



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 19

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Tuesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

24 April 1990

The House met at 2.00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, before we move to the normal business of the day I want to ask all hon. Members of the House to consider asking you, Mr. Speaker, to write to the family of the late Dr. Paddy McNicholas who since this House last sat has died. A significant number of the Members, as I look around this House, sat here as Members while Dr. McNicholas was both a Member and a Speaker of this House. I did not sit in the House with him while he sat as an ordinary Member but I sat in the House for a couple of years while he was Speaker and I have no hesitation in saying that I and the Members that I sat with then in Opposition esteemed greatly the manner in which Dr. McNicholas presided over the affairs of the House and esteemed greatly Dr. McNicholas's personal manner of dealing with all Members of the House. It was clear that all Members of the House held Dr. McNicholas, his values and his approaches, in high esteem. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to ask you and ask the whole House to endorse this request to ask you to forward to the family of the late Dr. Paddy McNicholas an expression of our high esteem for Dr. McNicholas then as Speaker of the House and to convey to his family our continuing high esteem of Dr. McNicholas. Would you also, Mr. Speaker, convey to Mrs. McNicholas and their children our sincere condolences on the sudden passing of their father.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I know I speak for all Members on this side of the House, and I expect Members on both sides of the House, when I say that I fully concur with the remarks made by the hon. the Premier. Many of us in this House had the opportunity to serve with Dr. McNicholas and we knew him to be a great Newfoundlander and a great Canadian. He contributed tremendously to the economic, social, and political life of Newfoundland and Labrador, and he leaves behind a great memory, a great deal of dedication to the people of this Province, not only in St. John's where he was known best, but in all of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Those of us who were in Newfoundland last Thursday, I think, practically every one of us who were in Newfoundland last Thursday took the opportunity to attend the funeral of Dr. McNicholas and to express in a concrete way our condolences and our sympathy to Isabel and to the family. But I think it is indeed appropriate that this House recognize and, through you, Your Honour, pass on in a formal way to Mrs. McNicholas and family our formal condolences and to express as well, as the Premier so aptly put it, the high esteem in which this House has held the contribution of Dr. Paddy McNicholas and in fact will continue to hold the contribution that he made to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the House convey a message of congratulations to the Center Stage Players of Conception Bay Center, who distinguished themselves during the last week or so by winning five awards at the Stephenville Festival. That particular group, Mr. Speaker, I think deserves a great deal of credit in that they managed to come away with the most awards of any group at the Festival. They were eligible to win eight awards and came away with five awards. The group under the direction of its President, Mr. John Ryan, has also been chosen by the Stephenville Festival to represent Newfoundland and Labrador at the Dominion Drama Festival in Saskatchewan on July 1 of this year.

I think it is worthy of note as well, Mr. Speaker, that this group from Conception Bay Center are a group that did not have all that much access to the types of facilities like Arts and Culture Centers and what have you, that groups in more urbanized areas of our Province have. In spite of that they have excelled very well and will represent the Province in Regina, Saskatchewan, on July 1.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the absence of the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs I have been asked to bring this House's voice in line with that of the hon. Opposition Members and extend our congratulations to the Center Stage Players.

We are indeed proud to think that that particular group has distinguished themselves in such a way and will represent Newfoundland at such a prestigious festival as the National Drama Festival. We certainly wish them well in that event and again are very proud that the hon. Member from that area brought the award to our attention today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I must say the Minister of Finance, in my view, displayed the backbone of a jellyfish just last week by announcing the details of his payroll tax when this House was in recess. The Minister, in fact, in our opinion, breached the privileges of this House by announcing the details of a tax measure in another place other than in the people's House. Now, Mr. Speaker, since the Premier does not have the courage to demand the Minister's resignation,

and since the Minister does not have the integrity to offer it, will the Minister at least, today, apologize to this House for the blatant way in which he abused the privileges of the people's House, by announcing the details of a tax measure in some other form, in some other place, other than on the floor of this Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, before we recessed for Easter, and ever since the Budget was announced, Members opposite were asking on behalf of the public that the details be announced, and I agreed that I would announce them as soon as the details had been all worked out. I did so, Mr. Speaker, so I do not know what it is they are trying to kick up a fuss about.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, there is a display of what the House and the Legislature is supposed to be all about. Mr. Speaker, now, as the Evening Telegram referred to it, that the Minister has his dunce cap taken off to come into the House, would the Minister tell the House how much additional funding will have to be added to departmental budgets to accommodate the payroll tax and how much additional funding will have to be found in other areas of the Budget to transfer to hospitals, educational institutions and so on, so that those institutions, as well as the Government itself through his Department, will be able to offset the payroll tax the Minister announced in the Budget?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, what we are going to do here is make a budgetary transfer, and that will be done in due course.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the question was very specific. How much more additional funding will have to be added to all the Departments, to the departmental budgets and to the institutions, like hospitals, school boards and so on? In other words, how much directly will have to be found by the public treasury to offset this payroll tax? That is the question I asked the Minister and, after a month, cannot the Minister give the House that information?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, there will be a transfer at the end of the year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have one short question. Will the Minister tell the House how much exactly will have to be transferred to offset the payroll tax?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I will dig into that and display the actual information

later.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Maybe the Minister will dig into that when the House recesses for the Summer and then make another announcement, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister tell the House whether or not, in order to legally appropriate \$5 million for the departmental budgets alone, not counting the school boards, not counting the hospital boards, not counting other Government agencies, but \$5 million for Government Departments alone -

MS VERGE:

Ten million in total.

MR. RIDEOUT:

- whether the Minister intends to bring in Supplementary Supply to do that, whether or not he intends to amend the Budget, whether or not he intends to maybe bring in a new Budget, since the Minister has so blatantly and fraudulently brought in a fraudulent document to this House called a Budget, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not about to be lectured on Budgets and how to bring in Budgets by that crowd opposite. The last Budget that was brought in by that crowd had no mention about the Sprung Greenhouse. Remember how they

brought in Special Warrants? And not only that, Mr. Speaker, when the House was called together they did not even have the courtesy to bring those Special Warrants before the House. I am not about to be lectured by that tribe opposite.

MR. SIMMS:

There he goes again, with his dunce cap on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, Your Honour, no doubt, at the appropriate time will ask the Minister to withdraw 'tribe' and 'crowd opposite' and so on. The Minister can get as hot and as bothered as he likes, but there is parliamentary language in here.

MR. SIMMS:

Right on!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The Minister went overboard just a few nights ago on that.

MR. SIMMS:

The Premier will lecture him.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, just be careful, because the Premier could call you stunned and silly and stupid again. See him on television last night?

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the departmental budgets which have been and are now in the process of being considered by the

various Estimates Committees are at best incomplete, and at worst they are fraudulent - that is the worst they are - would the Minister now undertake to have those Estimates referred back to the appropriate Estimates Committees so that the Estimates Committee can, in fact, review the real departmental budgets? They are not accurate, they are not complete, so, therefore, it is fraudulent work, Mr. Speaker.

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. KITCHEN:
No, Mr. Speaker.

MS VERGE:
Resign.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Resign, boy, for God's sake!

MR. WARREN:
Why resign? Walk out, boy!

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:
Obviously the Easter recess did not help the Minister of Finance to come up with answers, Mr. Speaker. I am really interested in how the Minister of Finance is going to protect health care and education and ensure that these program deliveries are not affected by this payroll tax, as he said in his statement. If he is indicating that he is going to transfer money from another Department or from another subhead

- this is some magic formula he is going to come up with, how he is going to do that and where he is going to find the savings - as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition just pointed out, therefore, the Budget documents we are debating and going over in the Estimates Committees is an absolute waste of time; it is garbage, it means nothing, it is something to bring into the House of Assembly and they will do what they will with it after. Obviously, they are going to take that on their backs as they have the House of Assembly.

I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, this question: If he is going to transfer money from other Departments, then where is the saving? Where is he getting money if he is indicating that all Crown Corporations and agencies are going to be protected? He obviously cannot tell us how he is going to do that. But if he is going to do that and take money from other Departments of Government, where will he get the \$25 million he has estimated? Because if he is going to protect all of those, as the figures we used in the House of Assembly recently indicated, there is not enough payroll left in this Province at 1.5 per cent for the Minister to get \$25 million.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Hear, hear! Where are you going to get it?

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

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker, the net amount of revenue we anticipate getting this year is \$15 million. Next year it will be \$25 million. Now, as far as Government Departments are concerned, we will be bringing in

a measure to get this money, and the money will come in on the one hand and it will go out on the other hand. It is in and out, from the Government into the Government pocket. We are taxing ourselves. When you tax yourself, Mr. Speaker, the net amount is zero. So there is no need of their being hot and bothered, we will bring in the appropriate procedures either through Special Warrant or Supplementary Supply, at the proper time.

MR. TOBIN:

How do you get \$15 million out of nothing?

MR. WARREN:

What is the advantage in that?

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister is answering the same question -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister has touched on my second question, which was how is the Minister going to fund the tax implications on various Departments of Government? That was not the question I asked, but that is a good question, too. He obviously cannot answer that. The question I wanted to ask is where is he going to find all the money to help all these health care and other institutions?

What the Minister is indicating, Mr. Speaker, is that obviously there is a tremendous amount of paper burden involved here. Will the Minister please tell us, does

he know the implications of the paper burden? And all these employers of whom the Minister says even if they are not taxable they must apply, they must register as an employer, they must file a return saying we do not owe you anything, and I think the tax is to be remitted monthly, will the Minister tell us how much paper burden is being created within Government particularly, and in the private sector, in trying to deal with this silly tax?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, no one likes to pay taxes, and it would be wrong for me to suggest that taxes are a good thing. Sometimes they are an inevitable thing, and in this case they are. Now there will be some paper burden. It will be a limited paper burden, because people calculate their payrolls on a monthly basis and they make returns to Government about their payroll. So this will be a similar return and there will be very little additional paper burden on the part of the businesses of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say one more word about this. I do not want to hear too many more silly lectures from 'One-Budget Windsor.' He brought in one Budget and that qualifies him as a Finance Minister. He was there a very short time, Mr. Speaker, and when the new Government came in, the first thing they did was flick him out, and he has the gall to criticize my Budget.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I remind hon. Members, when the

Speaker rises and says, 'Order', hon. Members should take their seats promptly and quickly. The point of order I was going to make is disposed of now, since the Minister has sat down.

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has taken leave of what little sense he had. He has gone wild.

The Minister just indicated, as he did in his recent press release he tried to sneak out, that these taxes will be remitted monthly. Let me ask the Minister a simple business question, and I will put my record as Minister of Finance up against his any day of the week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

Are companies going to be expected to also finance this tax? I will try to explain it in baby talk to the Minister. If those taxes have to be remitted monthly on goods and services billed out, do the companies also have to finance the tax or do they submit the tax when payment is received for goods and services?

