use it today because he might not be here Monday.

Back in the years from 1949 to 1971, the Southern Avalon area, the District of Ferryland and the district of the then St. Mary's did not receive funding for one inch of paving or one cent for water and sewer. All those years, the 22 years from 1949 to 1971, the whole Southern Avalon area, within a gunshot of St. John's, practically, starting on either end, did not receive one cent to go towards paving, there was not one inch of paving in the District of St. Mary's - the Capes in 1971, and no money at all spent on water and sewer, none.

Now I presume that the Premier in his promise of fairness and balance will make sure that this Liberal government, unlike the other one, will make sure that this does not continue. He did not nod his head but I presume inside he nodded to make a commitment to make sure that this does will never happen again.

My own district spreads over more than a couple of hundred miles, in and out through a number of communities, has a sparse population, only about 5,000 voters, 80 percent of whom voted Tory and, hopefully, because of that, they will not be punished. And because they are spread out over, 30-odd communities, you have not got too many people in any one place, so, hopefully, we would not be punished. Well, I heard the great statements of fairness and balance, and in the great budget speech that funding was going to be delivered and distributed so equally across the Province, and I said to myself, Well, certainly we will benefit from this. But I suddenly realized, when I listened to the list that were read out of work to be done, and I analyzed the statements that were made,

that my district, which had been forgotten so long by the former Liberal government, was forgotten again, and it was the only district in the Province that did not receive one red Liberal cent for water and sewer and road work, not a copper.

MR. SIMMS:

The Premier says that is not accurate.

MR. HEARN:

It is accurate. Some districts did not receive funding for water and sewer, perhaps, some did not receive funding for roads, but to the best of my knowledge mine is the only one, or one of the very few, that did not get one cent for anything. Maybe we have no needs, this rural district spread out, as I said over, a couple of hundred miles or more, with 30-odd communities, with little water and sewer, with many miles of dirt road: I would have thought we had some priority.

Now, I presume that is because the Premier did not visit my district during the election; a very busy man, maybe he was taking it for granted, but he did not visit my district during the election. I would have certainly welcomed him well and I would have brought out some people, because there was not enough from the other side to go out and meet him. I did meet him once in my district and welcomed him quite cordially, before he became Premier, actually. I would welcome him up there anytime and certainly treat him courteously. But I hope that he will get a chance to visit so that he will recognize the great rural area that we have that still needs a lot of things, so maybe next time round we will not be forgotten as we were in the past. But it

certainly puts a new light on the myth, I guess, that was perpetrated by the government, of fairness and balance, because there was absolutely no fairness, no balance and certainly no friendliness. But, anyway, on the budget itself -

MR. DECKER:

Get serious.

MR. HEARN:

The Minister of Health, now that the Premier has gone, opens his mouth and says, 'Get serious!' Let me talk about health and health care in the budget. First thing the Minister does when he comes in is start closing down hospitals. Nobody was more vocal in the last couple of years than the Minister of Health, when he was over here in Opposition, especially in relation to hospital beds. 'Every hospital bed in the Province should be open, and if we go over there we will reopen them.' Certainly, we have seen what happened this year, and we have as many beds closed as ever before. We see hospitals being closed down on the Burin Peninsula.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The ones you guys closed.

MR. HEARN:

No, no. In fact, the minister should go down and talk to to the Burin people and ask them: To whom do you give credit for keeping our hospitals open?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Tell us about Sprung.

MR. SIMMS:

Tell us about Come by Chance.

MR. HEARN:

A tremendous success! Talk about Sprung, us leaving you with a

legacy, well, we were left with Come By Chance, and what happened? It was turned around, and Sprung will.

The hospitals down in Grand Bank and Burin shut down. One other thing that disappointed me in the budget about health is the amount of beds - and I am not zeroing in on the member here at all; forget what happened here in the last few days - allocated to private boarding homes, homes for special care. I have maintained for several years that the best bargain we get today in health care services in the Province, dollar-wise, is in the homes for special care, moreso than home care because quite often with home care several visits are needed to the house, and many of these visits, even though they are short, are estimated by the Department of Health to cost perhaps \$10 a visit. That does not sound like much, but if it is a visit a day, that is \$300 a month, which is quite cheap, if you look at nursing homes and hospitals, if you have to have those people in them. But in the boarding homes, the cost of keeping an individual in them, the total government subsidy is around something over \$4,000 a year, half of which is paid for by the feds. So it costs your department \$2,400 a year, roughly, give or take a few dollars, to keep a person in a home for special care, where that person is well cared for, diets are looked after, regular visits by professional people, nurses and so on. Tell me where you can get a better bargain in health care than that, yet we see only 50 extra beds. There is a crying need for such beds in many parts of the Province.

DR. WARREN:

You guys had a freeze on them.

MR. HEARN:

There was a freeze on because individuals in the Minister's own department were pressing for different, more expensive methods of health care, telling us 'Here is the way to go; expensive nursing homes, hospitals, etc.' Many people want to stay as close to home as they can, and if they cannot stay in their own home the logical thing is the private boarding home, which also creates jobs and construction. It is a private business, for those who believe in private business, and it creates a number of jobs for people who work in the area.

Once some people who got in who were aware of that and recognized what is happening outside the Overpass, things begin to change. Not only was the freeze lifted, but a hundred beds were approved last year, 110 in fact, zeroing in on areas of the Province where there were no homes at all. There was not one such home on the Burin Peninsula, for instance. Out in the Premier's district, Bay of Islands, there was none out there anywhere, although one was approved, I know. I do not believe there is one on Fogo Island, and we can go on and on. I know the Minister of Fisheries, who is not here now, is looking for one for the Twillingate area. But even for getting areas where there are none, and there are still several large geographic areas of the Province, if an elderly person wants to go into such a home he or she has to be brought miles and miles away, cannot be visited regularly by relatives, and so on. Certainly with our aging population now, we could have one on almost every corner and have it filled, so that

it would be a viable operation. Even where we have a lot of these homes there is still room for more because of the aging population. I am disappointed that we did not see more money in that area.

On education, I spoke the other day and I expressed my disappointment in not getting full equalization in a couple of other areas, but the thing that disappointed me most was the performance, or lack thereof, of the two members of government who were former hard-line fighters for educational funding, the former presidents of the NTA. The one thing that amazed me is the fact that they could go on for a couple of years telling teachers that they were not getting a fair share of the pie. Of course, what is happening now is the teachers in the field, and I am sure they have expressed this to the Minister of Education as he goes around, are extremely concerned, because they are saying, if what you are saying is right, that the share of the pie really does not relate to the amount of money, that there were blips and inconsistencies, and an extra teachers' payroll, several millions of dollars, can throw your budget right out of whack, he is right. I have no argument with him. His share of the pie is relatively good when you look at declining school enrolment, when you look at the increase in the number of older people and the need for extra health care, the need for social assistance because of the drug oriented society we are in, and so on, his share of the pie is not too bad, considering the size of the pie we have in this Province. But you could not sell that to the two members. Now I hope, since they are in there, and they are assessing the documents, they

believe what you are saying, I believe they always did. But the big question asked out there is that now they have seen the light when we have a smaller share of the pie than ever, not fewer dollars, but a smaller share of the pie, how come they deceived us for several years and said what a terrible government we had then, constantly giving us less of the pie? So something has to happen: They either have to stand up and vociferously disagree with the Minister of Education, and take him on around the Cabinet table, or outside the door for the Member for Exploits (Mr. Grimes), or they have to go out and apologize to the teachers around the Province to whom they owe an apology for deceiving them for several years by misinterpreting entirely the funding arrangements. So these two people must be in a tremendous fix, because they cannot be loyal to Ceasar and to their followers so, whatever, they either have to apologize to teachers or get up, as I say, and not agree with the policies of the government. Of course, the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations has only one choice if she does not agree with the government policy, and that is resign and go back to the classroom.

One of the other concerns, I guess, for teachers was raised yesterday when the Minister of Finance talked a lot about concern for the state of our pension plans and benefits, long-term funding, and he has a legitimate concern, a very serious concern there involving the Public Service, and the Newfoundland Teachers Association, in particular, perhaps our own MHA plan to a point, and the Uniformed Services but particularly on the teacher plan, the way he spoke, with that

hard glint in his eye - we are not going to have a deficit in this Province and we will continue to have a surplus - I said to myself, forget 30 and out. Everything the teachers fought so hard those last few years may be going down the drain with the new Minister of Finance. Now I presume his friend and colleague, the Minister of Education, is going to visit him constantly and thump on his desk, as we did with our Minister of Finance, and go up to Ottawa with the teachers to fight to make sure their pension plan is not axed. Hopefully the process of letting teachers get out, teachers who served long, hard years in the classroom, and enjoy something else in life, to let some new blood into the classroom, with new ideas and young people out there, well-educated who cannot find jobs, the opportunity is there to do both, but not if the Minister of Finance suddenly decides to make changes in the pension plans and teachers go back to having to spend many more years in the classroom.

One of the first big things, I guess, that ties in with the budget when we are looking at overall costs and saving the government money was the creation of a smaller, leaner, meaner Cabinet. One of the things that the Premier did not say, however, when he announced the fifteen-person Cabinet - whatever - that he has, was that he was going to make up for the loss of the other five or six by adding the Recovery Team. Not only is he going to bring in this new Recovery Team, but he is going to pay them much more than he will pay ministers. Now that leads two questions: Number one, for the salary that these people are going to be paid, a minister and

executive assistant could certainly be paid. They will need staff, he said, so I presume that will make up for any laid off. In effect, most of the people in the departments are still there anyway, so that did not result in savings, except for the few people that they did not want, that they axed, and kicked out, some of the most competent people in the Province, just because they were afraid they would not agree with the policies that they were going to bring in. But here we have really half a Cabinet, half a Cabinet responsible to no one. No direction, no one to report to, so it is a blank cheque. The Premier said, 'They will talk to me occasionally,' free rein basically, a blank cheque and a free rein to go out and do practically whatever they want. So try to estimate that cost! The poor Minister of Development (Mr. Furey) is sitting there tapping the desk, wondering what is going to become of him, because the power that he was given when the Cabinet was formed has now been eroded and taken away and given to a recovery team that is going to go out and take over practically every division that he has in his department. So hopefully the minister will find some time to go out in his district and pacify the people who are not happy with their community services, not happy with their ferry set up they have, the one he fought so hard for. Seeing that he did not have power enough in Cabinet to deliver, maybe if he gets out now and spends more time out there he will find ways of doing that. So the big myth that was perpetrated upon the Province is disappearing into the fog.

Recreation: The minister of - I was going to say;

'multiculaturism,' and I guess he is the minister of that too, but the minister of multidepartments, the member for Waterford - Kenmount, he certainly has taken on much more than he can chew, which is quite evident from his performance this morning, his lack of knowledge of what is going on, his lack of realism in relation to the reaction of the people against some of the policies that he is advocating. But recreation has been lost, buried somewhere in the depths of this great department. And there are so many young, aggressive members over there, like the member for Port de Grave, who cares so much about recreation and fitness; the member for Placentia, a long-time advocate in sports and recreation, and not only an advocate but very involved personally in sports and recreation in the Province; and the member for LaPoile, so involved with the Mariners hockey team; the member for Carbonear, and the member for Pleasantville, and so on, yet we see the department of recreation, as such, just buried, we have not heard a sound about, it is gone. Talk about a Recovery Team! The best recovery program that we saw was the recovery of the three cheques that were issued for stadiums in Fortune-Hermitage, Fogo and Bonavista North; commitments made, promises kept, cheques issued legally and aboveboard. The Minister of Finance, with his big vacuum cleaner, just sucked up everything in sight, including legitimate cheques that would have given a start to areas that so badly need facilities. So talk about recovery! That was the quickest recovery we ever saw.

The Minister of Education, again, has run into some problems with his text. One of the things that

was initiated in the last few years was an endeavour, an effort to try to provide where possible, as much work for local publishers as possible. He mentioned himself that the present text that has been discussed so much in the press was done locally. Of course, that had no reflection upon the issue, that could happen with any text done by any person, and the items put in the text are always analyzed. In light of the fact that I heard two more contracts have just been awarded for the publishing of two new texts, and both went to major firms outside the Province, despite submissions by local publishers, I presume the minister, when he gets time to get in there and get a handle on all of this, will try to do as we did in government, try to make sure that as we spend hundreds and thousands and millions of dollars on the publication of texts, that where these texts can be published locally by our own people involved in the editing and the preparations and the publishing and what have you, that this will be done. The publishing industry in the Province is a lucrative industry, Mr. Speaker, and has come a long way. We do not have to go back too many years to find very, very few books published in Newfoundland. They would be written in Newfoundland and published outside. Then, gradually, we saw more and more books, written here by Newfoundland authors, published by Newfoundland publishers, on the shelves in our schools, of quality that will match anything you will see anywhere. Recently, we have seen them getting into textbook publishing, and they have not got to be large publishing companies. One of the best books put out last year was done by a very small

company out in Central Newfoundland, run by a very good friend of the hon. gentleman over there, Mr. Sparkes, and he did a magnificent job on the text with his very small publishing company. but we also have Jepherson and Breakwater and Harry Cuff publications and other people involved, all of them showing that they can produce material that equates with anything that can be found across the country. So I hope the Minister of Education will try to make sure that as texts are developed we have more done here in the Province by provincial people.

That leads me to one other thing. Talk about emphasizing the need to draw attention to something that is going on locally, as I stand here some members around here are wearing buttons that say 'No sealing, no fish. Support our sealers.' Yesterday evening, as I walked through the mall, as did several other members, I stopped and talked to the young Newfoundlanders who are fighting back. I have heard about the organization, I know some of them, I support what they are doing, but it was not until I really stopped in the mall saw these young people taking on everybody passing through, trying to stress the fact, that I truly realized here we have an extremely serious situation, the amount of fish destroyed by seals. Here it is a bit less than what some people say it is; with the 4 million seals that exist we are talking about 12 billion pound of product a year. What an amount of fish! Of course, we talked about the parasites, worms and so on, earlier. Maybe the Minister of Fisheries, who is not in his seat right now, when he starts assessing his own budget and gets

to his miscellaneous funding areas, might look at putting some money into helping these young people, either through funding them directly or providing some other support services because perhaps for once we are going to win a battle against the Greenpeacers and the other people advocating an end to sealing, who, perhaps as we did yesterday evening pass by these people and scoff - not saying we scoffed, we would not but they would - and then walk in, sit down and have a steak. Now tell me, where do you get steak from? Certainly not from fish. And if it is fish, where do you get a fish from? It is living, too, the same as a seal. So how can they justify a no seal kill when we kill chicken, cows, moose whatever. It certainly does not make sense, but we argue that for years.

So maybe it is time for Newfoundlanders generally to stand up. Perhaps these young people can create the awareness that it is no good for a handful of people, no good for politicians here in the House trying to look good by defending the seal fishery. It is time that everyone who has concern got involved; then we can win some of these battles. Hopefully the Minister of Fisheries, in his budget, as I said, will use a few of his dollars to support something like this. Now there are many more things I would like to say, but a number of hon. gentlemen would like to speak, so I would leave it at that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend mentioned texts and the problems I have been having with texts. I want to make a few observations on that controversy, I have been waiting for the opportunity, in fact, to talk about the money we spend on texts and the texts that have been selected and the problems the hon. Minister is having with texts.

Mr. Speaker, I have learned a great deal from this House in the past two or three weeks. I have learned a great deal. Maybe if the hon. Leader of the Opposition were here he would say, You are never too old to learn, and he will recall that line of some weeks and some months ago. I have learned how to orchestrate a controversy if you got friends in the Opposition, and I know how the controversy on the text developed. I know why the hon. member for St. John's East asked the question about texts. I know why the hon. member, my friend from Fortune - Hermitage, did not raise the question related to the controversy concerning texts. I know why the member for Fogo district did not raise the question about censorship and texts, because I have the letters from his district. I know why the member for Green Bay did not raise it.

MR. SIMMS:

You are playing this game, boy.

DR. WARREN:

I know why the member for Grand Falls told his friend down there, not to ask questions and make comments, so I have learned a great deal, Mr. Speaker, about this issue.

I as a Minister, as the member for

St. Mary's - the Capes should know, had a decision to make on text: Should we go ahead with the original draft of the text; should we change it; should we publish two texts. These were the options that the minister was faced with. And, Mr. Speaker, the decision was to review some of the items and, instead of printing two texts, one with these items in and one without them, the decision was to be sensitive to the traditional and constitutional rights of the churches in this Province and try to get agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

Informal consultations, Mr. Speaker, were held with the churches, as they had been in the past, and the agreement, the decision was, Mr. Speaker, that we would proceed with a text that was sensitive to the rights of all Newfoundlanders, to all groups. Now I know, Mr. Speaker, some members of the House did not hear me earlier, that there were 12 items initially in question. When discussions were held, before it was raised in this House, that number was reduced to six, and, finally, the number was reduced to two, Mr. Speaker, to be replaced, and there were some minor adjustments with the others.

So instead of going with two texts, which we could not afford, and which I was told would not be used by certain denominations, instead of trying to ram this thing down the throats of Newfoundlanders, instead of trying to ram it down the throats of Newfoundlanders who have traditional and constitutional rights in this area, the minister decided to get consensus and we

got consensus. The publisher agreed to it because this government is not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to ram down the throats of people, who have constitutional and legal rights, certain programs. A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, I was grilled in estimates, by the hon. member for Humber East. At that point in time I thought, The audacity of the member to raise these questions, and I almost would say the hypocrisy of raising those two questions. I had two authors call me in the past few days, who said, Do you want chapter and verse of what happened when the member for Humber East was the minister? And I said, No, I do not want to do that. These two authors have said to me privately, 'If you want it, I can give you the changes that were made in text, the material that was changed, chapter and verse.'

DR. WARREN:

Some time I will; I will ask these people to put it out. What the minister did, Mr. Speaker, was what has traditionally been done in education, and if the member for St. John's East had asked her hon. friend from St. Mary's - the Capes what the precedent is, he would have told her that in his period he did the same thing as the present minister did: He consulted informally with the churches before he went ahead with materials on family life, materials on AIDS, on certain text, on adolescent courses, on sensitive issues; on sensitive areas of the curriculum what the present minister did, Mr. Speaker, was what has been the precedent. And we have every intention, as long as the denominational system exists, of respecting the traditional and constitutional rights of the churches. Whether

we as individual members agree with the system or not, this is the system, this is what has been done in the past, and our intention, Mr. Speaker, is to continue that.

MS DUFF:

There has never been one (inaudible).

DR. WARREN:

The letters are coming, Mr. Speaker. The letters are coming from all districts, and the silent majority are beginning to speak, and they are going to ask questions of me because, Mr. Speaker, the words that were quoted in the press and quoted over there are not the issue. The word 'God' or the word 'damn' or the word 'hell' these are not the question, these are not the words, Mr. Speaker.

MS VERGE:

Those words are in the Bible!

DR. WARREN:

The words are out. People know there are two items, there are two selections, Mr. Speaker, that are now in controversy, two items only, 15 pages out of 501 pages. We thought we would, by consensus, arrive at respecting the rights of everybody, to ensure that this text was acceptable to everybody. I did not want to have a text printed which would be rejected by some of the denominations in this Province, and I have every indication that it would have been.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

I did not in estimates the other day raise these questions, Mr. Speaker, but there has been such innuendo and such

misrepresentation of the facts that I felt an obligation as minister to put it on the table. I got a letter this morning from a person who said he is going to ask where his member stands on this issue, because he said this House last year passed a resolution asking the federal government to entrench in the constitution the rights of the Pentecostal Church in this Province. This House unanimously passed this resolution, so are members opposite asking the present minister to override the traditional rights of the church?

Now one final comment, Mr. Speaker, and I beg your indulgence for just another few minutes because I have not spoken very much in this House, on local text. I am delighted the hon. member for St. Mary's - the Capes - I wish he were there in his seat; he is not behind the Chair, is he? - raised this question of local text. When I arrived in the department, I was told that the hon. member had had a national call for text last November; they had this call, and had gone through the process and a decision had been made to grant these texts to these national firms. In the past they had some local calls. I wish that some of these calls made last year had been local calls, and I wish local publishers would be given a greater opportunity to compete with national firms.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:
My officials have already met with the publishers and I have offered to meet with the publishers in the next few weeks to find ways whereby we can give publishers a better opportunity to compete,

number one, with these big national firms and, number two, to give them some local materials, have some local calls for materials and for text, so that more of these firms will get much more than they have gotten in the past. I assure you that this government will ensure that local publishers get a greater opportunity to bid successfully for school materials because this is very important. I promise that to this House and I will meet with them in the next two or three weeks.

Last November they started on this decision, and it was one of the first things that I was briefed on. I, as a minister, would have liked to have been able to say, 'Look, we cannot do that.' We could not. The bids were such that the decision was unanimous on everybody's part in this case. But I can assure this House that from now on we are going to do everything possible to help these local publishers, to ensure that they provide the quality. I can list you the books that they have published - fantastic quality! We will ensure that they get an opportunity to bid successfully at the national level and, secondly, that they be given some local materials to do, some local calls, so that we will keep the jobs here in this Province, and so that we will capitalize on the tremendous strengths that these people have, on their skills and their abilities, these local publishers, some of whom you know quite well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:
There was a question on the school tax yesterday, and I want to restate the position of this

party. There has been some controversy over the years, and this party promised in the last election to abolish or revise, to review the whole system with abolition as one of the options. The school tax has had some real problems. I do not want to elaborate on them right now; I could, but there have been some real problems with it. The school tax is judged to be inequitable and regressive in some cases. Some people say it is inefficient. Well, perhaps it needs to be abolished, but I can assure the hon. House we are going to look at every option, including reforming the tax, perhaps cutting the number of School Tax Authorities from twenty-one to ten, perhaps having one commercial tax for the Province, because the commercial tax is now collected by twenty-one districts. Maybe there should be one so that we can distribute the money that comes from school taxes more equitably so that the rich will not get more and the poor get less because of the availability of wealth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

We are going to look at all these options, I can assure the hon. House, and this Fall we will have a committee in place and, in time, we will respond to our promise and attempt to provide a more equitable tax system, a more just tax system and a better educational system for the students of this Province.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The people of this Province have been sorely saddened, really, certainly disillusioned, watching this new government perform in its first eight weeks. Some of us knew at the outset that the Premier is a traditionalist and an elitist, that he is paternalistic in his outlook. We saw some of that in Question Period today when he was commenting on the victims of abuse at Mount Cashel. But, Mr. Speaker, many people had high hopes for certain members of the new administration, particularly the member for St. John's North, whom they regarded as enlightened and well-motivated in his entry into politics. But, Mr. Speaker, the way this Minister of Education is handling censorship of the high school literature text, the way he is upholding the absurd decisions of his staff, is cause for tremendous disenchantment among the people who had hopes for him. Not much of what we have done here in the last few weeks is going to linger in people's memories. By September not much of what we said here will remain in people's memories, because people have short memories, but, Mr. Speaker, there are two or three things that this government has done that we have dealt with in this first sitting that are going to remain in people's minds and one of them is the way this Minister of Education, this administration have treated curriculum selection.