AN HON. MEMBER:

You do not know what you are talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WINDSOR:

Nobody over there understands it. I realize I have gone over their heads, Mr. Speaker, but it is a simple matter. If you have to pay tax today on money you are going to receive tomorrow, then you have

to finance that money in the interim period. Or is the tax payable when the funds are received? A simple question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, the baby talk was not sufficiently infantile for me to understand it. You can now understand why it is that the Premier before last flicked him out, and you can also understand why their Government was defeated in the last election.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to move to another Minister, where, perhaps, we might get some answers. I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Mines and Energy. For quite some time now, at least over the past year, this Government has been making, from time to time, public statements about negotiations and discussions which were taking place concerning Labrador hydro development initiatives between this Government and the Government of Quebec, and, indeed, at one time involved Premier Peterson, representing the Government of Ontario. In recent months, though, precious little has been heard, at least from the public's point of view, even though one full year has now passed since this Government took over those negotiations. Can the Minister tell this House what negotiations specifically have taken place, particularly since that time of the positive impression created by the high profile photo opportunity with the three Premiers involved?

Can the Minister tell us exactly what negotiations have occurred and what is happening on this issue?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will give an update as of January 1. Since January 1 of this year we have had four meetings. The latest meeting was last Wednesday morning, when the Hydro Quebec negotiating team came to Newfoundland and met with us here in St. John's. There is another meeting scheduled, and there will be others over the next few weeks and months. The meetings are making progress. I cannot say we are definitely going to have an agreement or not by any particular time, but I would like to know by this fall whether or not we are going to have an agreement, and I believe we will know by this fall. I am pleased with the negotiations, and I am pleased with the tone of the negotiations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Minister. Has the Minister himself had any substantial meetings with his Quebec counterpart, the Quebec Minister of Energy in the last few months to discuss in detail or substantially any of the details concerning this particular issue?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

No, Mr. Speaker, I have not had any meetings. I was supposed to have one tonight, actually. We were going to meet tonight in Halifax to review the status, to basically discuss the status of negotiations, sort of an update, but this morning we had to change that and we will be getting together some time later.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Would the Minister confirm that in fact the Minister of Energy from the Province of Quebec is reluctant to hold any detailed negotiations or discussions with his Newfoundland counterpart? And can he also confirm that the main reason for that reluctance is attributed to the high profile, silly and stupid provocative statements of our Province's Minister of Finance and, indeed, this Government's position on the Meech Lake Accord?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

No, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. The

subject has never been raised. We are having excellent discussions on Labrador Hydro and I expect these discussions to continue. The reason tonight's meeting had to be cancelled was something quite different from that. We were both going to be at the Northeastern Energy Conference in Halifax, which starts tonight, hosted by Premier Buchanan, and the Minister of Energy from Quebec had to cancel her visit for other reasons and, therefore, that meeting tonight will not occur.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I have one final supplementary. Can the Minister tell me or tell the House when it was this Minister held the last meeting with his Quebec counterpart at which a comprehensive discussion took place on this very important issue? And, secondly, would he not agree that the matter is of such substance that a meeting between the two Ministers merely on the thought that both were going to be attending another conference is hardly an initiative that you would expect from a Government which purports, over the last year, to be dealing with this matter in a comprehensive way?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, we do not need to have the meetings at a ministerial level on a weekly or a monthly basis. We are getting our regular updates from our individual negotiating teams, and they are having good meetings, excellent

meetings. The last time the Minister of Energy for Quebec and I met was October, and we have seen no reason to have a meeting. There was really no reason to have a meeting now, because the negotiating teams are keeping us briefed and they are making good progress, as I have just said. I anticipate that when the opportunity arises, we will meet to discuss progress. But there is no need for me to call a meeting with her, or vice versa, at this time.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - the Capes.

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, last year in his Budget the Minister of Finance stated that initiatives taken in the post-secondary system would be costly. In fact, he said, 'students must help share the burden of these costs, and accordingly it will be necessary for Memorial University and provincial institutes to increase tuition fees by 10 per cent.' I ask the Minister of Finance then, in light of the new initiatives taken this year in reorganizing and expanding the post-secondary system, is this what caused a lack of proper operational funding for the University so that they, in turn, had to increase the tuition fees by 5 per cent?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my hon.

friend is aware that the University has discretion with respect to tuition fees. This year they decided to increase, I was informed through the press, 5 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, the real explanation for our intervention last year was that the 10 per cent was a more complex issue because we built that into the negotiation with Memorial. We felt, at that point in time, because we built the 10 per cent into the negotiation with Memorial, that we should announce the 10 per cent increase. But that was extraordinary, because the University, as my hon. friend knows, has full discretion with respect to the amount of fees, and this year the increase is 5 per cent.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the students at the University have indicated some surprise that the amount was only 5 per cent, and some pleasure. And even though they are up 5 per cent, our fees are still the lowest in the country. In fact, I had a calculation done over the weekend which indicates that Memorial's fees are 71 per cent of those in the Atlantic Provinces; they are the lowest in the region and they should stay the lowest in the region, and this Government will ensure that they will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. HEARN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister who answered the question well knows that the fees

might be lower. So is the earned income; the unemployment rate is much higher, especially the student unemployment rate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:
Would the Minister of Finance then tell us, Mr. Speaker, if the payroll tax which he has bought in has been responsible for this increase? Would he also tell us if it is factual that other post-secondary institutions, especially the private institutions which are not going to be reimbursed, if any of them are, are also contemplating fee increases to offset this badly bungled tax measure brought in by this incompetent Administration?

MR. SIMMS:
Wake up, Herb! Is that not shocking?

AN HON. MEMBER:
He is afraid to get up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

MR. HEARN:
Apparently the Minister does not know whether or not it has an effect, and we all know that it does.

Will the Minister then, seeing that there is no sense in expanding our post-secondary system if students cannot afford to go, tell us, or does he realize, that tuition fees to students have gone up 15 per cent within the past twelve months? Does he realize the effect that is

having on the students, especially in light of our floundering economy? Does he care? If he does, does he care enough, I ask the Minister of Finance, to restore proper funding to the University so that this increase will be unnecessary?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to answer the hon. Member's question. Yes, we do care, and that is why this Government is committed to education as a priority. We are making plans for post-secondary, elementary and secondary education for the future. We do care. We are anxious that a higher proportion of our population go on to post-secondary institutions.

Let me give you the 1989 figures: For Memorial University in 1989, for an Arts Degree for the full year, \$1,280 was the tuition figure. It went up this year by \$64 for the year, \$32 a semester. That is the increase this year. Thirty-two dollars per semester, the tuition fees have gone up. Now the good news, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

DR. WARREN:

If you would just let me have a minute, the good news is this Government is going to increase substantially the student aid. That is the good news!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

For years and years the students have waited for an increase in the

grants. We are going to increase it by substantially more than the cost of last year's and this year's increase in fees.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. WARREN:

One more thing, Mr. Speaker. Why do my hon. friends not go to Ottawa and tell their friends in Ottawa that this Government is doing its share in Newfoundland, why can they not change the student aid program and the student loan program? Then they might be of some benefit. Why do you not do that?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to remind the new Minister of Education that he is the one who is supposed to go to Ottawa and represent the Government of Newfoundland, not the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. As the Minister is aware, the report of the consultants on the extended ferry service for Argentia has been completed since January 8, 1990. It has been made public since March 27, I believe, when it appeared in the media in our Province, and I know the Minister had advance copies of it. Would the Minister tell this House if the Provincial Government have made their intentions known on their preference to the extension of the ferry service at Argentia?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I might add that there were discussions on this at the Estimates Committee also, and the Minister's answer three weeks ago was no, also.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to inform the Minister, because I doubt very much if he has even read the report yet, the three options recommended in the report, or suggested in the report, are to go from thirteen weeks to nineteen weeks for passenger service, year-round freight and passenger for thirteen weeks, or year-round freight and year-round passenger. Which of these options would the Government support?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware of the options. We are looking at them and the Member will be made aware in due time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, we have another Minister now who is going to wait until the House closes to answer some questions.

Mr. Speaker, one question the Minister can answer perhaps is has the Government had any studies

prepared or completed on the effect of year-round freight and passenger service as it affects St. John's, Argentia, and Port aux Basques, and will the Minister table these studies in the House of Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, my Department is currently working on it and have been working for some time, and I will table the reports when I am ready.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister responsible for wildlife I would like to direct my question to the Premier, and it is a very important question. Tomorrow evening, I think at sunset, the hunting season for caribou in Northern Labrador is supposed to end officially. At the present time, there are a number of native hunters enroute into the country looking for caribou, for subsistence hunting. I would ask the Premier if he could give an answer today so that the people in my district could be notified as to whether the season will be extended past tomorrow's deadline.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I never heard of the matter before. If it was important and urgent that it be

considered and an answer given right away, I would have expected the people concerned, or the hon. Member if he was aware of it, to have contacted me earlier and I could have provided an answer, perhaps, by now. I certainly cannot provide one right away in this House today.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

For the last number of days, those concerned have been in contact with the Department responsible but they have not received a satisfactory answer. Whether the Minister was trying to contact the Premier or his Cabinet to extend the season or not, I do not know. But I would think the Premier of this Province should be able today to advise the people in the northern district who depend on caribou as a subsistence living, advise them whether they can hunt for the next two or three days in order that they will not be charged by the Wildlife Department.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I will endeavor to find the answer to the question as quickly as I can. It may well be that I will be able to find the answer sometime this afternoon. And if hon. Members Opposite have no objection, I would be glad to interrupt the ordinary course of business of the House and notify the House of what the answer is. But I will attempt to find the answer quickly.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister responsible for Forestry and Agriculture. Because the season for the spray program is coming upon us again in the very near future, would the Minister inform the House of the results of last year's spray program using Bt, especially in the northern peninsula area?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the hon. Member for his question. I am proud to tell him that the Bt program last year was just as successful as the fenitrothion program had been the year before.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that both Bt and fenitrothion have been effective in the past, and in view of the fact that there are serious concerns about future wood supply shortages because of insect infestation, would the Minister now tell the House what type of spray he will be using in this year's program, whether it will be Bt or fenitrothion?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. Member can be assured that this Government will take whatever steps are necessary to protect the forests, to protect the trees, and we will apply whatever treatment that, in the view of Government, can do the job we want done.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister take it upon himself to table his report over the next few days for all Members of the House to see?

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister tell the House if he will be taking any advice from professional foresters and paper companies in the Province before making his decision on what he will use, whether it be Bt or fenitrothion?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, of course I will take advice from anybody who is in a position with regard to forest management, with regard to their knowledge of the forest, or with regard to the effect the infestation of budworm or Looper or blackheaded budworm will have. I will take advice from everywhere, Mr. Speaker. But the hon. Member will have to agree, as in past years, having received all the advice that is available, the final decision for what we do in our forests and what application we use rests with this Government. And having received the advice, we will make the

decision based on what is in the better interest of the forest, and, of course, we will be very, very concerned about what effect whatever we do will have on the total environment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question period has expired.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As Minister responsible for the Office of the Legislative Council pursuant to Section 18 of the statutes on Subordinate Legislation Act I am required to lay before the House of Assembly a copy of subordinate legislation that falls under that Act. Accordingly I tabled the editions of the Newfoundland Gazette published between May 12, 1989 and April 12, 1990.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, as required by Section 14 of the Liquor Control Act of 1973 I formally present to the House the annual report of the Newfoundland Liquor Licensing Board for the year ended March 31, 1989.

Notices of Motion

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Savings Plan Act." I give further notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act."

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Dangerous Goods Transportation Act," and, "The Summary Proceedings Act."

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the raising of loans by the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro Act."

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On behalf of the hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Creation Of Regional Service Boards Throughout The Province."