The minister, denying his university intellectual background, is trying to justify cutting out of a Grade XII literature textbook, developed by

such eminent people as Ray Clark, Roy Bonisteel, Judy Gibson and Betty King, selections by Hemmingway, and an author who was killed in the Second World War, as a young man, Richard Hillary. Mr. Speaker, people are going to remember this. This action on the part of government has made an impression on the people of the Province that will remain. Next Fall, or in three or four years time when it comes time to judge this government at the ballot box, people are going to remember the way this government dealt with the Grade XII literature textbook. People are also going to remember how this government has treated culture generally, the Premier downgrading it and short-changing it in his Cabinet downsizing and realignment, merging culture with such a hodge-podge as municipal affairs, housing, as well as other incongruous areas that had been combined earlier.

The new government disbanded the newly created Department of Culture and Tourism. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but as we have seen already by the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, this government has not shown any appreciation whatsoever of the significance of the arts and artists of this Province. The Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, with his colleague, the President of Treasury Board, attempted to provide a \$12,000 grant to an amateur theatre group in Gander, outside of regular channels, and without reference to the Arts Council, which is constituted by legislation to award provincial public funding to the arts. The minister denies any basic understanding of the legislation, saying he did not even realize that the mandate of the Arts

Council allowed it to deal with these requests from the Gander group. Mr. Speaker, people are going to remember how this government dismissed and undervalued artists right at the outset of its terms of office.

And third, Mr. Speaker, people are going to remember the way this government is dealing with victims of crime, particularly the alleged victims of crime at Mount Cashel in the mid-1970s. The Commission of Inquiry set up to deal with those events have been stripped of a power that was given in its original terms of reference, to make recommendations about compensation to victims. The Premier's answer here this morning is that those victims will be looked after by the Inquiry co-counsel. How paternalistic, Mr. Speaker. It is not up to the Premier to impose his views about what is best for these people. They are entitled to select their own lawyer, they are entitled to choose counsel they are comfortable with and have trust and confidence in.

Mr. Speaker, then the Premier goes on to say that the interest of victims can be pursued elsewhere, before the Crime Compensation Board and in the courts. Mr. Speaker, this Premier, above and beyond most people in the Province, realizes how expensive that is.

Going to court is extremely expensive, it requires legal representation and, as he well knows, that does not come cheap. And how are these people going to afford the cost, not to mention the emotional stress, of mounting private legal action? Why put these people through that added trouble and agony? Why not

empower the commission to deal with the interests of the victims and to award compensation to them, if not directly, then fund their legal representation in actions in the courts or before the Criminal Compensation Board? But no, Mr. Speaker, this government has ignored completely the interest of the victims in this piece. How can there be justice if there is not justice for the victims?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:
But no, Mr. Speaker, this is an administration that is rooted in the past, that is guided and motivated by values that prevailed not even in Newfoundland but in Central Canadian suburbia in the 1950s. It is being operated in a Father Knows Best style.

MR. HEWLETT:
Little Liberals. Little Liberals.

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, my colleague from behind, who comes up with such apt lines, labelled this administration the 'Regressive Conservatives' as opposed to the Progressive Conservatives over here. And that is very, very fitting, in view of the way that they have dealt with the senior high school literature textbook development, in view of the way they treated the artists of the Province, in view of the way they devalued culture, and in view of the way they are dealing with victims of crime.

Mr. Speaker, the former Rideout Government had mounted initiatives to improve services and support for victims of crime. We had everything in motion to employ victim court workers throughout

the Province; in Gander, in the Treasury Board President's district; in Grand Falls, in my colleague's district; on the West Coast, in Labrador, on the Avalon, victim court workers who would liaise between victims and the police when investigating, Crown Attornys when prosecuting, and ensure that the interests of victims are considered properly in the criminal trial process.

But, no, Mr. Speaker, this administration could not see fit to proceed with such a progressive initiative. And, indeed, the Minister of Justice does not even espouse philosophical support for that approach, saying he is inclined to believe that services for victims should be self-financing. Imagine that, Mr. Speaker! This new Minister of Justice not being willing to spend taxpayers' dollars out of general revenue on victim court workers. What better use can there be for public funding than to provide supports for among the most vulnerable people in our society, victims of abuse and victims of belittling in personal relationships, support for children who have been sexually assaulted and abused in other ways, support for women who have been battered and emotionally abused in the home.

Mr. Speaker, the former administration was going to increase significantly funding for transition houses, the three existing fully funded homes, but moreso was committed to funding a new home in Gander, in Central Newfoundland. And the President of Treasury Board is nodding because he understands. I venture to say he supports that move and is probably quietly working to make sure that in the next budget

that will be taken care of. But, Mr. Speaker, it is very, very sad that the move was delayed by a whole year. Mr. Speaker, there are needs for other transition houses in the Burin Peninsula region and Labrador West, Mr. Speaker. But no this government welshed on the progressive moves that had been planned, that had been initiated, that were provided for in the preliminary budget estimates that the new government inherited.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I have only recognized the hon. member for Humber East, so I ask the other hon. members wait their turn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Social Services talked about good intentions, but he has not put his money where his mouth is. He talks about providing more social workers to deal with the problems of child abuse. He has acknowledged that the reports of child abuse have been increasing sharply. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no money in his budget to do it. All he said in the way of specifics is that he is going to analyze the workload of social workers, possibly shuffle them around.

Mr. Speaker, tell me, where is there any sign of a social worker in the employ of his department who does not have a full caseload now? How can he expect to shuffle

around people and magically transform them into competent child welfare officers? Mr. Speaker, that is an irresponsible and misleading approach.

The minister has not even acknowledged a commitment to dealing in a priority way with putting in place resources for adult survivors of child abuse. Among the increased incidence of reports have been people in their adult years who are just now coming to terms with abuse that was perpetrated upon them in their youth.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health gives, as a feeble excuse for not doing anything to extend mental health services to the children and adolescents the difficulty his department might have in recruiting qualified people. Yet, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if his department were offering decent salaries to these people there would be no trouble at all putting in place a children's mental health service in Central Newfoundland in the President of Treasury Board's area. There is nothing in that region now for young people who need mental health services.

That was identified by the Department of Health as a priority need, and everything was in place in the Winter leading up to the takeover of power by the new administration, for young people's mental health services to be established in Central Newfoundland, but no, Mr. Speaker, that was slashed too.

This 'Regressive Conservative' administration considered it more important to have a \$25 million surplus on current account than to provide funding for the Mount

Cashel victims to have legal representation of their own choosing at the Hughes Inquiry Commission. This government considered it more important to have \$25 million surplus on current account than to employ victim court workers by the Department of Justice. This government considered it more important to have a \$25 million surplus on current account than to employ more social workers, particularly workers trained in the areas of child welfare.

Mr. Speaker, it is a severe disappointment. In the months and years to come, while people will undoubtedly forget much of what this government has done and said in its first weeks in office, people are going to be left with an impression of an ultraconservative, traditional, reactionary, 1950s paternalistic, elitist group, a group which is so narrow-minded in its approach that it would cut out material from a Grade XII literature text that had been recommended by Roy Bonisteel, Ray Clarke and a group of English teachers, a group that was so narrow-minded and rigid in its approach to justice that it denied funding for victims of Mount Cashel to have their own legal representation at the Inquiry Commission, a group so rigid, traditional and elitist in its approach that it would not expand the criminal justice system by adding victim court workers, a group so inconsistent and even hypocritical that it will not give the Minister of Social Services the money to go with his mouth so that there will be something real and meaningful done to improve the situation for children who have been abused. Mr. Speaker, Judgement Day will not be until three or four more years, but

people will remember these early moves of this administration which are so indicative of their mindset.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRETT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It gives me great pleasure to rise in the hon. House this morning and give my first speech to this great assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:
As has been the tradition in this House, I would first like to congratulate the hon. member for Bonavista North on his election as Speaker, and to you, Sir, on your election as Deputy Speaker. And, I would like to congratulate myself as Deputy Chairman of Committees.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:
It is a great pleasure to represent the district of Bellevue. At this time I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman who represented the Bellevue district before I did, Wilson Callan, who served the district for some seventeen years as a Liberal, and then decided to cross over and join the other group. I pay tribute to the man because anybody who offered himself for public service, regardless of which party he stand for. It is a great honour and it

is also a difficult job. There are a lot of demands put on a person who serves in this hon. House, so I pay tribute to Wilson Callan this morning. The other person, one I admired for years and years, who for a period of time represented the district of Bellevue, is the late Don Jamieson, who, I guess, has to go down in history as one of the greatest Newfoundlanders who ever lived.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

It is interesting that the late Mr. Jamieson grew up on an Island in Placentia Bay called Sound Island. I grew up on an Island in Placentia Bay called Woody Island, which is about one gunshot away from Sound Island. The other hon. gentleman in the House to whom I would also like to make reference also comes from that Far Greater Bay, the community of Haystack, which is probably five or six miles from the great historic community of Woody Island. I remember growing up on Woody Island long before electricity, long before we had a lot of the services that we have now become accustomed to. I remember as a high school student studying Civics, one of the reasons I got involved and interested in politics. When I started school in Woody Island there was a one-room school. When I finished there was a four-room school and the teacher had grades U111, 1X, X and X1. Of course, in these days in rural Newfoundland you tried to do as many subjects as possible, because you wanted to have spares in case you failed one. I was never an artist, so while everybody else in Grade 1X in that particular year did Art, I did

Civics. I remember, with the kerosene oil lamp on Woody Island in the wee hours of the morning, reading about the House of Assembly, about the Government of Canada and about the things that happened in the House of Assembly. Little did I know that some thirty years later I would be sitting in the House of Assembly. I guess I should express my appreciation to the people in the district of Bellevue who put such great confidence in me and who elected me to this House with a majority of 1609. I hear the hon. member for Torngat Mountains, whose home is in Chance Cove, may be even thinking about coming to Bellevue district the next time around. I welcome that particular move and I can assure you that the people of Chance Cove will support me again the next time around.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, over the last fourteen or fifteen years I have had the opportunity to work as a public servant in this Province, and it was a great honour. I served under some great, capable ministers. I served under Mr. Gerry Ottenheimer, who was the Minister of Education. I would say that there will be three Ministers of Education who will go down in history. One is the hon. Fred Rowe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

Another is Gerry Ottenheimer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

And the other person who will go down in history as reforming the system will be the hon. member for St. John's North, the present Minister of Education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

People say to me, 'Percy, why did you get involved in politics? Why did you give up a good job that paid substantially more than you get being an MHA?' I guess one of the great concerns I have, being a member of government, is being involved in policy decisions and trying to have some impact on which way this Province should go. As a public servant I had very little impact and very little say in how things went.