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Young Persons Offenders Act."

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following resolution:

WHEREAS during the past several years following the total collapse of the commercial seal hunt, landsmen hunters have diligently pursued the revitalization of the hunt; and

WHEREAS successive Provincial Governments have supported such a revitalization program through financial support for the Canadian Sealers Association and the Northeast Coast Sealers Co-operative; and

WHEREAS because of the low price for seal skins this year, it is imperative that there be Government price support in order to guarantee a seal hunt; and

WHEREAS the Harris Report recognizes that a seal hunt is essential for the preservation and rebuilding of our fish stocks; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House deplores the decision of the Government of Canada not to offer price support for a seal hunt this year; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House calls upon the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to immediately institute such a program so that the landsmen hunters can continue with this years' seal hunt and so that the Northeast Coast Sealers Co-operative can meet its market commitments.

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, on April 5 which was the last day we sat, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked some questions about the Government's policy with respect to hiring in the Public Service. He tabled a letter and asked of a variety of Ministers a variety of questions, then went on to ask a question about a particular individual that he said was improperly discharged from the Public Service, improperly removed in that it was a political vendetta. I undertook in Hansard to make a full enquiry into the entire record and position and make available to the House the full details.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the full details are too long to read. I am tabling the relevant correspondence and a summary that is a chronology of events. I will satisfy myself with saying on the basis of advice last July from both the Chairman of the Public Service Commission and the Department of Justice, we were told that the action taken by the then Premier, now Leader of the Opposition, and the Deputy Minister of Fisheries of the time who is no longer with the Government Service, was illegal and the position could not be maintained. So I am tabling this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

Petitions

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I -

MR. SPEAKER:

Before the hon. Member presents his petition, and this will not be taken out of his time, if I might be permitted to welcome to the Speaker's Gallery a former Member of the House in the person of Mr. John Nolan. I would like to extend a welcome to him on behalf of all hon. Members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I stand today to present a petition on behalf of approximately 100 people from the community of Rock Harbour in my District who are requesting but, I think, on their behalf I shall demand that the Minister of Transportation do something with the desperate road conditions that exist in that community.

Mr. Speaker, I guess prior to Government changing the former Minister of Transportation put before Cabinet a paper that dealt with the road improvements in this Province. Included in that, Mr. Speaker, was the allocation of funding for the community of Rock Harbour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these people expected their road. We in good faith made that commitment to them on behalf of the Government. When Government changed, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation, not only the first year, denied the people of Rock Harbour a decent road but again another Budget has come and gone and he still, Mr. Speaker, has not put forth the money. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, in denying it he basically robbed the money that was delegated. The Government robbed the rights of the people of Rock Harbour to have a decent paved highway, Mr. Speaker, that is what has happened here.

They are hard working, committed individuals who have made a great contribution to Newfoundland. It is a community where practically everybody works. They work in Marystown at the shipyard and the fish plant and other places. They pay taxes, Mr. Speaker, the same as everyone else in Newfoundland and Labrador, and the officials in the Department of Transportation

three years ago recognized there was a need for Rock Harbour road from Spanish Room to Rock Harbour, to be prioritized, and that funding be allocated for it.

I want to ask the Minister of Transportation somehow, somewhere, to find the necessary funding this year to do that road. Just a few weeks ago, a sand truck went out to Rock Harbour - and I have mentioned this already to the Minister of Transportation and I can say that when I told him about the incident a few weeks ago, he was concerned about what happened. I give the gentleman credit for that. He was very concerned. In Rock Harbour, Mr. Speaker, the sand truck rolled down over the bank and the road was so slippery that no one could get out to get the driver in the truck. It took him several hours to get from Rock Harbour back to Spanish Room because of the slippery road conditions. He was injured and the truck was bottom-up, and nobody could get to him.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Rock Harbour deserve better treatment from their elected Government. The money was allocated two years ago, and this Minister and this Government denied that to the people. It was dealt with in our Cabinet. And I honestly believe, Mr. Speaker, that if there is either bit of decency in this Government, they will find that \$400,000 somehow to do what needs to be done for the people of Rock Harbour. It is really important. The road is in desperate shape, Mr. Speaker, and, as pointed out in the petition, these are people who work. They are hard working, decent individuals, hard working Newfoundlanders who deserve better

treatment than they have been given by this Government.

There are days when the school buses cannot get to that community. There are days when the people cannot get to their place of employment because of the road conditions and yes, Mr. Speaker, there are days when people cannot get the basic essentials such as food and fuel. Fuel trucks cannot get to the community. There are days when people cannot get out to do their grocery shopping or whatever the case may be. That road is not fit for anyone to drive over, it is basically worn out, and the people of Rock Harbour do not deserve this callous treatment.

I ask the Minister of Transportation and all his colleagues in Cabinet present in this House today, if they will look through their Budget right away.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has expired.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, I thank you, and in cluing up, I beg the Minister of Transportation, on behalf of these people, to look at his budget and find the necessary funding to pave that road.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

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

I just want to say a few words in support of the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed to see that the Minister is not interested in rising in response to this petition. At least, he might try to explain to this hon. House and the people of Rock Harbour, who desperately need these road improvements, why he cut the Transportation budget in his Department, the capital works budget, from \$50 million, which the former Conservative Government had in their Budget, to \$30 million. That is probably the reason why the people of Rock Harbour will not get their road paved this year, Mr. Speaker. And unless there are increases in the Budget allocation for capital works in the Department of Transportation, they will not get their road work done for the next several years.

One suggestion I would like the Minister to comment on was made by a Member on his side of the House this weekend, that they are going to take the money from the Outer Ring Road and spend it in other parts of the Province. Mr. Speaker, I have been saying for quite some time now that the City of St. John's does not have adequate representation on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker. We have weak Members from the City of St. John's and they are allowing Budgets and monies that should be spent in the City of St. John's to be taken from the City of St. John's and spent in other areas. Mr. Speaker, I would doubt very much if the money for the Outer Ring Road is taken from the City of St. John's I would doubt very much, that it would be spent in Rock Harbour, Mr. Speaker, because, again that is a Tory district and if there was one very political Minister in this Department, Mr. Speaker, the

Minister for the Department of Transportation is probably the most political, or maybe the second most political Minister in that Government, and I am sure he would not allow that money to be spent in a Tory District.

But I would implore the Minister, as did the Member for Burin - Placentia West, to see if he could find a small amount of money to help, for safety reasons if for no other reason, to help the people of Rock Harbour get some road improvements. It would not be a great expense to upgrade this road to satisfactory standards and we could avoid near tragic accidents, as happened already on the road at Rock Harbour, Mr. Speaker. We will have no more sand trucks turning over and endangering lives of staff of the Department of Transportation and endangering the lives of the general public who continuously use that road. I once again, want to support my hon. colleague and I implore the hon. Minister to find some monies in his Department this year to do the upgrading of the Rock Harbour Road.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know the people of Rock Harbour have concerns about their road. My colleague from Bellevue was down and had a public meeting there and their concerns were expressed and he has been in contact with me concerning this. I would point out to the hon. Member who presented the petition that the list for the Provincial Capital Roads Program for 1990-1991 was developed as the one for 1989-1990, on a needs and priority

basis.

Most of the Tory Districts had been well looked after for seventeen years, so what, I suppose, he can perceive to be is the fact that I am political in this, is actually his way of trying to undo the serious imbalances which were put in place by the Tories, because the Tories know nothing at all about fairness and balance, Mr. Speaker, and therefore they cannot understand it or judge it, because everything that was done by the previous Government was a political decision, so the only way to create fairness and balance is to distribute on a needs and priority basis and this is what we have done in our Capital Roads Program for the last two years.

Now as the Member is aware, there are 3,000 kilometers of gravel road in this Province that has to be done out of a very limited Budget. The priority was established for the Capital Roads Project by the officials in my Department based on the knowledge which they had and with judging the conditions of the road which had to be done. I noticed an article in The Southern Gazette where the Member who presented the petition, talked about the fact that the previous Government had promised it, I checked with officials in my Department and they assured me that they have no idea that there was any commitment and it certainly was not a priority as far as the roads Budgets which they were developing. So I think the Member should check his records again because I know he was not attempting to mislead the House, but my officials tell me there is no record in the Department that there was ever any commitments to

do this road.

Now the Member for Kilbride, when he stood up he talked about the cut back in the transportation costs in the Local Roads Program for the last two years and he wondered why. I tell him that it was because of seventeen years of mismanagement by the Members Opposite when they were in the Government, that is why the Program had to be cut back, and maybe the other reason would be that the Federal Government cut back on the transfer payments to Newfoundland would have to be taken very seriously when you consider the Capital Roads Program. I might point out to Members opposite that we are the only Province in Canada that ever had to sell a part of a transportation system to get money to provide a road system, and that was done when they were in power. So I can assure you that we are very serious and concerned about the conditions of the Rock Harbour Road as we are the other 3,000 kilometers of gravel road in the Province, and it will certainly be taken into consideration and looked after as the priority arises.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains, on a petition?

MR. WARREN:
Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I have in fact twenty-six or twenty-seven more

petitions, but I will only do two or three today. I have a petition and I advise my friend, my colleague for Eagle River that it was a petition once again from his District. Mr. Speaker, this petition deals with an action of this Government during the past thirty-five days. The present Government did a double-whammy on the people in Labrador. Mr. Speaker, they cut out the air subsidy program that some 6,000 people availed of last year, and on top of that two days later they announced a \$100,000 cut in the travel program for sports and cultural and historic events.

This is the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker. We the undersigned residents of West St. Modeste, in fact, Mr. Speaker, I would anticipate that the Member for Eagle River will support this petition for two reasons, it shows that the Government he is part of is discriminating against Labrador and secondly, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by 113 voters from a community in the hon. Member's District. Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition... that we are concerned that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has reduced the Labrador air subsidy and is thereby unacceptably increasing the burden of transportation costs on the residents of this Province who live in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased there not too long ago to hear through the Labrador media that my hon. colleague for Eagle River has spoken against his own Government for bringing in this new policy on the people of Labrador. Now, Mr. Speaker, practically every individual person that can communicate in Labrador are saying that this is a backward step.

This program was brought in, Mr. Speaker, by the first Premier of our Province, Premier J. R. Smallwood.

Mr. Speaker, it was brought in because the Premier and the Government of the day back twenty-four years ago wanted Newfoundland and Labrador to be one Province, and there was an incentive there to get people to move back and forth. And, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that twenty-four years later when a Government of the same colour comes into power that this Government would change it. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that I would be discussing this petition today and knowing, Sir, in the Speaker's gallery, there is a former Minister of that Government who brought in this policy in the first place. And I want to say to the hon. Member in the gallery, Mr. Nolan, that when he was a Member of that Government of the day he understood the necessity of having such a program instituted for the people of Labrador. And it is very, very interesting, Mr. Speaker, that I would be presenting not only one petition, but two other petitions today on this same problem.

And I hope the Government will take the initiative and you should not be ashamed to admit a mistake. Now this is a very simple initiative for the Premier and his Government to take. Do not be ashamed that you made a mistake and re-instate the Labrador Subsidy Program that was so beneficial to the thousands of people who travelled from Labrador to Newfoundland and vice versa. I call upon the Government to take back a mistake they made. The Premier has set up a Cabinet Committee of one third of his

Cabinet to decide what is happening to \$300,000 or \$400,000. I would think, Mr. Speaker, the Premier does not need to do that. All the Premier has to do is listen to this petition, listen to the Member for Eagle River, and listen to the thousands and thousands of other people in Labrador who say, for God sake, Mr. Premier, wake up and realize that Labrador is part of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Mr. Premier, yes, tut, tut. I say, tut, tut, tut, Mr. Premier, because I think it is shameful that your Government would make such a drastic step against the people in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Menihek.

MR. A. SNOW:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity of rising in support of the petition presented so capably by the Member for Torngat. In a sense I was a little disappointed that somebody on the other side of the House, who also represents people in Labrador and understands the problems associated with travel from Labrador, would not rise in support of this particular petition, and the fact that it is something that, I think, is probably maybe the root of the problem in the fact that there is not a real understanding of what this has created within Labrador. It is a deeper alienation developing between that portion of the Province and this portion of the Province, the Island portion.

It is unfortunate that these programs that were put in place twenty-four or twenty-five years

ago by a previous Liberal Administration has to be gutted and dismantled by this particular Liberal Administration. I am disappointed that they did not treat Labrador with a little bit more fairness and balance that we hear so much about, or we have heard so much about in the last recent months. We are talking about an area that has contributed a tremendous amount of wealth to this Province. There is no other population geographically located in any area that is represented by only four seats, that contributes such economic wealth to this Province as Labrador does. I am disappointed that Members on the other side of the House could not convince their colleagues in Cabinet, or the colleagues on their side within their party, of coming in with a better subsidy program than was already in place. I know the hon. Member for Placentia was instrumental in setting up the Labrador Air Subsidy Program. He was asked by a former Premier, Joseph R. Smallwood, to sit on a Citizens Committee Program from Western Labrador.

He made that recommendation, to come in with a program from the Government to offset travel expenses to the people travelling to and from the Island. It was a recognition of the necessity of having this subsidy program in two forms, the Labrador Air Passenger Subsidy Program and the Labrador Travel Program Subsidy. One was to enable specifically the youth to travel for sports, cultural and athletic events, and the other one was general travel for adults, or specifically to travel for all types of reasons other than business. I find it rather odd that the Minister of Finance would suggest the reason why the cut in

this particular program was a budgetary one, and the fact that this Government brought down its Budget and had a \$10 million surplus yet they discontinued two programs that were costing in total only \$500,000. I also find it odd that a Minister would suggest that one of the reasons why the program was discontinued was the fact that very few people were using it, when subsequent investigations found that 20 per cent of the population of Labrador used the Air Travel Program that was in place last year. I find that if indeed this program is discontinued, we can have a further deepening of alienation, and the gap between the Island portion of the Province and the Labrador portion of the Province. And to quote from a letter from the Smokey Mountain Ski Club, if I may, Mr. Speaker, 'It is more logical for skiers from our hill to travel to Quebec to races as it is for skiers from Marble Mountain to travel to Nova Scotia. Both clubs chose to attempt to develop skiing in our Province first, but it is apparent that the Government does not think that way and it is driving a wedge into our sport. Please, for the sake of our young skiers, show some foresight.'

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would request that the people on the other side of the House, more specifically the special Cabinet Committee that was struck, reconsider and assess the programs that were dismantled in the announcement in their Budget and reinstate the program, taking into consideration the high cost of transportation into Labrador, and, indeed, improve on the transportation subsidies that are now in place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

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

I am willing to wait for a response from somebody opposite on the first petition before I go forward with the second petition.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Eagle River.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I understand the Member has three petitions on this same matter, so I neglected to rise immediately to respond to this petition. But after the indication that he was going to revert to another petition, then I will certainly add my comments to this particular proposal.

Certainly, as the Member has indicated, there are things in Labrador which at times have not gotten full hearing in the Cabinet room, and things have happened in this House of Assembly which have not been fair to the people of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DUMARESQUE:
I have said it before, I said it again today, and I will continue to say it again tomorrow, because

it is just a matter of geography, it is just a matter of understanding, that with people who are out of sight, often they are out of mind. We have seen that before and we will continue to see it. But one of the things you will always see I submit, Mr. Speaker, is the Government on this side of the House continue to be sensitive to those needs. I think if the Members on the other side were fair, they would indicate that the sensitivity of this Government has been illustrated by the striking of this particular Cabinet Committee, which is reviewing this particular issue, and certainly Members opposite can be comforted that the Labrador perspective will certainly be put forward and that the Government of the day will make the right decision.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

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

I have a petition signed by forty-seven residents of the community of Davis Inlet. Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition is: 'We are concerned with the health care that is presently available through Grenfell Regional Health Services. Concerns have been expressed that patients are not receiving the proper health care.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have already presented several petitions on this same issue in this House. I have a number of petitions left to present, and I will, Mr. Speaker, as long as I am the Member for

that particular District, present every petition that is delivered to me. This petition is basically saying to the Government what it has been saying to the Government for years. And I concur with my colleague for Eagle River, that for years and years and years the people of Labrador have not gotten the attention they deserve. The Government of the day has taken help from Labrador but put very little back, and it is time for that to change.

I am glad to know my hon. colleague for Eagle River is going to fight his own Government to see that they will be sensitive to Labrador, but I have to disagree with him when he says this Government is showing that they are sensitive to Labrador. Mr. Speaker, if they were sensitive to Labrador, they would not need to put a Cabinet Committee in place today. There was no need to. The program was in place. It did not need fixing. It was fixed already, and it was working. Mr. Speaker, there was no need. If that is why the hon. Member is saying the Government is sensitive to the people of Labrador, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he is misleading this House. Because this Government is not sensitive to Labrador; it is not sensitive in air transportation, it is not sensitive in subsidies for culture and for sports, it is not sensitive in health care, it is not sensitive in any other issue - in education or in the environment.

We have a PCB incinerator closed down for the second time in Happy Valley/Goose Bay. Where is the sensitivity of the Government for that issue, Mr. Speaker? And I say the same thing applies to health care. I would suggest to the Minister that the only answer

to improved health care in Labrador, and my colleague opposite has said it time and time again, is we need better health care. And one of the avenues to be used is to have a public inquiry so that the person in West St. Modeste or the person in Black Tickle or the person in Davis Inlet or the person in Nain can come forward and tell all the horror stories coming out of the health care system presently existing in Labrador. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister should do the right thing and call immediately upon a judge of the Supreme Court to have a public inquiry so that all the issues can be aired concerning health care in Labrador. I support this petition, and therefore refer it to the Department to which it relates.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few brief remarks in support of the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the Member for Torngat Mountains, who continues to amaze me with his relentless efforts on behalf of constituents he represents on the coast of Labrador.

Time and time again this Member stands up in this House and makes representations on behalf of those people who live on the coast of Labrador in particular, and in his constituency, as well as other interests and concerns related to people from all over Labrador. And his relentless efforts never cease to amaze me.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, when this Member was on the Government side, when we formed the Government and the Member was in Cabinet for a short period of time - I forget now, but I guess it was nearly two years - he constantly, around the Cabinet table, without breaking any oath of secrecy, constantly made other Members of the Government and other Members of the Cabinet aware of the situations that existed and exist on the coast of Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I should also add that the situation he talks about today refers to a situation that exists in Davis Inlet, I believe it was, where forty-seven petitioners, which represents, I guess, the adult population of Davis Inlet -

MR. WARREN:

Within five votes of the number I got in the last election.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, close to the number of votes the Member got, which was a considerable percentage of the electorate.

MR. WARREN:

I could have got more.

MR. SIMMS:

So, it is more than half the adult population, I suppose, or close to it, in Davis Inlet. And this petition cannot be presented without those of us on this side of the House who has sat in the Government taking some responsibility for the fact that that situation still exists in Davis Inlet, and we have all heard about it. And we hear and have heard over the last number of years sad stories from Davis Inlet.

MR. WARREN:

And it is getting worse.

MR. SIMMS:

So whatever responsibility there is for those of us who sat in the previous Administration, I am sure we accept. But the the fact of the matter is, another year has gone by, another Government has taken office and the situation there continues to deteriorate. I think that is the point expressed by the Members and by the people who signed the petition from the Community of Davis Inlet. I do not think their request for a public inquiry into the health care situation in that area is really an unreasonable request, and I think what the Member has suggested in other petitions he has presented, representing a couple of dozen other communities on the coast of Labrador, I guess -

MR. WARREN:

I have twenty more left.

MR. SIMMS:

He has twenty-odd petitions remaining there. I do not think it would hurt to expand that request for a public inquiry into the health care situation on the coast of Labrador, but certainly if there is one community that makes a reasonable request, it is the community of Davis Inlet. I think I have heard the Minister of Health, in fact, say from time to time, and I believe the Minister of Social Services made reference to the fact, that a serious situation exists there and that maybe, indeed, the Government might - I am not sure if I heard them say they might consider it or not, but perhaps the Minister of Health could take a couple of minutes out of his busy schedule; I know he is very busy there today, talking to his colleagues about other matters of import.

Perhaps he could take a couple of minutes during this discussion on the petition to let us know seriously whether or not - I am sure he feels there is a serious problem in Davis Inlet - he feels there is justification, or the request of the petitioners is reasonable, to have some kind of an inquiry into the health care situation that exists in that particular community.

I look forward to the Minister of Health making some contribution to this particular discussion, because, Mr. Speaker, it is a very, very important matter. Again, I commend my colleague, the Member for Torngat Mountains, on his relentless pursuit on behalf of righting the wrongs that exist in the constituency, in particular, that he represents, Torngat Mountains.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I have not had the privilege or the opportunity yet to have seen the petition presented by the Member, but I am sure when I have had an opportunity to look at it I will give it very serious consideration. Because, truly, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador can realize we finally have a Government which is always willing to listen to people when they petition this Government. I will certainly be reading that petition very carefully to see exactly what the people of Davis Inlet are talking about. I am sure this is not the case with the people of Davis Inlet, but I do believe that the Member for the District, Mr. Speaker, does not fully understand what the Grenfell Regional Health Services Board is

all about. It is really a board made up of people of the Labrador Coast and people of the Great Northern Peninsula. So, what we would be investigating is a board. Now, if that is necessary, and the Government is convinced that it is necessary, then I do not see any reason why it should not be done.

But I think the hon the Member for Torngat is confused with the old International Grenfell Association.

MR. WARREN:

No, no!

MR. DECKER:

He thinks in his mind, and his mind is back in the 1800s, he honestly believes that the International Grenfell Association is running those hospitals and nursing stations. That is not the case. It is a board made up of local people from the Labrador Coast, from Goose Bay and from the Great Northern Peninsula, who are looking after their own health care matters and, for the first time in seventeen years, they are getting substantial support from this Government. That was indicated in the last Budget, under 4.4.03, Community Clinics, \$2,030,000 for clinics going into Davis Inlet and on the Coast, Mr. Speaker.

I should also say, in addressing this petition, I assure the people that we are going to give it very strong consideration. But they have to realize that the health care system in this Province has taken a tremendous beating over the past seventeen years. Not a nail was driven, Mr. Speaker, for three years, a total freeze on hospital and nursing home construction. That is the legacy of that Administration. For one

year, all throughout Newfoundland and Labrador, not a bit of maintenance was done, not a nail was driven, the health care system was put on the back burner, Mr. Speaker, totally, absolutely neglected.