As a person who grew up on Woody Island and a person who was from a single parent family and being an orphan at nine years of age, I have always had a great concern for the economically and socially disadvantaged.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

I know that in this Province today there are still a lot of people who live below the poverty line, a lot of people who do not have the opportunities to progress within our society, a lot of people who, even though we have pumped a lot of money into education in this Province, lack the opportunity to be able to get jobs because they lack the basic education to do so. Despite the fact that we have had, Mr. Speaker, compulsory education in this Province since 1949, roughly 53 per cent of the adult population in Newfoundland still have less than a Grade X

education, and still lack the opportunities.

We made tremendous progress under the leadership of Mr. Ottenheimer. When he was the Minister of Education he had a great commitment to the socially disadvantaged, particularly the people in adult education, because at one time in his early career he was the Director of Adult Education for the Province.

When I sat in the board rooms in this building I saw that from 1978 to 1988 roughly \$800,000 was being spent on 50 per cent of the population that needed the greatest service, I saw a government that was committed to very high tech and very committed to low tech, I saw an offshore agreement that was to provide the infrastructure, when we realized that 95 per cent of the jobs that were going to be involved in Hibernia were of the low technical nature, the trades, labourers, the rebar workers and all these sort of things, when I sat there and saw that 95 per cent of the Offshore Development Fund was spent on the Parkway in St. John's to provide opportunities for high tech courses where 5 per cent of the population was going to be involved in Hibernia.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Bellevue is a district that is going to be impacted effected more by the Hibernia development than any other area of the Province. To my knowledge, not one cent of the Offshore Development Fund has been spent in the District of Bellevue.

Mr. Speaker, the development of Hibernia is going to have a great environmental impact. There have to be discussions take place with

the fishermen, because the fishing grounds that I fished as a boy in Placentia Bay, around the the Bread and Cheese, will be destroyed. If we use Swift Current and that whole channel there, we could see the destruction of that beautiful community of Swift Current. We have to have more input, and this government is working on it.

I was very pleased a couple of weeks ago to go with the present Minister of Mines and Energy to the community of Arnold's Cove, where we met with the Offshore Platform Advisory Committee, a group that has been organized for two or three years that has been screaming to the government to have input into what is going to happen in their communities and the social impact and the environmental impact that is going to take place within the district particularly the communities of Arnold's Cove and Come By Chance, Sunnyside, Goobies and those areas around there. I think it was the first time in the history of Bellevue that a Minister of the Crown went out and sat down with a group of people and discussed and had a dialogue, a one-on-one dialogue. I am very proud of our Minister of Mines and Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, we need to provide the infrastructure in the communities of Come By Chance, Sunnyside and Arnold's Cove. There has been a great resettlement program in Bellevue District over the last seventeen years. The people in Bellevue were very disheartened by the way that they were treated by the last administration. We saw the

hospital in Come By Chance not only closed down but destroyed. The building itself was even taken down. People in that area are very, very disheartened with the previous administration.

We also saw the hospital in Markland being closed. I can sympathize and I feel for the people of Grand Bank and St. Lawrence. As a matter of fact, a lot of my relatives live on the Burin Peninsula of Newfoundland. I have a lot of friends in St. Lawrence. I operated programs over the years in St. Lawrence. I feel for them. I also feel for them because the previous administration operated on crisis management. The people that may lose their jobs in St. Lawrence and Grand Bank, I really feel for them, but I think that if it had been done the right way these people would not have lost their jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:
The plan on the Burin Peninsula was to build a regional hospital, to close out the cottage hospitals, and to provide a better service to the people of the Burin Peninsula. If it were done the right way the people on the Burin Peninsula would not have been hurt.

Mr. Speaker, a royal commission some time ago recommended that a regional hospital be built on the Isthmus of Avalon, and the plan and the recommendation that was made by the these experts was that a regional hospital be built in Come By Chance.

What happened, Mr. Speaker, is the previous administration defied that particular report. The hon.

member for Trinity North, and I compliment him, he was a great constituency man, and I guess he still is, he fought for his district and he got the hospital moved from Come By Chance to Clarenville. But when I hear people on the opposite side talking about taking jobs out of rural Newfoundland, well, the people in Come By Chance needed the jobs that were being provided by that hospital. And it happened, Mr. Speaker, at a time in our history which saw the closedown of the refinery, and things were pretty bleak, and there was not even a fish plant in Arnold's Cove to provide jobs, and that hospital was a great source of employment. And the same thing happened in Markland.

But I can see, I can understand why the hospital in Come By Chance and the hospital in Markland closed, because there were regional hospitals created. Now what I disagree with is the fact that it should have gone to Come By Chance instead of Clarenville, because that was the central location. Mr. Speaker, I sat in this House and listened to the Speech from the Throne. I guess one of the proud moments of my life was when His Honour talked about this government's commitment to the undereducated in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

We talk about the arts groups and we talk about every other group in the Province, and we talk about the silent majority; I tell hon. members that these people in Newfoundland have been the silent majority. And I can stand in this House and cite examples of

successes of people who came back to education and are now gainfully employed and have great jobs in his Province.

The other highlight in my role as a M.H.A. was five or six days ago, when I had a call from a person on behalf of another person who was accepted into a six week course as a teacher aide in this Province. I am happy to say that it was a teacher aide course that I started at the Avalon Community College, before I left, to get ready for the teacher aide program that was going to come into effect this September. And for hon. members who are not familiar, teacher aides in the classrooms help out with the physically and mentally disabled and were hired from the Social Services rolls. These people who were on social assistance were hired and were paid to be teacher aides.

Well, I had an example of a woman in one of the communities in my district who was a sole support parent, who had two kids, who worked as a teacher aide last year under the sponsorship of Social Services, was accepted into the course here in St. John's at the Avalon Community College, but she could not afford to go. She had now terminated her employment, she was going to get unemployment insurance for the Summer, and if she did not get this particular course she could not go back to her job at the school in September.

I made some calls to the Department of Social Services and yesterday I received word that we could fund her tuition, fund some child care for her, and some transportation costs. And if I never ever do anything else, Mr. Speaker, in this hon. House, that justifies my salary for this

particular year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

This particular woman will do this six week course and in September will start a permanent job that she will have as long as she wants, and to me that is a real success story and that is what this government is about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

I am also very, very pleased, as I have said to the Premier and I have said to the Cabinet ministers, that I believe in fairness and balance. I am committed to fairness and balance and I want to be part of fairness and balance. I think if people will look at my career they know I believe in fairness and balance.

But after seventeen years of neglect in the Bellevue district, the problem I have is I need equalization payment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

I was very happy when the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs stood in this House and announced that we would be providing \$1.7 million for water and sewer in Whitbourne, \$990,000 for water and sewer in Come By Chance - as we say on Woody Island, Come Be Chance - \$380,000 for Norman's Cove-Lawn Cove, and \$300,000 for Arnold's Cove. But that is not enough, we have got to catch up.

Mr. Speaker, the road system in

Bellevue district, except for the last couple of years when they got a little bit of money, is the worst road system, outside of Fortune - Hermitage, in the Province. The people of Markland over the years have driven over a road where in the Spring of the year you could at least lose an eighteen wheeler.

When the present Premier, the leader of the party, wanted to come to Bellevue district during the election campaign, he said, 'What do you want me to do when I come to the district of Bellevue?' I said, 'I want you to take it easy. I want you to go for a nice ride on the bus.' We travelled in over the Markland road. Now, granted the grader had gone in just before, because during the election campaign they engaged a grader to go ahead of me. So the grader had gone in over Markland road and it was in good condition compared to what it was the day before when I was there.

PREMIER WELLS:

The grader went ahead of the bus in several places.

MR. BARRETT:

Yes. Well, we had to stop the bus because the bus could not get over the bridge. Then we had to get out and use the media cars to travel in over the Markland road.

I guess another highlight was that after the announcement of the transportation funding, I had calls from Markland saying, 'In the last election there were twenty-nine people voted against you. If the election was called tomorrow, everybody here would vote for you.' Because the road to Markland is being upgraded. Three kilometers are being done

now and three kilometers will be done this year. The same way between Bellevue and Bellevue Beach. Now, that is not enough money.

The roads to St. Jones Within and Southport are all being upgraded, but that is under a previous agreement. I have to compliment the members opposite that they allocated the funds for that. I like to give compliments when I can.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other concerns that I had was the mushrooming bureaucracy within government. When I see the number of divisions and all the jobs being created in the Public Service, and when I see them all being created inside the Overpass, it disturbs me greatly to know that people in Bellevue district have to wait anywhere from three to four years to get their applications reviewed for RAPP funding. When I drive past the big building there on the Parkway called the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, and all that big bureaucracy that is there, with their presidents and vice-presidents and directors and assistant directors and the directors of styrofoam cups and paper clips, it disturbs me to know I have people in my district, Mr. Speaker, who have been waiting for four years to have their applications reviewed for RAPP funding and that some of the houses are falling down. The bureaucracy has a tendency towards a snowballing effect.

If we only could see what has happened in education in this Province, particularly in post-secondary education. The previous administration released a White Paper four or five years ago

on post-secondary education. They set up a system for post-secondary education in this Province. I compliment them on that. As an adult educator I was always firmly committed that the decision making process in adult education and in training should be made as close to the learner as possible. By established local control for post-secondary education, that particular objective is being accomplished.

But, like so many other things that the previous administration tried to do, they had great intentions but never really followed through. They set up a system of community colleges and provincial institutes. For people who are not familiar, the community colleges were to provide programs that were of up to one year duration. They were to respond to community and regional needs. The five community colleges, one headquartered in Carbonear, one in Burin, one in Grand Falls for Central Newfoundland, one in Stephenville for Western Newfoundland, and one in Labrador, are great organizations. I know, I worked with one of them.

Then they set up three provincial institutes, and that is where the system started to break down. They set up the Fisher Technical Institute in Corner Brook, which was not necessary. I do not know why it was done but Mr. Speaker, we can always guess why it was done. That particular institution in the last fiscal year had a budget of \$4 million to operate programs. It is a very small institution but it is a very expensive institution to run. The administrative costs are very, very high. I will be strongly advocating we look at the whole

system of post-secondary education in Corner Brook. We have already announced that we were going to look at the Grenfell College and expand the mandate and expand the programs there, but I firmly believe that it is not necessary to have a provincial institute in Corner Brook offering two or three year programs. I think what should happen is that we should look at expanding the role or the mandate in some areas of the Province, particularly in Labrador, particularly in Western Newfoundland, and Central Newfoundland, about passing the mandate for two and three year programs over to the community colleges rather than setting up another bureaucracy and having a separate institution in Corner Brook, the Fisher Technical Institution, with a separate administration. We are probably only talking about peanuts, but by doing that we could save money on administrative costs.

Here in St. John's we have a mishmash of post-secondary education. We have the Cabot Institute down the road and we have the Marine Institute on the hill and we have the Avalon Community College, with five campuses. The mandate of the Marine Institute was to provide marine related training, the mandate of the Cabot Institute was to provide two and three year technology programs, but that did not happen. You did not follow through on your own recommendations, you did not follow through on your plan. It is too bad that you did not, because I must say you really would have done an extremely good job of reorganizing post-secondary education in the Province if you had followed through with it, but it fizzled.

What should have happened, though, and was recommended a long time ago, was that there should be one technology institute for the Province. It was labelled at that particular time as the politechnical institute. You had a great opportunity, when you built the Marine Institute on the hill, to have combined both organizations. At the time you had the presidents of both organizations retiring, so there would not have been a power struggle take place. The time was right to make the right decisions but you did not. I do not know why you did not make the right decisions.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I must inform the hon. member that his time has elapsed.

MR. BARRETT:
By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave.

MR. BARRETT:
So what should have happened is that these two institutions should have been put together.

One of the things that this present administration is going to have to do is have the political will to make some of these difficult decisions. Right now, within St. John's, we have three institutions competing for dollars. I was out there in the marketplace, and a lot of the programs that are being offered by these institutions are done under contract training to private industry and federal government

departments. We had French and all kinds of programs, and a lot of the programs are being offered under contract. I used to be out there competing with the Cabot Institute and the Marine Institute and we need to bring that thing together.

As I said, I had thirty minutes, but I had five hours and I will have more opportunities to expound on my personal philosophy and education and health matters in this House, and I am sure that we are going to be here for the next three or four weeks. So I am sure that we will have lots of opportunities, but I thank you very much for your attention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before I recognize the hon. member I want to on behalf of the hon. members of the House welcome a group from Stephenville. We have sitting in the gallery, Mr. Calvin Kindon, Administrator of the Sir Thomas Roddick Hospital; Mrs. Tina Moore, Assistant Administrator; Miss Kathleen Lawlor, Chairperson of the Board of Trustees; Dominic Maddick, Vice-Chairman of the Board; and Dr. Allan McComiskey, Chief of Staff.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LANGDON:

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the

hon. member for Bellevue, our relationship goes back quite a bit. In fact, we were both elected to a municipal council in the town of Point Leamington in a by-election some time ago, and we were elected at the same time for this particular House, on different sides, but we are still friends and I can sympathize and empathize with many of the things he said.

Getting to some of the things that we have already discussed in the budget, I was reading an editorial in a St. John's paper, The Evening Telegram, one day the week, and the person who wrote the particular editorial was chiding some members of the House because of the fact that they had come from the teaching profession, and the fact that this particular House dealt with education more than other areas of concern within the Province. And that bothers me, in a sense, because I realize, and I am sure all of us here realize as well, that if we are to progress as a province then the educational standards of our people must be raised. And the hon. the member for Bellevue just said a few moments ago in his speech, in fact, there is a larger percentage of illiterate people in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador than other other province of Canada, and asked how can we avail of the opportunity to put our people to work in either professional or vocational areas if they do not have the education ability to avail of the job market that is available to us?

Getting back to education and the hon. the member for St. John's North, there is no doubt about it that over the last number of days there have been some controversy as to censorship, or whatever you

want to call it, of the particular articles for a textbook for Grade XII. There is no doubt about it, either, that over the last term, I believe it was, there was a motion put forward by the Progressive Conservative Party, the then government, in support of the Pentecostal people entrenching their rights into the Canadian Constitution. So let that be noted in the sense that we do support the denominational education system. However, in going back, if I can reminisce to a point, I believe that the hon. Minister of Education, when he wrote his report in 1966, the Warren report on Education, did look at a number of areas and ways that the educational denominational system in this Province could be improved.

And it was widely speculated at the time, if I am correct, that because of his views on the denominational system he was not considered for the post as Dean of Education at the University. Whether that was right or not, that was the perception, that was the way it was perceived.

There are a number of communities in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador where the denominational system has splintered, if you wish, and fragmented the number of students who attend school in the communities. There is no doubt about that. There is overlapping of funding and probably some incidents where we have not got the best bang for the buck because of the system, but I do not think anybody is questioning the right of the denominational system. I do not think that is what we are here for. However, I stand to be corrected on what has happened over the last number of days. I

do not know if the churches were consulted previously to the decisions that were made regarding the particular items. They may or not not have been, but I do not know.

MS DUFF:

They were not.

MR. LANGDON:

The member for St. John's East tells me they were not. Where I am coming from, and I think I have already discussed this with the hon. member for St. John's North, this particular furor that has gripped the Province could have been averted within the department. Probably the terms of reference that these people had could very well have been done. However, on the other hand, I think also that the public in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador are not fully aware of the context, in a sense, of what we are talking about. We talk about Ted Bundy and one particular letter. That is not what it is about. I think when we do not give the people the full selections, in a sense, to view, and the whole context of it, then views do tend to get distorted, and when distortion takes place then we have a snowball effect, where everything starts to get to the point where everything is distorted, and I think this is what has happened in this particular case right here.

Also, when we talk about the education budget for this year, as a teacher for the last twenty-seven years I have seen a number of newsletters come over my desk from the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, and they have always complained, and I am sure the member for Conception Bay South and the member for Exploits, I

as former NTA Presidents agree, presented graphically the fact that we were getting a smaller portion of the pie. The number of dollars were increasing but the pie was getting smaller, and if we look at this budget that has just been presented I think we will see the pie is getting a little smaller, it is shrinking, even though we got a larger number of dollars, so I think it is important to remember that.

In the educational field I can empathize with what the hon. member for Bellevue said. I, too, grew up in a school where there were Grade VII, VIII, IX, X and XI in one classroom, where we had the potbelly stoves, and sometimes during the night I had to put mitts on my hands and light the kerosene lamp to study. These were very difficult times, and if we were to go back to some of the schools in the Province we have seen tremendous strides being made, there is no doubt about that, but we have to continue to make strides. I am sure that over the next number of years we will be able to carry on with some of the things that have already been initiated.

In the field of Municipal Affairs, in the district that I represent, Fortune - Hermitage, there needs to be equalization grants as well to bring the communities from my district up to par - water and sewer and roads.

I was interested in the comment that the hon. member for Bellevue made, Mr. Speaker, about the Premier's touring bus going into Markland having to take its time because the roads were so bad. I would like to direct his attention to the community of Gaultois on the South Coast. That particular

community needs special attention outside of the basis infrastructure money that is needed to look after that. In fact there is no way that you can build a road with the ordinary gravel. It has either got to be done by asphalt or by the concrete. In that particular community, which has an FPI modern fish plant, there is no water and sewer, and that particular community is crying desperately to have these services upgraded. So there is a need for fairness and balance.

When we talk about progressiveness and fairness and attracting people and tourists into our Province, I think we realize the benefits that accrue from that. Just let me illustrate the problem with fairness and balance that I have probably come in contact with over the last little while.

This year there is a Come Home Year in Harbour Breton, Pass Island and Grole. Two of these communities, Grole and Pass Island, were resettled under the Liberal Administration. This year these particular communities are having Come Home Year reunions. The community of Pass Island is expecting anywhere from 2,000 to 3,000 people in a week-long celebration. To get to the island, of course, they need some particular docking facilities.

The people there, the Come Home Year committee, have worked diligently, they have worked hard, they have spent in the vicinity of \$4,000 to \$5,000 of their own money, and I have been looking for a grant of \$2,000 to build the particular landing place. I have gone from one particular department to the other looking for \$2,000 but there is no money available for capital grants.

When you realize that the budget of this Province is from \$2 billion to \$3 billion and you cannot dig out \$2,000 to help get tourists, who come from all parts of this Province and Mainland Canada, into a boat without getting over boulders the size of gasoline drums, I would like to know where the fairness and balance is. So there has to be some particular money somewhere available for that.

Also in transportation, Mr. Speaker: The member for Bellevue, who now occupies the Speaker's Chair, was talking about the roads in Fortune - Hermitage. Without question that particular district has the worst roads in all of the Island part of the Province. The hon. Minister of Transportation is nodding.

I have the greatest respect for a former member of the House who was mentioned here this morning by the member for Bellevue, the late Hon. Don Jamieson. He was in the Liberal Cabinet for years in Ottawa. He had the ability to do something with that particular area. He put in the road to the Burin Peninsula. That was done. I can go back further than that. I can think of the late John Courage, who represented that district under the Liberal Administration from 1949 to 1972. There was no money put there then under that administration either. So we can go back and we can blame it on the P.C. Administration. We can do that. So can you. But the idea is, I really look forward over the next number of years to seeing that particular condition rectified, and I believe that it will be. I have to believe that assumption. If it is not, then obviously it will be another example of fairness and balance

being misconstrued and misconceived. I will not prejudge because the people in my district honestly believe that these things are going to be done and looked after.

Mr. Speaker, I could if I wanted to, I guess, expound the needs of my district, Fortune - Hermitage, for months and years on end, but I do not intend to do that at this time. As other members have already said, Mr. Speaker, we will have time to do that over the next number of months and years in the next session.

I would like to again thank the House for this opportunity to speak on behalf of my district of Fortune - Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, the member alluded to a couple of things in Transportation to which I would like to respond. First of all, he is sort of locked in history. He used to be a liberal and far-thinking fellow and, then, all of a sudden, he is over there and he is locked in history again; he talks about the roads in his district not being paved because Don Jamieson did not do it.

I will point out, as I am sure he knows, roads are a provincial responsibility and not a federal one. I would point that out to him, and the fact that the district was neglected for seventeen years. It is in the system, and with fairness and balance, it will be looked after.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

As far as Pass Island is concerned, I am now entertaining a request from Pass Island. They want to try and provide a ferry service out to Pass Island for this Come Home Year. As for spending capital money to construct something on Pass Island, I certainly do not have any in my budget for it, and I do not think it is possible.

Mr. Speaker, in your district right now there is a great Come Home Year planned for Spencers Cove, on the tip of Long Island, this year. We have not received any requests from there at all, and there are going to be 5,000 people going out there. I can assure you it is a problem. All of us who come from the far greater bay and the other bays around, realize there are Come Home Years and stuff like that. We have not received requests to get people back during the Come Home Years to those places. It is sentimental for them, no doubt, to go back, but we just do not have the money to put into building roads and wharves for people for Come Home Year. I commend the people from Spencers Cove, who are going to get 5,000 people to Long Island during the first week of July, and who have not asked the government for any help. Really, it is not something we should be doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down!

MR. SIMMS:

No, Mr. Speaker, I will not sit down.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to have a few words to say in the budget debate. I have not spoken in the debate. I will not be pressured by the government into concluding my speech early. We will not be forced into closing the House or anything of that nature. The House will carry on as normal, and if we make progress we make progress.

Now, I must admit I had not intended to speak at any great length until I heard the dissertation by the Minister of Education this morning. Now I have to admit that his attack and his approach this morning in this debate was enough to turn anybody, in my view. It was a very unfair approach. It was a threat by the Minister of Education. That is all it was. It was a weak attempt to try to take some of the pressure off that he is receiving from all over the Province. Every editorial board in the Province has been attacking him, and editorial boards in other parts of Canada have been attacking him. I would wonder about his friends in the academic community. How do they feel about him?