This administration has put health care right up at number one. \$834 million will be spent this year in health care, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, we cannot do it all in one year. The people on the Labrador Coast, the people on the Avalon Peninsula, the people on the Burin Peninsula, the Great Northern Peninsula, all over Newfoundland and Labrador, will be pleased to know that this Administration has given health care top priority, and in due course we will be getting around to Davis Inlet, we will be getting around to Nain, we will be getting around to Goose Bay, we will be getting around to Red Bay and Forteau, Mr. Speaker.

Just a week or so ago I went up and visited the people in Goose Bay. I had a tremendous meeting with them. I went down to Forteau and had another absolutely tremendous meeting. And the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are saying, 'For the first time in seventeen years, we finally have an Administration which recognizes the value of the health care system.' We are doing our utmost, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that we deliver good health care to the people of Labrador and the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Revise The Law Respecting Securities," carried. (Bill No. 15)

On motion, Bill No. 15 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Judicature Act, 1986," carried. (Bill No. 8)

On motion, Bill No. 8 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Mineral Act, 1976," carried. (Bill No.7)

On motion, Bill No.7 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Premier to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Authorize Certain Agreements Between The Government Of The Province And Other Parties Respecting The Future Operation Of The Corner Brook Newsprint Mill," carried. (Bill No. 30)

On motion, Bill No. 30 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. BAKER:
Motion 1.

MR. SPEAKER:
Motion 1.

Before recognizing the hon. Member for Mount Pearl, who adjourned this particular debate, on behalf of hon. Members, I would like to

welcome to the public galleries today, a delegation of Mayors and Councils as follows: The Mayor of Englee, Mr. Robert Keefe and the Mayor of Roddickton, Mr. Wayne Canning, the Mayor of Main Brook, Mr. Leander Pilgrim accompanied by Councillors from Englee, Main Brook, Bide Arm, Conche and Roddickton.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot count the pages in five minutes, the notes which I have here, and those are only notes! I am still at sea as the hon. the Opposition House Leader points out. I am still just into my preamble, trying to set the tone for my remarks when I get into the Budget debate.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A short summary of what (inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

Well, I can go over that, but I mean, I have lots of time to that over the next couple of months before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, there is no hurry at all and having had a couple of weeks vacation- I did not get to go to Florida like the House Leader - he is a bit brownd off over there as are a few other hon. Members, opposite. I was here all over the Easter recess trying to defend the Province against the Minister of Finance's little games, Mr. Speaker, but I will be more than five minutes, you can rest assured. Mr. Speaker, the first thing I want to address today, in fact, I think I have a duty, an

obligation to the people of this Province to address, it is the performance of the Minister of Finance.

Particularly over the past couple of weeks, ever since the House opened, ever since he was elected I should say, but in particular on his Budget document, and his response in the House of Assembly, and more particularly the fact, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out in Question Period, the fact the Minister now responded outside the House. In all of my time in the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I have never seen a Minister of Finance, first of all who brought down such a fraudulent document and a document which is notable for things that are hidden in it or absent from it, more particularly the things that were absent from it.

This is what the Leader of the Opposition was talking about earlier today, the details in this now infamous payroll tax. A tax which other provinces of Canada discovered, is a regressive tax, it is a disincentive to investment and development, and they are now eliminating it and the Minister of Finance for Newfoundland is now bringing it in. He is bringing it in not knowing what he was doing. I think we pointed that out very clearly.

But I think it is a very serious breach of the privileges of every Member of this House of Assembly when the Minister of Finance, almost every day that the House was open from the time he brought down his Budget and his Budget Speech, almost every day, Hansard will show, there were questions to the Minister of Finance on the Budget and most particularly on

the payroll tax. Will the Minister tell the House something about his payroll tax and whom does it apply to? Which Crown corporations and agencies will be subject to this tax? And who will not be?

Almost every single day, Mr. Speaker, there were questions. And all we get from the Minister of Finance is some sort of a foolish response evading the question. He has refused time and time again to deal with the issue. Absolutely refused to give information to the House. Now we all know that in Question Period, no Minister is obligated to answer. We do not question that. He is not obligated to answer in Question Period to any question that he feels is distasteful, is unreasonable. Well, Mr. Speaker -

MR. GILBERT:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
No, in reference to the comment from the Minister of Transportation, my questions have not been irrelevant. They have not been foolish questions. They have not been distasteful questions. They have been questions asking for facts about the most basic document that is ever tabled in this House which is the Provincial Budget. No other document that is tabled in this House is as important as the Provincial Budget, Mr. Speaker, no other document that the people of this Province have such a right to know the details of, as they do the Provincial Budget. And the Minister of Finance has consistently refused to give any details or otherwise was unable to give those details. There is the question, is he refusing to give information to the House? In

which case, even though he is not bound by the rules of the House to answer a particular question in Question Period, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that he is bound by responsibility to the people who elected him to this House, to the people of this Province who he serves as a Minister of Finance he has a responsibility to tell them, particularly when it relates to a tax, because a tax applies to everybody in this Province. Everybody in the Province is going to be subject to this tax one way or another, either directly or indirectly. And the Minister of Finance has a responsibility to give details on a tax measure, and this tax measure was introduced over a month ago and we are only now getting some of the details. And what is even worse, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister chose to do it outside of the House of Assembly. He refused to do it.

MR. EFFORD:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
Yes, it is, I say to the Minister of Social Services, shocking. It is a disservice to the people of this Province that the Minister of Finance is so incompetent and knows so much that he is wrong on that tax, he tries to sneak it in.

He did not even have the courage, Mr. Speaker. Not only would he not face the House of Assembly but he did not have the courage to face the news media. He would not even have a press conference. He waited until most of his colleagues were off in Florida sunning their buns on the sands of St. Petersburg. The Opposition were here doing their duty to the people of the Province. I was here. I had no trouble having a

press conference, Mr. Speaker, and standing before the news media of this Province, since we did not have the opportunity to stand in the people's House where we should be dealing with this issue. This is where it should have been dealt with.

This is where the Minister should have been answering for it. He did not have the nerve to do it here. He did not even have the nerve to do it before the news media who are the second guardians of the people of the Province when the Opposition does not get an opportunity in the House of Assembly. They are our means of getting information out to the people of this Province and informing the people of this Province just what little games this Government is up to. The Minister did not even have the nerve to face the news media. He tried to sneak it out through a press release through NIS.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen a Minister of Finance deal with an issue as important as a tax measure through that mechanism before. I have never seen it and I challenge hon. Members opposite to give me an example of it. Give me an example of where a Minister gives details of a tax measure through a press release. Flick it out as if it were an announcement that he was going to speak at a Lions Club in Trinity. There was no more importance to it than that. Yet, Mr. Speaker, that tax measure hauls \$25 million a year out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this Province. Now, that, Mr. Speaker, is an insult to the people of the Province, and it certainly is an insult to the Members of the House of Assembly who were elected here by the people of this Province to protect

them against such measures. It is an insult to our whole parliamentary system where Ministers are answerable in the House of Assembly, particularly on matters as important as the Budget and taxation measures.

Never before has it happened, Mr. Speaker. But it did and it is another example of this Government having absolutely no regard whatsoever for this House of Assembly. We saw it in the Meech Lake debate when Your Honour as Deputy Speaker was grossly insulted by the Government opposite, a vote of non-confidence. The Deputy Speaker was insulted by his colleagues opposite. The hon. House Leader can shake his head all he likes but he knows inside that what the Government did to Your Honour during the Meech Lake debate is something that has never happened before, and I do not think it will ever happen again. I really feel sorry for Your Honour in having your colleagues put you in such a position. What they have said is they have no regard for the House of Assembly. They have no regard for the rules of the House of Assembly and they will now manipulate the rules through Your Honour by manipulating Your Honour, when Your Honour acted entirely properly in every ruling that he made on that particular day.

I want to say to Your Honour that your Opposition has the highest regard for Your Honour and the way you conducted yourself in that Chair. The Government has totally overruled Your Honour, the authority of the Chair, the authority of the House of Assembly, has taken the House of Assembly on their back, and the Minister of Finance is falling

right in line with that. He now has absolute, total disregard for the House of Assembly and for the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, he finally did give us some idea of what the payroll tax meant. What did he say? He could have taken his six or seven pages and eliminated them all and simply put out a statement with one sentence in it, 'the Opposition was absolutely right in everything they have said in the House of Assembly.' That is what he said. He finally came out and admitted that every statement, every claim that the Opposition has made over this past couple of weeks in dealing with the payroll tax was in fact true.

The sad truth of it, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister of Finance did not even know when we made those statements that we were right. The President of Treasury Board knows that and that is why he is smiling now. He knows that. It must have been an interesting session of Cabinet. I wish I were a fly on the wall in Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Finance finally came up with it, I suppose he did maybe he does not have enough respect for Cabinet to come forward with such an important statement and air it in Cabinet first, to give Cabinet the details of his tax. I do not know, maybe he does.

Let us assume he did. I would have loved to be in that Cabinet room when the Minister of Finance finally came back a month after he brought down his budget document, a month after he announced the payroll tax, and said, 'By the way guys and ladies, this payroll tax that we announced in the Budget, guess what? Guess who it applies to?' There must have been some

interesting comments. I can imagine the President of Treasury Board, I think he must have danced on the Cabinet table. I would say that he felt misled by the Minister of Finance. I would suspect the same when all of those Ministers sat around that Cabinet table and put their stamp of approval on the Budget document a couple of days before the Minister presented his Budget Speech in this House.

I will submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that none of them had any concept that Government institutions, health agencies, educational institutions, the university, or Government Departments themselves were taxable. I do not think that they realized there was not enough payroll out there in this Province, when you eliminate all Government agencies, Government payrolls, Crown Corporations, Government funded bodies, charities and churches.

MR. BAKER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
You still get your \$15 million.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say to the President of Treasury Board, if he still gets his \$15 million there is no possible way that all of these agencies can be protected, as the Minister of Finance tries to say in his statement. Over and over again he says, 'We will ensure that the programs of this Agency or this Department are not affected. We will guarantee that there is no revenue loss to this Agency as a result of this tax measure.'

In other words, they are saying Mr. Speaker, we are going to give them back this money under the

table. We are going to give it back to them somehow. And in Question Period today the Minister of Finance tried to say, 'Here is how we are going to do it. We are going to transfer.' Well, from where? If he is saying now, Mr. Speaker, before the Budget is approved, that he is going to transfer all of the monies that will be required by these Agencies, in other words he is going to give it back, but he has to transfer it from somewhere. From where? Which subheads in this Budget document that we are here in the House of Assembly debating today are wrong? Which ones will be reduced so that the Minister can shuffle the money around, so that he can play with the numbers, play with the books, juggle the books to cover up his payroll tax in Crown Agencies and Departments of Government? Where is he going to get the amount of money that is required to go into the Department of Education budget to cover the tax on teachers' salaries, for that is where that will be. It is not in the school boards. It is paid directly by the Department of Education. The hon. Member for Placentia probably did not even know that. The teachers' salaries are paid by the Department of Education.

MR. HOGAN:
I know that.

MR. WINDSOR:
He was Chairman of the School Board at one time so he knows that.

Well, let me say to the Member for Placentia who is an hon. gentleman who I know is concerned about this, that teachers salaries are paid by Government. Therefore, Government has to show somewhere in the books now, 1.5 per cent of teachers' salaries as tax payable

to the Department of Finance. They have to show that because the Department of Finance is now an employer of teachers. So somewhere in the Department of Finance subhead, it is not there now, the Minister announced it in his Budget, he said there is a payroll tax in his Budget, but he did not know that he had to put money in his own Budget to cover the salaries of teachers and his own employees.

Every Minister over there should be saying to the Minister of Finance, 'Wait now, where is this 1.5 per cent payroll tax that you are going to take back on me, where is it? Which one? Are you taking that from my subhead? Maybe that is where the vehicle expenses are going, Mr. Speaker. Maybe that is why Ministers are going to lose their cars now, to pay the taxes on the payroll of his Department.'

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
Are you getting new cars? No, I hear you are losing them. I hear you are losing your cars.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister did not even know he had to do that, yet he is asking us to approve this Budget - he is asking us to approve this Budget! Does the Minister of Health realize that somewhere in his budget there has to be funds now added? The Minister says by transfer. I would submit by Special Warrant, sometime before the year is over. It may not appear as a Special Warrant to put back the money that is taken for payroll tax, but it will come forward as a Special Warrant somewhere else and maybe the Minister will transfer from a

subhead, if he can do that under the Financial Administration Act. Interesting! I do not think he can do it. I do not think you can transfer to a subhead that is not there; there has to be a new subhead created for this. So it has to be the salary account, I suppose. He could hide it in the salary account. Maybe he can do that. What a cowardly way of trying to do something, Mr. Speaker. I mean, clearly by the Minister's own admission in the House today they do not have provision in every Government departmental estimates. No provision is in there to pay this tax back to themselves.

Now let us get back to the point, because if we are going to do that with all the Government Departments, if we are going to do that in the educational system, somehow put back into the educational system all the taxes that would normally be paid if they did not want to exempt the educational system, all except for private schools - they are businesses, Mr. Speaker. They do not add anything to education in this Province. The private educational schools now, CompuCollege and some of these, they are going to be taxable. They are businesses. The fact is that those businesses and the students who are going into those colleges will pay that 1.5 per cent. Do not kid yourself. Those companies are operating now on a very minimal profit margin and most of them are having extreme difficulty; Governments of the past have had to help them. I do not know if this Government has given any help. I suspect they have not. They are putting a tax of 1.5 per cent on them. That means that money has to be added to the tuition fees.

Students attending those institutions now, Mr. Speaker, are attending entirely at their own cost. I am not aware of any subsidy going into any of those. If the Speaker is aware of a subsidy going in, I am not. Now, I just had to be corrected by Your Honour. I do not think there is any subsidy going into those institutions. I know at one time I believe we provided a guaranteed loan for one of those institutions for short term financial difficulty as we would any other business, but I am not aware that there was any subsidy or any write off, any grant for any of those institutions. If I am wrong, I will be corrected in due course.

So that 1.5 per cent, Mr. Speaker, has to go onto the tuition those students are paying. And they are already paying very high tuition for the education they are receiving. These are people who are not in university or trades colleges or any of the other institutions, not in the Manpower Training Programs. All of these normal educational institutions are subsidized to a greater or lesser degree; some funding is made available.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Tax curbs.

MR. WINDSOR:
Tax curbs. They have a tax curb, but that is a minor, minor bit of assistance to a student who is paying very high tuition fees to get an education in a particular trade or what have you. These private institutions are doing a tremendous job of educating thousands of Newfoundlanders every year and turning out high quality. The hon. Opposition House Leader, Mr. Speaker, as the President of the Treasury Board

points out, is teaching in one of these colleges. This shows the caliber of the staff, Mr. Speaker, in these institutions. That they can attract somebody of the caliber of the Opposition House Leader to instruct in those institutions shows just how useful these institutions are, yet the Minister of Finance wants to tax them, he wants to make it more difficult.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you take all the other institutions out of it, you take out health and education if, indeed, the Minister is going to protect them. Now the Minister says, we will deal with them on a case by case basis in consultation with the affected agency and with consideration given to the nature of its operations. So we still do not really know which institutions will be receiving a kickback under the table to relieve them from this financial burden. Now, how will that be dealt with, Mr. Speaker? It cannot be political, I am sure. The Minister of Finance would never do anything on political grounds. That will not have any impact. It does not matter which District you are operating in, I suppose, or who your Member is or anything else, surely not! or how much you contribute to the Liberal Party. Surely that will not have anything to do with it.

What is the basis, Mr. Speaker, under which the Minister of Finance is going to give back some of these kickbacks under the table?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Under the table?

MR. WINDSOR:
Under the table. Oh, yes! It is not on the table. The Budget document is on the table. There

is nothing in the Budget document, so the kickback has to be under the table.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. WINDSOR:
It has to be under the table, somehow. We have to sneak back some money later on in the year. We do not know from where. The Minister says we will transfer it somehow. From where? What are we giving up to transfer this money back to Government?

MR. SIMMS:
There will be another month down the (inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
Ah, ha! Or are we at the root of it, Mr. Speaker? Since our statistical analysis of this Budget showed under this tax, showed clearly, that it is impossible for the Minister of Finance to gain \$25 million by way of a payroll tax unless he taxes some of these institutions, and maybe now we are playing with numbers, maybe we will see taxes paid by the Departments, but we will not see the kickbacks to them, even though he is telling he is going to. So maybe we are getting to the root of it, Mr. Speaker, that there is indeed not \$25 million going to be gained by it. Maybe we do not know how the Minister is going to do it. Maybe he is going to hide it that way, and that he will show taxes being paid by Government Departments, that those taxes will not be fully returned to the Department so that we are talking of cutback in services. Because it is not possible, Mr. Speaker, there is not enough money paid out in payrolls in this Province, just not enough, for the Minister to

gain \$25 million a year and be able to exempt all of these groups.

Now, Mr. Speaker, which ones indeed, dealing on a case by case basis, is the Minister going to exempt? How about the Housing Corporation? Is the Housing Corporation going to be exempt? The President of Treasury Board indicates probably not. Even though he is not speaking now, not making a statement, he is indicating, shaking his head, probably not. The Housing Corporation may well have to pay this tax. That is good for the price of housing, at a time when the housing market is at the lowest level we have seen in a long, long time. The Minister of Finance is finally saying something; I cannot determine whether he is making sense.

DR. KITCHEN:

Go talk to your friends in Ottawa.

MR. WINDSOR:

How many times is the silly Minister of Finance going to say go talk to your friends in Ottawa? He cannot blame the fact that he bungled his Budget on the Government in Ottawa.

DR. KITCHEN:

(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

He cannot say that, Mr. Speaker. He cannot blame the Government in Ottawa when the Government in Ottawa has given him \$42 million more this year than they gave him last year.

DR. KITCHEN:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Your days are numbered too, old buddy!

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is up to his antics again. I have to tell you that my thirteen year old daughter is very interested in what happens in the House of Assembly. She asked me to send her the transcripts of Hansard for some of the speeches I have been making since the House opened, particularly the Budget debate. She has taken a real interest in the Budget debate, and she wanted a copy of all the debates on the Budget debate to which, so far, other than the Budget Speech itself, it has only been myself speaking, and I have been giving her copies of those. She read it the other day and somewhere in the midst of it there was a reference made by another Member, I think, 'Oh, the Minister of Finance is making faces at you now.' It occurred the first day I spoke, I think, the Minister of Finance was over there making some silly faces. My thirteen year old daughter said, 'Dad, does the Minister of Finance really act like that in the House of Assembly?'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WINDSOR:

She could not believe it. As a thirteen year old, she could not believe that the Minister of Finance would sit in the House of Assembly - the Minister of Finance is always considered the senior Minister, but the Premier has him popped into the backbenches, and now we know why. We know now why he tried to hide him behind the Minister of Fisheries, it is because he is so ashamed of him. But, here is this thirteen year old girl, Mr. Speaker, who could not believe that the Minister of Finance, who normally is looked on

as one of the senior Ministers in Government, one of the senior people controlling the economy of this Province, sits in the House of Assembly and makes faces. She said, 'Dad, you do not make faces back, surely!' I said, 'No, dear. No, I will not lower myself to that level.' And the Minister of Finance is at it again today.

Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, Mr. Speaker, are they exempt? The Minister of Energy is not here. I would like to know how he feels about it. Maybe the Minister of Consumer Affairs is concerned. Because any way you look at it, an increase to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro will increase the cost of electricity in this Province.

Now, there are two increases hidden in here. One is the payroll tax on the employees of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, and the other was announced last year in the Budget. Two measures, actually, were announced last year. One is that Government would eliminate over a three-year period the subsidy paid to the PDD, the Power Distribution District, to stabilize the cost of electricity in rural Newfoundland. They were going to eliminate that. So they cut that down by \$10 million last year, \$20 million this year, and they will cut out \$30 million next year. Now, there is \$20 million in this fiscal year, in this Budget, that Government is grabbing back through Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. Plus they are also saying that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro borrows money to do capital works, to build new sources of electrical generation in this Province, and Government has to guarantee the loans that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro

has, the money they borrow to do that, so they are going to charge them now \$10 million a year for that service of guaranteeing. It did not cost them anything to do that, a name on a piece of paper, it is a contingent liability on the prospectus of the Province. That is all it does. The Government is going to charge \$10 million to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro for that service. So that is \$30 million taxation being grabbed there, in addition to the payroll tax.

MR. EFFORD:

Your time is up.

MR. WINDSOR:

No, I say to the Minister of Social Services, my time is not up. I have unlimited time.

It is one of the democratic procedures in the House of Assembly. The Minister will learn when he is here long enough that the Opposition have unlimited time. The Minister of Finance has as long as he chooses to take to present his Budget document. If he wants to go for three or four days on a Budget presentation, that is his choice. And, similarly, the official spokesman for the Opposition has unlimited time, as well, to respond, to expose the Minister of Finance and what he is trying to do, to point out to the people of this Province what the Minister of Finance tried to sneak through under the guise of a people's Budget. People's budget, alright. It nails the people right to the wall, Mr. Speaker. That is why he called it the people's Budget. That is what it does.

I spoke to a group at lunch today, the Professional Purchasers' Association, a very good group of

individuals, and outlined some of the things that were in the Budget to them, and I think they were amazed. They looked at me and their chins hit the table. They could not believe that this Budget which they were told was such a nice Budget, no taxes on people, they could not believe some of the taxation, some of the increases I pointed out to them which were actually in that document. You could see the look of how they were deceived. They felt so deceived by the Minister of Finance.

MR. EFFORD:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
No, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Social Services wants to know.

There are many ways, Mr. Speaker. And I am not talking about how you do it, I am talking about the way you do it. You do not try to hide it, you come up front; you have the intestinal fortitude to say in the Budget document, 'Here is what I am doing to you.' You have the intestinal fortitude to say, 'There is \$2.5 million coming out of the Budget this year in increase in the Liquor Corporation. There was only \$1 million last year. The Minister of Finance found it important enough last year to put two paragraphs in the Budget dealing with a \$1 million increase, and tried to hide \$2.5 million this year. He neglected to point out - he did not have to - but he neglected to point out this year that he increased personal income tax last year, so that there is, in fact, an extra 1 per cent this year. He was honest last year, but he learned very quickly. Probably he got the whip put to him last year for being so honest

in his Budget.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) the Budget last year, too.