MR. HEWLETT:

The Red Liberal.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. O'Flaherty and Mr. Boswell and people of that nature, people he spends time with on the cocktail circuit. I just wonder how they feel about him. But to use the approach the Minister of Education used this morning, I think really does a disservice to himself,

because he is an individual who is supposedly highly respected in the education community and in the academic community. I do not think the Minister of Education is smart enough politically yet to try this little approach, so I suspect he has received advice from some of his colleagues on that side. You are taking so much heat on this bill, the way to approach it is to try to turn it around, try to cloud the issue, attack the Conservatives in Opposition, bring in the issue of the churches. That is precisely what the minister did this morning, and he can shake his head all he wants.

And I do not want him to get away with trying to leave the impression, when he brought up the Church issue and the constitutional amendment for the Pentecostal Assemblies, that somehow his Party was the strong force behind that, because that is absolutely untrue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

That is absolutely untrue, Mr. Speaker, because it was this Party, when it was the government, which took that initiative. The Conservative Party and the Conservative Government took that initiative, brought the resolution into the House, and, of course, members opposite had no choice but to support it; they did it for political reasons, I suspect, not for any strong reasons of faith or support for that particular constitutional amendment.

So do not try to cloud the issue, do not try to turn it around somehow to take the heat off yourself for something you have

done, something you have to take responsibility for. Because the issue is censorship. That is the issue. It has nothing to do with the churches.

DR. WARREN:

Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

MR. SIMMS:

No, there are no questions, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Education spoke. If he had not spoken the way he had today, we might have been out of here now.

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is right.

MR. SIMMS:

He said in his speech, 'I have learned a lot, Mr. Speaker...' - those were his opening remarks this morning - 'I have learned a lot in the few weeks I have been here in the House. I have learned a lot of lessons.' Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe he has learned another lesson today and he is going to learn another lesson before the day is over, and then, maybe, his colleagues who advise him will tell him what the lesson is, if he has not been smart enough to pick it up as yet.

But I just think it was a dastardly approach by the Minister of Education, a very unfair approach. He did not stick with the issue, he tried to cloud the issue, tried to make it political, but I will tell him he will get nowhere with that approach. He will not get anywhere with it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to address some other issues that have been raised both this morning and in the past. During the Budget Debate, the member for St. John's South (Mr. Murphy), I

remember because I made a note of it, in his maiden speech, I think - I am not sure if it was his maiden speech or not. Maybe it was in The Throne Speech. No, it was in the Budget Speech, because he used words like 'the Minister's Budget was courageous. The Minister of Finance was courageous to bring it in' - the member for St. John's South spent a lot of time alluding to the great Liberal theme song during the election campaign 'Come home Newfoundlanders'. Everybody remembers that, and the member for St. John's South alluded to that considerably during his comments on the budget debate.

I listened with great interest to the member for Bellevue (Mr. Barrett) this morning, in his maiden speech. I thought he gave a very good speech in the House, an excellent speech, as a matter of fact.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Unlike some of his colleagues over there, the Minister of Health (Mr. Decker) and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Efford) in particular, who are so partisan they cannot see beyond their noses, unlike those kinds of members on the other side, the member for Bellevue was good enough to commend this Party, when it was in government, for some of the initiatives it had taken and congratulate it for some of the work it had done. Now, I can understand why the member for Bellevue did that, by the way. There is always a reason, there is always something behind the scenes that people really do not know and do not realize. The member for Bellevue, of course, when he

talked about educational improvements, and so on, as we all know was a member of one of the education departments, Career Development I guess it was at that time, so he himself had a role to play in all these great improvements, no doubt, and that is the little message behind the scenes that he wanted to get out, not to mention the fact, of course, that the member for Bellevue had always had strong conservative leanings. Very strong conservative leanings the member for Bellevue had and would have been a fine member on this side of the House, as well. I suspect he looked at the scene politically and felt that his best opportunity to become elected to the House of Assembly was to run in a staunch Liberal district as a Liberal, and that is what he did.

I listened with interest to the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation (Mr. Gilbert) who made a few brief comments a few moments ago. He was going to get up and speak in the budget debate, but his colleagues all said, 'Sit down, sit down.' They do not even want to hear him, and I do not blame them for that. He got up and spoke for two or three minutes and immediately misrepresented what the member for Fortune - Hermitage, (Mr. Langdon) my colleague, said in his comments in the budget debate.

First of all he said, 'The member for Fortune - Hermitage got up and said the roads in his district were not paved because of Don Jamieson.' That is not what the member for Fortune - Hermitage said. The member for Fortune - Hermitage, who was responding to some cracks from across the way, such as, 'Why did you not do it? Why did the last government not do

it? The last government did not do anything with the roads,' and he merely said, 'Yes, and you can go all the way back to Don Jamieson's day, or John Courage's day or anybody's day, the Liberal days, when the roads were being done.' So the Minister of Transportation should not try to take out of context and misrepresent what the member for Fortune - Hermitage had to say.

The Minister of Transportation likes to try his little political digs, too. He made some quick reference to the Liberal views of the member for Fortune - Hermitage. It always interests me to see the Minister of Transportation make those kinds of cracks, but yet neglect to mention the Progressive Conservative views held by the Minister of Transportation a number of years back. He absolutely forgets that. He never mentions it. I do not suppose he has even told his colleagues about what a strong Conservative he was only a few short years ago.

AN HON. MEMBER:

After you became a Tory he decided he would become a Liberal.

MR. SIMMS:

That is not true. That is absolutely not true. The Minister of Transportation could not get his way with the Tory Government, and that is why he became a Liberal. I will not elaborate on it. I could but I will not. I will leave it at that.

What really galled me today was when the Minister of Transportation got up and said - the member for Fortune - Hermitage asked for a couple of thousand dollars, a measly couple of thousand dollars to assist a small

community which has no other source of revenue, who have put \$4,000 or \$5,000 themselves into building a landing - that is all they want, nothing else - they are looking for a couple of thousand bucks and he says, 'Well, we have no mechanism for that.' A \$3 billion budget, and there is no way to find a couple of thousand dollars, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have sat in government and we know that you can find a couple of thousand dollars to help a community out. There are always ways to do things. Even the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island says there are ways. Surely the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Provincial Affairs could give serious consideration to this reasonable request from the member for Fortune - Hermitage for a measly couple of thousand dollars to help that community out, and I hope he does.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to briefly talk about the budget itself, the method of presentation, the presenter of the budget, the Minister of Finance. I cannot let this day and this opportunity go by without having a few words to say about the presentation of the budget, the method of presentation, and a few words about the Minister of Finance himself; I just might throw in a few words about the Minister of Finance himself.

We have already reviewed the minister's performance over the last seven or eight weeks. He seems to be coming along a little bit better now. Slowly, but he seems to be coming along a little bit better. I guess his colleagues are propping him up and giving him encouragement and

shaking his hand and clapping him on the back. The Minister of Forestry is probably giving him a lot of advice, no doubt. The Minister of Forestry wants to get his name mentioned somehow, so he keeps raising it across the floor, 'Mention my name!' 'Mention my name!'

I wonder if the Minister of Finance is aware - this is not a personal attack now, I do not want him to take this wrong. Oh, please do not leave! I was wondering if he was aware - he is within earshot - of some of the tags that they have placed on the Minister of Finance over at the university, some of the names they have placed on him. For example - and it is evident in his presentation -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Come on!

MR. SIMMS:
No, no! It is only all in humor. Have a sense of humor, boy. But his students over at the university refer to him as the Mad Professor, I am told, the Mad Hatter.

AN HON. MEMBER:
We made him mad last night.

MR. SIMMS:
Yes, he got mad last night, finally. So we are seeing that come true.

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

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

MR. BAKER:
The member from Grand Falls is giving such an excellent speech, I

wonder if we could stop the clock so we can avail of the opportunity to listen to the full extent of his speech?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Is it the wish of the House that we stop the clock?.

MR. SIMMS:
We can stop the clock for the moment anyway, Mr. Speaker. Certainly! But, of course, we have other alternatives.

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

MR. SIMMS:
I can adjourn the debate, if you wish, and we can come back on Monday or Tuesday, or whatever. It really does not matter. It is no matter to us.

AN HON. MEMBER:
I have a sense of humor. Carry on!

MR. SIMMS:
I kind of thought they might encourage me to continue.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Tell us about the Mad Hatter.

MR. SIMMS:
Oh, yes, the Mad Hatter. I do not know where he went, and I am really disappointed. Oh, here he is, the Mad Hatter, the Mad Professor. I was wondering if you were aware that former students of yours over the University referred to you as the Mad Professor, the Mad Hatter. That has been passed along to me.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

You were a former student of his?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No! My God, no!

MR. SIMMS:

You refer to him as the Mad Professor?

DR. WARREN:

(Inaudible) turned out a lot better.

MR. SIMMS:

But the Minister of Education was aware that one of the tags the Minister of Finance's students placed on him from time to time was the Mad Professor.

DR. WARREN:

Never.

MR. SIMMS:

You never heard that one?

DR. WARREN:

He is the best person (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, I am not talking about whether he is the best person or not. He could not get the Dean of Education's job, either, like the Minister of Education. Les was not interested in making either one of you Dean of Education. Les wanted to get both of them. I suspect, Les had a talk to the Premier and said, why do you not encourage these fellows to run again for the umpteenth time? Because they have run I do not know how many times.

MR. MATTHEWS:

They did not even get an interview. They called me to see if I could influence the board to interview them.

MR. SIMMS:

Is that right?

What, political interference? That is not true. I do not believe that. That cannot be accurate, is it? Are you serious? I think the member for Grand Bank is probably stretching a little bit. I am sure the minister would not have tried to use political interference in getting an interview for the job of Dean of Education. I do not think he would have done that, would he? He would not have called the minister. No, I do not think so.

MR. SIMMS:

Anyway, the Mad Professor, the Mad Hatter, he presented the Budget. He put on his dark blue suit and his red tie for television that day and came in and read the Budget, the biggest tax grab in the history of Newfoundland and Labrador, never seen before, never heard of before. He taxed everything that walked or crawled, including the Minister of Social Services - just about everything.

MR. MATTHEWS:

The Old Night Crawler.

MR. SIMMS:

There he is with his ear cocked up. Look!

MR. RIDEOUT:

As soon as you mention his name, he pops up somewhere.

MR. SIMMS:

Anyway he taxed everything in the Province he could, then, in subsequent days and weeks, when we had the debate on the Budget, when the responsibility is on the minister to get up and answer questions, and so on, he answered questions from the member for Grand Bank who asked, Can the

Minister of Finance tell us how much money is in the budget for the hospitals in Grand Bank and St. Lawrence? The Minister of Finance jumped to his feet and said, Well, sure, we just announced that they are closing. There is no money in the budget for the hospitals in Grand Bank and St. Lawrence. And the Premier had to quickly turn around and say, That is not so, Herbie. Then the Minister of Health jumped up to his defence and said, No, no, there is money there. There is a million and-some-odd. Then we saw the member for Grand Bank ask other questions in a ferocious attempt to try to get answers, and the Minister of Finance would not even stand to answer them.