MR. WINDSOR:
He had a more honest Budget last year. The Budget was a disaster last year, Mr. Speaker, but it was more honest. The Minister came out and said, 'I am taking out an extra \$31 million this year from the people and I am taking out \$43 million next year. Those are the measures I am announcing today, \$31 million this year and \$43 million next year.' He announced them last year, but this year he says there are no new measures. Does the President of Treasury Board not feel that the Minister of Finance would have been more accurate, more honest and up front with the people of this Province had he said there are no new measures other than the \$43 million I said last year I was going to take, other than the \$2.5 million that I am taking from the Liquor Corporation, other than the \$20 million in personal income taxes that were announced before and that actually come into effect this year, other than the \$35 million additional on retail sales tax, not all because of increase in sales activity, Mr. Speaker? It is partly because of this terrible GST that the Minister is going to piggyback on. He comes up and he attacks the GST. None of us are too keen on the GST. I am not here to totally defend it. It needs to be looked at.

DR. KITCHEN:
Give up. You are boring.

MR. WINDSOR:
The Minister of Finance may think I am boring, but at least I am saying something. I am not

sitting here saying absolutely nothing of substance, as the Minister of Finance does day after day. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, is clearly embarrassed by the Minister of Finance. I saw him again today in Question Period embarrassed by the way the Minister of Finance responded to legitimate questions from the Opposition. He absolutely refused to answer and came up with some sort of silly, sarcastic little comment. Never yet has he properly answered one question in this House of Assembly. The Minister of Finance may think it is funny, and he may want to hide behind his paper there and giggle and laugh today - at least he is not making faces at me today - he may think it is funny, Mr. Speaker, but the people of this Province are not at all amused. I say to the Minister of Finance, without any malice at all, that the people of this Province are watching his performance. They are watching him.

There is \$35 million for retail sales tax, \$20 million for personal income tax, \$4 million in gasoline tax. There is no increase in taxation, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing extra for the people. He refused to point out to the people that gasoline tax is on an ad valorem basis; we did that some time ago. So, as the price of gasoline increases -

AN HON. MEMBER:

The previous Administration did that.

MR. WINDSOR:

The previous administration did that, yes. As the price of gasoline increases, so too does the amount of tax that Government collects. He tried to sneak that

through, Mr. Speaker, and that does not work. The corporate income tax is gone up by \$9.4 million this year, tobacco tax \$1 million, other provincial sources \$21 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is interesting, other provincial sources. Somewhere in there the Minister says we are going to pick up, I think it was \$5 million, certain fees and costs of certificates will be increased, a minor thing. He sloughs that off, a few fees will be increased, the cost of a health certificate will be increased a little bit, nothing much, until you look in the Budget document, Mr. Speaker. When you look at the Budget document you see, for example, under the Registry of Deeds, \$2.7 million additional this year. It is not a large amount of money in the overall scheme of things in the Budget, but when you look at \$2.7 million in relation to the amount of revenues received previously through the Registry of Deeds, you see that that is a 35 per cent increase.

Now, I just asked the Minister of Finance if the Housing Corporation is going to be subject to the payroll tax and I got an indication that they probably would. So that is going to increase the price of housing in Newfoundland and Labrador. Now, when you register a mortgage -

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is stretching it a bit.

MR. WINSOR:

Is it, is it? What is the percentage of labour component in building a house, I ask the Minister, is it stretching it? What is the percentage of labour component in servicing a sub-division, in installing water and sewer services and the curb

and gutter and side-walks and street lights and everything else that goes into a sub-division, and tell me that one and a half per cent of that total cost, Mr. Speaker, is stretching it a bit! I would submit to you this payroll tax will add a thousand dollars to the price of every house in this Province. Because the cost of registry of deeds is going up by thirty-five per cent, a home owner who has to register a mortgage or a deed or both, will now also pay thirty-five per cent more. The Minister of Environment asks leave to give some information to a question from the Member for Labrador - Mr. Speaker, I will yield for a moment if he wants to do that, sure, I have no problem with that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

I was not in the House and I understand the Premier gave a commitment to provide some information with respect to a question raised by the Member for Torngat Mountains, with respect to the hunting zones in Labrador, The George River caribou herd. Mr. Speaker, that particular question has been ongoing for a number of weeks, just for background sake and we have been talking to the people in Northern Labrador including the LIA and made an agreement some time back, that, should the necessity arise, because of the late migration into Labrador of the Caribou, that we would, at the appropriate time consider and indeed would extend the season.

Before we actually acted, the request would come from the LIA, just prior to the closing of the

normal season to indeed insure that it was necessary for an extension, so on Friday past, we told Mr. Anderson of the Labrador Inuit Association that we would extend the season and at the first possible day, business day, which is today, we would take the necessary steps to have that done. Now, Mr. Anderson was aware of that last week and I can only assume that the Member for Torngat Mountains was aware also. I do not know what the question was, I have not seen the transcript, but however, for the information of the House and honouring the commitment made by the Premier, I have signed an order under the powers given this Department and myself under the Wildlife regulations which says as follows, if I can have enough time to do that, Mr. Speaker: 'This order may be sighted as the open season big game caribou hunting order, Labrador, 1989-1990 amendment to Section 4 of the open season big game caribou hunting order Labrador, 1989-1990, is repealed and the following substituted, Part A. Open seasons George River and Torngat Mountain zone, August 10, 1989 to May 12. It had previously been April 25th, which is tomorrow. We have extended that to May 12th, 1990, both dates inclusive except that persons holding the special licence may take male caribou any time of the year, and that is standard and part B, Michikamau east zone, Michikamau west zone, Twin Falls zone, Colville Lake zone, Lake Veron zone, Sawbill Lake zone, Miller Lake zone and the McPhadyen River zone, there is no open season. But to extend that just a bit further, the reason why these management zones, which I have mentioned and where there is no open season this year have been established, is to allow us to

fulfill an earlier commitment, Mr. Speaker, which will allow us for management purposes as the northern caribou move into these zones, to open them and close them in accordance with the migratory patterns of the animals, so that the hunters can make the harvest that they could not do under a blanket closing or blanket opening earlier.

In conclusion, I could say the brief press release to advise people also issued today and reads as follows: 'The Minister of Environment and Lands has extended the hunting season for caribou in the George River and Torngat Mountain zones from April 25th to May 12th'. And as I said, this is something that we have decided weeks ago, really, but required a certain request from the LIA and in a certain time frame in order to make it possible today. Because the George River caribou herd has been late migrating from Quebec into Labrador many Labrador hunters have been unable to obtain an animal. The herd is expected to migrate back into Labrador fairly soon and this extension to the regular hunting season will permit hunters to obtain animals despite the late migration.

I should say also, Mr. Speaker, this applies to individual hunters but also to the commercial caribou hunt mounted by the LIDC, the Labrador Innuit Development Corporation.

I thank the hon. Member and I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Members for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. Member is quite welcome I have no difficulty allowing Ministers opposite to give information to the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was mentioning the Registry of Deeds, fines and forfeitures, and health fees, and certificates, I wonder does the Minister of Health know? Is the Minister of Health aware of the increase in certain health fees and certificates? I would assume that probably includes birth certificates, marriage certificates and things of that nature. Only \$500,000 in health fees and certificates, Mr. Speaker, but it represents a 45 per cent increase. That is a significant percentage of increase. A 5 per cent increase, inflation. One could live with that. Fines and forfeitures, all of these things were going up by 5 per cent or something of that nature, one can live with that, assuming that they are going up every year.

As I recall we looked at all of these just a year or two ago, Mr. Speaker. A lot of them had not even been changed some of them for ten years and we changed a lot of them. There was indeed room in that area for significant additional revenues to be found reasonably by Government. We updated many of those fines. I think it was two years ago, many of those fees, fines, and forfeitures, so that they were more in tune with present day realities. So I would submit that there was not this kind of room to do that sort of thing to update. So there is an increase of about 45 per cent on health fees and certificates. That is a very

significant percentage increase and the Minister of Finance tries to hide that as all new fees. He did manage to announce that one, it was one of the few that he managed to announce.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of ways that taxation here has increased. Not by imposing more taxes, but in the reverse by reducing services basically, or eliminating something that was provided previously. So it is not an increase in taxation, but it is additional revenue available to Government for certain purposes.

Now the Government tried to put through in their budget the fact that there were no new tax increases. Yet, simply by taking the Budget highlights and going through the ones I just mentioned retail sales tax, personal income tax and these type of things, you see there is \$93 million there. That is what shows up there. The Minister admitted last year there were \$43 million additional that would be in there this year in measures that were announced last year, so you are up to about \$130 million now. And you start adding on some other ones you see that there was a great announcement made that money would be saved by fleet reduction. They are going to save \$1.8 million by reducing a fleet of Government vehicles.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
He is not. He is just not buying new cars. So we now have a formula where cars are going to last forever. You see that is a false economy, unless you are going to reduce the number of vehicles. You have to reduce the number of vehicles. Just not

buying them this year only means that you will have to buy twice as many next year. There is a good program, there are some professional people down in fleet management that have on computer now every vehicle: when it is purchased, when it is serviced, how many miles are going on it, what the useful life of that vehicle is, when is the best time to dispose of that vehicle, or transfer it for other services, transfer it to a messenger around town, take it off the highway.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We are no longer going to have a couple of thousand cars.

MR. WINDSOR:

Not going to have a couple of thousand cars. Well, I do not know where you are going to eliminate them. So what are you going to do.

MR. BAKER:

All over the place.

MR. WINDSOR:

All over the place. But is the President of Treasury Board saying that all over the place now there are public servants who have vehicles they do not need? That is what he is saying. If he can find that, then they should be eliminated. I would submit to him that he is not going to find them. He might eliminate the vehicle but up goes mileage paid to individuals for use of their own vehicle, up goes car rentals, up goes taxis. There has to be a point. I have no problem with Government looking at it, but to suggest that they are going to save \$1.8 million this year by that mechanism, Mr. Speaker, I think is really playing games.

The Government has reduced

maintenance on public buildings by \$3.4 million. That is not an increased tax, but that is a less expenditure. That is more money that Government has available to play with somewhere else.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
We have eliminated the Ombudsman. The people's spokesman, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:
We have not yet.

MR. WINDSOR:
You have not yet.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
Ha, we cannot do that. Announced in the Budget that it will be eliminated, now they are admitting, Mr. Speaker, as we all knew anyway that Government cannot do that. The House of Assembly has to do that. So they are taking back water on that. They will still go ahead with it. They will still bullet through this House. They will use the power of their majority. Overrule, Mr. Speaker, again if they have to.

MR. A. SNOW:
The tyranny of the majority.

MR. WINSOR:
The tyranny of the majority, my colleague for Labrador West points out quite correctly. The tyranny of the majority. They will use that to eliminate the Ombudsman's Office. To eliminate that avenue of justice which the people of this Province had available to them.

He talked a moment ago about additional taxation on the Housing Corporation, the additional cost of buying a house through the Registry of Deeds. Yet we are cutting back the Housing Corporation by another \$19.2 million. It will be interesting - the Minister of Housing is not here today - it will be interesting to ask him now next week or sometime this week when he comes back just what his projection is for the housing starts this year in the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:
He is very happy.