But the straw that broke the camel's back was at the beginning, when he had this \$1.4 billion Interim Supply Bill. We will never forget that one. A \$1.4 billion Interim Supply Bill with his name - woops! - on the front of the bill, Honourable Hubert Kitchen, Minister of Finance, Interim Supply Bill, \$1.4 billion. Normal process: Minister of Finance gets up and explains. Here it is here. The Minister of Finance gets up and tells everybody what is in this \$1.4 billion, what this is all about, what it covers. That is the normal process. What happens? The Speaker calls the Order and the President of Treasury Board stands up. The Minister of Finance does not even stand up. Then Herbie Goes Bananas. Now, that is the name of a movie. Then, subsequently, we had to try to force him. Not only did he not get up to present the Interim Supply Bill, I do not believe he even spoke on it, did he?

MR. RIDEOUT:
No, he did not.

MR. SIMMS:
I do not believe he even spoke on it. He might have at the end; he could not take the pressure anymore. So the minister's performance has been dismal, and that is my point. To summarize what my point is, his performance has been dismal.

MR. DOYLE:
And abysmal.

MR. SIMMS:
Abysmal and dismal.

Some people have looked at his reactions to comments over here, or his reactions after he gets up and makes what he thinks is a great speech, when he applauds himself, bangs on his own desk and all that kind of thing, and they call him 'Wynken, Blynken and Nod' all in the same, they are all in one. That is what they refer to him as, the Mad Hatter, and Wynken, Blyken and Nod.

He just has been dismal as Minister of Finance. Now, there is nothing personal in this. I am not talking about anything personal about the individual, but as Minister of Finance his performance has certainly been lacking. I do not believe the Premier even feels comfortable about it. I really do not. Now, he is not going to say it, obviously, but I do not.

PREMIER WELLS:
I am very proud of him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
And I can assure the Premier that

we on this side are very proud of him, too, and we look forward to him remaining in that position for the next two or three or three and-a-half years, whatever it might be.

Now, the real architect of the budget, of course, is sitting right here in the Premier's chair. I was reading **The Sunday Express**, 'Refrigerator Check List'. The Premier probably saw that a number of weeks ago. These are all the promises that the Premier made, which he says he did not make, of course, but there is a list of them. This is not all of them, this is only a summary. There was one interesting one there I glanced at this morning. Here it is here: "Clyde Wells has promised Cabinet decisions made by consensus but with forceful leadership." That is the promise he made to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, "Cabinet decisions made by consensus but with forceful leadership."

PREMIER WELLS:

Would you have it any other way?

MR. SIMMS:

No. It certainly should not be any other way, but it is, and that is precisely the point. The problem is it is another way. Everybody knows it, everybody sees it, and everybody can read it. Ministers will not dare open their mouths about it, but I can tell you that the reading is there. It is Cabinet decisions made by forceful leadership, period. That is how the government is operating and everybody knows it.

The best example is the budget, because it was not the Minister of Finance who made all these decisions. Go ahead and we will

implement all those \$90 million worth of programs and we will get it back by just taxing the people \$95 million. The Premier made all those decisions. It was not the President of Treasury Board, it was not the Minister of Finance, or any of those people. The Minister of Finance is not even on Planning and Priorities, the senior Committee of Cabinet that makes all the major decisions. So that is what we have and that is what we see.

Remember the old robbers Bonnie and Clyde? They refer to the reinstatement of the same group of robbers only in a different way, of course, a different context, and they now call them Herbie and Clyde instead of Bonnie and Clyde.

One of the biggest things in this budget, Mr. Speaker, that really devastated me was the elimination of the Private Sector Employment Program. I want to speak about that for a moment seriously, because either the minister has been duped or misinformed or misled by other of her colleagues, or they really do not want a program that was working well, and that the previous administration was getting some credit for, to stay in place. They merely want to eliminate it so they can bring in their own program, which will be quite similar. Quite frankly, what I heard the minister say on a number of occasions with respect to that program - and I heard other members making comments about it as well - is just not true. It is just not accurate. I can tell you from personal experience that it never was a program that was mistreated politically. It never was.

There was an interdepartmental committee set up to assess all of

the applications that came in. When the applications came through

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not true!

MR. SIMMS:

Look, you can research the Cabinet documents if you wish and you will find that the programs recommended by the interdepartmental committee staff, official bureaucrats, came to Cabinet and were practically rubber stamped, except for one or two. It had nothing to do with politics, it had to do with potential conflicts. But that is a fact and you can research all the Cabinet papers, if you wish, and you will find that that is a fact. So there was no political interference. That is an unfair accusation and it is without foundation, I can tell the minister.

I forget the exact figures and numbers. We asked the minister to provide us with the report she said she had done, the analysis, and so on, but we have not seen that yet, either. But she did indicate she would let us have it.

My recollection of the program is that 60 per cent, I think that is the number, or thereabout, it was a fairly high percentage, 60 per cent of the people employed under that program with the private sector were actually kept on beyond the subsidy expiry date. And I believe, further, approximately 30 per cent of those people who had been employed were actually kept on full time by the employers at the employers total expense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is creating full-time, long-term jobs, that is a program which does that. And

where 30 per cent of them were actually employed full-time, I cannot for the life of me understand why members opposite would see that program as a program that created only short-term, meaningless jobs. That is what the Premier said the other day, as a matter of fact, that one of the problems he saw with the program was short-term, meaningless jobs, when 30 per cent of them were kept on by the private sector. In fact, I think the implication made by the Premier was that the business community were only accessing the program to get a few bucks and take advantage of it. I think that is an unfair accusation, because the reality is that when the government put \$7.5 million into that program last year, the private sector put in \$7.5 million. You had \$15 million in the economy half of which was paid for by the private sector. In addition to that, 60 per cent of the people they hired were kept on beyond the subsidy expiry date and 30 per cent of the people were kept on full-time. Now, I really, honestly cannot understand why, unless there were a few members opposite, maybe two or three ministers, who had narrow vision, tunnel vision, and thought that it had to be political, it had to be politics because the Conservatives were involved in the program or something. There are some members opposite in the Cabinet who feel that way, anyway, they just cannot see beyond their noses. They feel because it was the Conservatives it was all politics and everything else, but it just was not true.

MR. MATTHEWS:

(Inaudible) that program now, it is going to be totally (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Well, that could be. We will have to wait and see.

But I want to emphasize that this program was not a free ride for the business community, because they matched dollar for dollar every dollar that we put into the program. I really think it is a shame that the government saw fit to cancel that program. It employed a lot of people. Twenty-eight per cent of the people employed, I believe, were university students, so I would ask the minister and the government to reconsider this situation.

I understood the minister said she was going to bring in a new program, and that is all fine and dandy, but the point is you have to do something soon. You cannot wait until next year, you have to do it very soon. The employment season for a lot of people is running out, students in particular - 28 per cent of them were students. You are not going to attract those people, unless you are waiting for the House to close and then make some kind of a major employment program announcement so that the Liberals, all of a sudden, get the credit for the big program. Now, that could be possible.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I have said on two or three occasions that the problem with being in Opposition, I suppose, is you can only try to point out the shortcomings of the government, which we have attempted to do, particularly in the budgetary process, highlight the areas that are positive, which we have tried to do, and highlight the areas which are negative, which we have tried to do, and hope that the public know what exactly is being perpetrated on

them by this particular government. That is what we have attempted to do, but the reality is, of course, when you are in opposition there is not much else you can do because the government will use its majority, will force through the budget or any other kind of legislation it wants to force through, and that is what we are going to see here today, or next week, whenever we get to concluding the debate on the budget. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. the Minister of Finance speaks, he will close the debate.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There are many things that could be said in response to what has been said, but I am going to forego many of the things that might be said. I would like to say, though, that if we conclude our debate quickly here, we may actually be able to save some money on the per diems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Shut her down right away.

DR. KITCHEN:

That will be good.

The point has consistently been made opposite that we have raised taxes by \$95 million. This is absolutely untrue, Mr. Speaker. The amount of money we anticipate raising by increased taxes is something like \$32 million or \$33 million. So this figure they keep quoting, which is being bandied

about in the press, and so on, of \$95 million, is completely untrue and should be corrected.

There is another point I would like to comment on. It has to do with the \$88 million deficit that was proposed to us when we assumed government. This was the proposed deficit. We were able, by increasing taxes modestly, \$32 million or \$33 million, and by chopping out some expenditures, to come up with a relatively balanced budget on current account. One of the things we did not have the opportunity to do because of the time constraints that went into the preparation of the budget and the necessity of preparing a budget which was much overdue, was to scrutinize the expenditure side as much as we would have liked. In the days ahead, and I do not wish to tell the Opposition what to do, but I will suggest that what we might do is try to find ways of not wasting money, try to spend our money appropriately but without waste. One of the things about the previous government is that they were not aware of this problem; they spent money like it was going out of style and we must stop that extravagance wherever we can.

I remember some years ago, first when I came to St. John's, the government offices were virtually all down in Fort William, down behind the Newfoundland Hotel - remember that? - in three or four long government buildings, and I remember when Mr. Smallwood constructed the Confederation Building it was to bring all government departments into one location. It was not built before the government started to expand outside. Now we have a second Confederation Building, a monstrosity to look at but yet

very large, and it still does not contain the public service. Every single day we get proposals to increase the public service, 100 here, 50 here, 25 here and I venture to say that before five years are up, if this current thing continues, we will have to put up another Confederation Building, and four and five and six. We have to watch what we are doing in government. This consistent expansion, expansion, expansion not of services but of the total public service, we have to get value for our money. The money must get out to the people.

The purpose of a budget, as I understand it, is to redistribute the money, not to hang on to most of it. We have to be very careful of that and I am going to ask all members, if they would, to be very careful, because every time we spend money in one place, we either have to chop it somewhere else or raise taxes. Nobody wants to raise taxes. I am not particularly proud of having to come to this House and ask for money by raising taxes. That is not something anyone would like to do. What I would like to do, though, is to keep our expenditures down.

Mr. Speaker, with these few remarks, I will conclude the budget debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of Ways and Means

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee of Ways and Means rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again, now, by leave.

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

DR. KITCHEN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have received a message, Mr. Speaker, from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

To the Hon. the Minister of Finance:

"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending the 31st day of March 1990, by way of further supply and in accordance with the

provisions of The Constitution Act, 1867, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly."

(Sgd).....

Lieutenant-Governor.

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

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, I move that the message be referred to the Committee of the Whole on Supply.

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

Committee of Supply

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Chairman, I move that the total contained in the Estimates be carried and a resolution be adopted to give effect to the same.

On motion, the total of the estimates contained in the message were carried.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed the amount of \$1,474,226,400 as contained in the Estimates of Supply and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again, now, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the Committee of the Whole on Supply with respect to the Estimates of 1989-90 together with a resolution and a bill consequent thereto be referred to a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means and that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of Ways and Means

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Resolution

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the

Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1990, the sum of one billion four hundred and seventy-four million two hundred and twenty-six thousand four hundred dollars (\$1,474,226,400).

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall the resolution carry?

On motion, resolution carried.

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One thousand Nine Hundred and Ninety And For Other Purposes Relating To the Public Sector.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed a certain resolution and recommend that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion, report received and adopted, resolution ordered read a first and second time, bill

ordered read a first, second and third time, Committee ordered to sit again, now, by leave.

On motion, resolution read a first and second time.

On motion, a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred and Ninety And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Sector, read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 14).

MR. BAKER:
Motion 3, Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour The Lieutenant-Governor for the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, you have to move the House into Committee, do you not? Unless there is some kind of a special procedure for Supplementary Supply that I am not aware of.

MR. SPEAKER:
I will read the motion first.

Motion 3 - To Move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain Resolution for the Granting of Supplementary Supply

to Her Majesty.

MR. SIMMS:
Oh, he is reading the message?

MR. SPEAKER:
Yes.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour The Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER:
"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit further Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending the thirty-first day of March 1990, by way of further Supplementary Supply and in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution Act, 1867, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly.

(Sgd).....

Lieutenant-Governor.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker, I move that the message together with the amount be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER:
When shall the Committee meet?

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:

This is a Supplementary Supply Bill and by leave of the House I would like to go on to the further readings now. I wonder if we could have leave of the Opposition?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Have the fans arrived yet?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

No, Mr. Speaker, we have no objection.

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

Committee of the Supply

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Resolution

That it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain additional expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1990, the sum of four million nine hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$4,950,000).

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall the resolution carry?

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Chairman, we are introducing this motion which will lead to a bill "An Act For The Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Additional Expenditures Of The Public Service..." It is basically to provide an amount which we had not in the budget, \$3 million towards the Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation and certain additional monies to provide post-secondary education in Labrador West for the Fall, for a total of \$4,950,000.

DR. WARREN:

No, not for the Fall, next Winter.

DR. KITCHEN:

Next Winter, is it?

DR. WARREN:

Next January.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall the resolution carry?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. BAKER:

I suppose we are in for four or five hours, are we?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, there there could be four or five hours debate on this one.

No, just a few short comments, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of minutes after having the budget passed, we are back looking for \$5 million, so I can say to the minister, there goes his \$5

million projected surplus. It is already gone, two minutes after the budget was passed. So I guess from here on in we will be into a deficit position with his budget, and on and on it will go from there.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Is that not what you said in your speech?

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is exactly what I said, that it would not be long. It is recorded in Hansard.

We might just say that we are quite pleased to see the expenditure for the Labrador West community college, offering first year university courses starting in January, 1990. We had hoped it would start in September of this year. It is due to the excellent work of the MHA for Menihek, and especially the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

We are delighted to see this expenditure of approximately \$1.9 million for that particular provision. We are quite pleased with that expenditure. We think the people of Labrador West certainly deserve it, and so we concur.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall the resolution carry?

On motion, resolution carried.

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Additional Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Ninety

And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service".

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the resolution and a bill consequent thereto, carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report that they have adopted a certain resolution and recommend that a bill be introduced to give effect to same.

On motion, report received and adopted, resolution ordered read a first and second time, bill ordered read a first, second and third time, now, by leave.

On motion, resolution read a first and second time.

On motion, a bill, "An Act For The Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Additional Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Ninety And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service, read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 13).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, in the greater spirit of co-operation that exists in this House, and has existed for some time and, we are informed, may come to an end sometime in the future, with that spirit of greater cooperation I would like to ask leave for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to make a brief statement on a matter of some urgency which has come to his attention during this morning's sitting. I wonder if we could have leave for him to make his brief statement, and have even a briefer response from the Opposition?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Since the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture has been itching and dying to get on his feet to get his name in the paper or something, I suppose, in the name of heavens, we will have to give leave for a brief statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I also want to thank the hon. Opposition House Leader, the Leader of the Opposition, and my own House Leader for arranging leave. I had an option: I could have gone directly to the press with this, but out of my great respect for the House and out of my concern to inform members of the House and the public, I chose to do it this way and I want to

thank the hon. member for his co-operation. I have a very short statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise this hon. House and the public that the insect control program against the soft wood defoliator, hemlock looper, will commence on the Northern Peninsula between River of Ponds and Castor River, on the Eastern side, near Roddickton, over the July 1 holiday weekend. The biological insecticide Bt will be used and applied in two applications, approximately four to six days apart. It is expected that between 5,000 and 6,000 hectares will be treated over fourteen to twenty-one days of spraying. The spray operation will be based at the Port au Choix airstrip, utilizing one helicopter and one fixed-wing aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, I would further like to advise that anyone seeking information on the spray operation may call collect to the Forest Protection Division, Corner Brook, and the number is 1-637-2622, or contact the Port Saunders unit office at 861-3502. The public will be advised through the media about the opening and closing of the various spray blocks. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Somebody on this side, Mr. Speaker, said facetiously that it was another example of Liberal pork-barreling, all this money being spent in another Liberal district.

Mr. Speaker, this really is an non-announcement. It is an opportunity for the minister to,

hopefully, get his name in print, or in press. He might! But it is really a non-announcement, because I actually announced last week that the spray program was going to get underway this coming weekend. It is all out there in the news anyway, so I do not know why the minister wanted -

MR. FLIGHT:
(Inaudible) that program.

MR. SIMMS:
I announced last week that the spray program was starting this weekend, so I do not know why he wanted to waste the time of the House today.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to suggest a very brief recess of about ten to twelve minutes, when hon. members will then be informed that the House will resume its business.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would ask hon. members to take their places, please.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS:
Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER:
Admit His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS:
All rise.

MR. SPEAKER:
It is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, Her Faithful Commons in Newfoundland, to present to Your Honour Bills for the appropriation of Supply and Supplementary Supply granted in the present Session.

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Ninety And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service." (Bill No. 14).

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Additional Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Ninety And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service". (Bill No. 13).

HON. JAMES. A. McGRATH
(Lieutenant-Governor):
In Her Majesty's Name, I thank Her Loyal Subjects, I accept their benevolence, and I assent to these bills.

MR. SPEAKER:
May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its present Session passed certain Bills, to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act". (Bill No. 3)

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Tobacco Tax Act, 1986". (Bill No. 4)

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Gasoline Tax Act, 1978". (Bill No. 5)

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned to the call of the Chair.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957". (Bill No. 6)

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957". (Bill No. 7)

A bill, "An Act To Authorize The Raising Of Money By Way Of Loan By the Province". (Bill No. 10)

A bill, "An Act To Abolish Certain Ancient Rights Of Action In The Area Of Family Law And To Amend The Children's Law Act, The Family Law Act, The Reciprocal Enforcement Of Support Orders Act And The Support Orders Enforcement Act In Order To Correct Anomalies And Errors In Those Acts". (Bill No. 9)

A bill, "An Act Respecting An Increase Of Certain Pensions." (Bill No. 8)

A bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law." (Bill No. 11)

HON. JAMES A. McGRATH
(Lieutenant-Governor):

In Her Majesty's Name, I assent to these Bills.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move that the House at its rising do adjourn to the call of the Chair, which I expect will be sometime around the middle of October, and that this House do now adjourn.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

June 30, 1989

*Tabled to
Min. of Municipal
and Provincial Affairs
30 June, 1989*

Mr. Simms (Grand Falls) to ask the Hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs - to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

An itemized list of travel 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.

May 27-28	Grand Falls Annual Meeting of Recreation Committee <i>(Parks & Recreation Association)</i>	- \$400
June 9 - 12	Vancouver (June's ticket included) Federation of Municipalities	-\$3,550
June 26	Gander Firefighters Anniversary	- \$320
June 24	Corner Brook To meet with Humber Joint Councils (Deputy Minister also went)	- \$860
June 5	Exploits District Function attended by Roger Grimes on behalf of me	- \$244

DEPT. OF MUNICIPAL
AFFAIRS

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
 First Session - Forty-First General Assembly
 Hon. Thomas Lush, Speaker
 Mr. Lloyd Snow, Deputy Speaker
 Mr. Percy Barrett, Deputy Chairman of Committees

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Mr. K. Aylward, (Lib)	Stephenville
Mr. R. Aylward, (PC)	Kilbride
Mr. Baker, (Lib)	Gander
Mr. Barrett, (Lib)	Bellevue
Mr. Brett, (PC)	Trinity North
Mr. Carter, (Lib)	Twillingate
Ms Cowan, (Lib)	Conception Bay South
Mr. Crane, (Lib)	Harbour Grace
Mr. Decker, (Lib)	Strait of Belle Isle
Mr. Dicks, (Lib)	Humber West
Mr. Doyle, (PC)	Harbour Main
Ms Duff, (PC)	St. John's East
Mr. Dumaresque, (Lib)	Eagle River
Mr. Efford, (Lib)	Port de Grave
Mr. Flight, (Lib)	Windsor-Buchans
Mr. Furey, (Lib)	St. Barbe
Dr. Gibbons, (Lib)	St. John's West
Mr. Gilbert, (Lib)	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Mr. Gover, (Lib)	Bonavista South
Mr. Greening, (PC)	Terra Nova
Mr. Grimes, (Lib)	Exploits
Mr. Gullage, (Lib)	Waterford - Kenmount
Mr. Hearn, (PC)	St. Mary's-The Capes
Mr. Hewlett, (PC)	Green Bay
Mr. Hodder, (PC)	Port au Port
Mr. Hogan, (Lib)	Placentia
Mr. Kelland, (Lib)	Maskaupi
Dr. Kitchen, (Lib)	St. John's Centre
Mr. Langdon, (PC)	Fortune-Hermitage
Mr. Lush, (Lib)	Bonavista North
Mr. Matthews, (PC)	Grand Bank
Mr. Murphy, (Lib)	St. John's South
Mr. Noel, (Lib)	Pleasantville
Mr. Parsons, (PC)	St. John's East Extern
Mr. Penney, (Lib)	Lewisporte
Mr. Power, (PC)	Ferryland
Mr. Ramsay, (Lib)	LaPoile
Mr. Reid, (Lib)	Carbonear
Mr. Rideout, (PC)	Baie Verte - White Bay
Mr. Short, (Lib)	St. George's
Mr. Simms, (PC)	Grand Falls
Mr. A. Snow, (PC)	Menihek
Mr. L. Snow, (Lib)	Trinity - Bay de Verde
Mr. Tobin, (PC)	Burin - Placentia West

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

-2-

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Ms Verge, Lynn (PC)	Humber East
Mr. Walsh, (Lib)	Mount Scio - Bell Island
Dr. Warren, (Lib)	St. John's North
Mr. Warren, (PC)	Torngat Mountains
Premier Wells, (Lib)	Bay of Islands
Mr. Windsor, (PC)	Mount Pearl
Mr. Winsor, (PC)	Fogo
Mr. Woodford, (PC)	Humber Valley

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

Hon. Clyde K. Wells	Premier
Mr. Baker	Executive Council
Mr. Carter	Fisheries
Ms Cowan	Employment and Labour Relations
Mr. Decker	Health
Mr. Dicks	Justice
Mr. Efford	Social Services
Mr. Flight	Forestry and Agriculture
Mr. Furey	Development
Dr. Gibbons	Mines and Energy
Mr. Gilbert	Works, Services and Transportation
Mr. Gullage	Municipal and Provincial Affairs
Mr. Kelland	Environment and Lands
Dr. Kitchen	Finance
Dr. Warren	Education