MR. WINDSOR:
He is very happy. Well he is the only one in this Province who is happy, Mr. Speaker. He is the only one. There is lots of activity in Mount Pearl, I will tell the President of Treasury Board. Gander is still fairly vibrant, and still going, you know, concerning the economy of that area. It is not doing too badly. And there are a few other pockets in the Province. Generally speaking the housing industry is dead, certainly in the St. John's area. It is a buyers market. It is a buyers market today in the St. John's area.

AN HON. MEMBER:
After I just bought a house.

MR. WINDSOR:
Well I am buying one on Tuesday. The deal is made. But I just get in at the right time.

AN HON. MEMBER:
It is a sellers market in Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:
No, it is a buyers market now, Mr. Speaker. There are a good range

of homes available now, and I do not mind admitting, I have taken advantage of that. I am just in the process now of buying a new home. I will be moving in next week.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

There is one right next to mine now, if you want to move in.

MR. WINDSOR:

The good historic District of Mount Pearl, of course. Where else? The Member for Lewisporte will be delighted to know I am moving out of his District finally.

But it is a buyers market. Housing is at an all-time low right now and yet this Government is taking \$20 million from the Housing Corporation which they could be using as incentives to try to stimulate more housing construction, to create employment through housing construction, which is a very significant employment generator in this Province.

Housing construction is a significant employer all over Newfoundland. And it is something that this Government or any Government can do to help the economy of rural Newfoundland as well as urban Newfoundland, anywhere in the Province, anything that you can do to stimulate house construction is possible. There is such a spin-off, not only in the house construction industry but in the furniture industry and all the other things that are peripheral.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The interest rates are not helping.

MR. WINDSOR:

I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER:

The interest rates are not helping at all.

MR. WINDSOR:

The interest rates are not helping at all. I managed to get in under that too, just before the increase last week. But the interest rates are up. They will come down shortly. They will come down I predict over the next number of months. But I certainly hope they do, because if they do not then we are heading for some difficult times. But I believe they will.

The Minister talks about this great Budget that is putting so much emphasis on education. Until we look at the capital budget for education and we find that there is \$4.6 million less this year in the capital budget for education than there was last year; \$4.6 million less. Yet this Government holds a payroll tax out as a health and education tax so we have more money to do the things we need in education, \$4.6 million less. Community Development; a very good program, Mr. Speaker, which has created employment around this Province, a good program. The Minister of Social Services does not like it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is that?

MR. WINDSOR:

The Community Development Program.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They want that changed.

MR. WINDSOR:

We will get it changed. The Minister of Labour does not like it. She says, go on welfare. That was her comment, go on welfare if you do not have a job. What a statement, Mr. Speaker.

What a statement for a Minister in this Province to make. If you cannot get a job go on welfare. That is the policy of the Minister of Labour. What a dismal failure as a Minister of Labour. She is admitting, I cannot find a job for you, I do not know how to create employment in this Province, so you have to go see the Minister of Social Services.

The Minister of Social Services does not have anything to do now that the refugees are all leaving. What an admission of failure on behalf of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. There is \$5 million less this year for community development projects around this Province, at a time when the fishing industry is going to be so adversely effected by the resource crisis and when all of rural Newfoundland will feel the affect of that, we are cutting back on community development projects by \$5 million.

MS VERGE:

And the Employment Generation Program is down \$4.5 million.

MR. WINDSOR:

The Employment Generation Program is down \$4.5 million, my colleague reminds me. There is \$10 million in job creation programs from the Provincial Government being reduced. You add all that up, Mr. Speaker, and you find that you have just taken from the people of the Province, either by taxation or by cuts in specific programs, \$162 million.

The Minister of Finance would have us believe this is a people's Budget. Well, it is interesting. Look at the Budget summary and you look at where the money is going, a summary of gross Government expenditure, current and capital.

The Budget says two things. This is a Budget that is aimed at helping health and education and developing the economy. It is creating economic activity.

The Resource sector this year has gone down to 6.7 per cent of the total gross expenditures. Last year 8.1 per cent so they have reduced this year 1.4 per cent and that is a significant reduction. The total Budget of Government, current and capital, that was allocated to resource sector last year. That is a significant reduction in Government's activity directed at the resource sector to try and create jobs in this Province. Now, how can this Government, Mr. Speaker, say that this Budget is directed toward resource development when they are reducing by 1.4 per cent?

MR. BAKER:

Where is the increase?

MR. WINDSOR:

I will come to that. But you have to look back a year further, Mr. Speaker. I will tell the President of Treasury Board where the increase is. You have to look back a year further and see where we were in 1988 in this terrible Budget document that I brought in and that the Minister of Finance is over there waving around today because it has a picture of the Sprung Greenhouse on it. He thinks that is terrible. It shows again how much he hates development and industry in this Province.

In 1988 where was it, I ask the President of Treasury Board, does he have any concept? It is 6.7 per cent this year, it was 8.1 per cent last year, and in 1988 it was 15.1 per cent. This Government, Mr. Speaker, in two years has cut

the allocation to the resource sectors in more than half, and then they have the audacity to say in the Budget Speech that this is a Budget aimed at resource development and creating economic activity and jobs in the Province. How can they justify it, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is more efficient.

MR. WINDSOR:

More efficient. Mr. Speaker, if this Government can tell me how they can do more with half of what they had before then I will admit that they are more efficient. But I suspect, Mr. Speaker, I will be hear a long time before they can answer that. That is the resource sector. The President of Treasury Board says where is the increase? The social sector? Yes. There we are, the social sector. Increased to 65.7 per cent from 63.4 per cent last year. Increase in the social sector. Pound the desks and beat the drums and wave the flags. Until you look back at last year, and the year before. And you will find that last year they decreased it from the year before. So all they have done is to go back up to where we were.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There is a problem with what you are saying.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No there is not.

MR. WINDSOR:

There is no problem. These are numbers right out of your budget document. These are not numbers that I am fabricating, Mr. Speaker, these are clearly spelled out right in the budget highlights.

MR. BAKER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

President of Treasury Board, you cannot have it both places, he is right. Where is it? Where is the increase, Mr. Speaker? If you look at the third section in this pie chart, the general Government sector. The cost of doing Government has increased from 1988 to 27.6 per cent from 20.8. In two years the cost of Government has gone up by 6.8 per cent of gross Government revenue.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They are paying off your bad loans.

MR. WINDSOR:

Paying off our bad loans, Mr. Speaker.

The cost of Government, Mr. Speaker, that is where it is. Not in the social sector. They have taken from the resource sector and increased the cost of Government. This Government, this party, Mr. Speaker, that when we were over there were saying what a fat Government, what waste, what extravagance. Travelling all over the world in limousines and all of this foolishness. And yet in two years they have taken 7 per cent of the gross Provincial budget, current and capital combined and added it to cost of Government. Increased it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Premier's salary has gone up.

MR. WINDSOR:

The Premier's salary.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are into.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

And they try to say to us, Mr. Speaker, that this is because we are not getting as much money from the Government of Canada. The Minister of Finance three or four times today said go talk to your buddies in Ottawa. I mean how can the Minister of Finance say that?

AN HON. MEMBER:

The answer is in Hansard.

MR. WINDSOR:

Well we better get Hansard and see what - I do not know how many times we have asked the question here and it is all Ottawa. No, not as much money from Ottawa. \$42 million more this year from Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Per cent of budget.

MR. WINDSOR:

Per cent of budget. Yes, per cent from the Federal Government from the budget document, Mr. Speaker. These are not my numbers, this is from the budget document. Per cent from Federal revenues 44.8 per cent I say to the President of Treasury Board, 44.8 per cent. Where was it last year? 44.8 per cent. We are talking about the Minister of Finance claiming that we are losing money now, that there is less money this year. That is why we have to bring in a health and education tax because the Government of Canada is cutting back. And yet we find that 44.8 per cent of the Provincial budget this year comes from the Government of Canada. 44.8 per cent last year came from the Government of Canada. What does that mean? It is that the money coming from the Government of Canada increased the same percentage this year as did Provincial sources, exactly the

same.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How much more did they get?

MR. WINDSOR:

I have never heard a more dishonest statement. When right in the Minister's own budget documents it clearly points out that the amount is exactly the same and the Minister's only defense is to wave the 1988 budget again.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, let me say this to the Minister of Finance. He is waving my budget document of 1988. I will take that document in my hand and I will give him this one for his Budget of 1990 and let both of us go to the electorate and see which Budget they would like to have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

Let us go.

I will take my Budget document in hand. I will take it. Let us add up the tax increases in there on the people of the Province. Find it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

Oho, oho!

The Minister of Finance is right proud of the fact that he got, what is it a \$10 million surplus hidden away in there. Congratulations! Ten million dollar surplus. But I just

pointed out that he stole \$163 million from the people of the Province in eliminating programs and indirect taxation. Anybody can have a surplus of \$10 million when they take \$163 million out of people's pockets.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Shame.

MR. WINDSOR:
We went into the hole because we refused to put that kind of taxation. I refused to bring in a payroll tax and take \$25 million out of the taxpayers pockets. I refused to put in something that would chase business and industry out of this Province.

The only reason, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance has a surplus this year is because last year after his Budget the Federal Government gave him \$35 million more than he was expecting. So what did he do, he paid \$21 million off to the Pension Fund, he paid \$4 million on interest to Marystown Shipyard last year so it does not show up in the Budget this year, so he comes up with his \$10 million. These are the games he is playing. When is he going to stand up and be honest with the people of this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
The mad professor.

MR. WINDSOR:
I will qualify that, Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that the only good thing in the Budget is this Economic Recovery Commission. I am not even sure that is good. On the surface it looks like a positive thing that there is some emphasis being put on economic

recovery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
I want to see the report card. There was a document circulated last week at the request, I think, of the Resource Estimate Committee. I have the document downstairs, I have not had a chance to read it yet. It will be interesting bedtime reading. I will read it tonight.

MR. SIMMS:
I read it.

MR. WINDSOR:
Did you read it? My colleague from Grand Falls indicates he has read it. I will read it tonight. I will probably be awake all night laughing. But I can just imagine what has been produced by the Economic Recovery Commission. I would say that the only thing they have produced is their own salary. They have produced another \$1 million, Mr. Speaker, to create another Crown Corporation to take some of the load off them to try and divert their failure at creating any jobs in the Province.

MR. FLIGHT:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
They have created \$1 million on that. Taken some of the responsibility away from the Minister of Development, taken away some of his authority and moving everything away from Government. Another Crown Agency an additional million dollars to do what? We do not know. We could not find out in the Resource Estimate Committees really where the \$1 million was going except

that it is going to cost a million dollars to combine part of the Department of Development with the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
I did not get my ticket.

AN HON. MEMBER:
It is coming.

MR. WINDSOR:
It is coming. The Minister of Development offered us a ticket to a conference they are sponsoring next week, a Business Development Conference. I am interested. I was going to go anyway. So was the hon. the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island. I am going to go anyway now. The Minister of Development is going to pay the price. And it should be very worthwhile, I am interested to see. I hope it is worthwhile. Look, I will be the first to complement the Government or any Minister on an initiative like that. I believe it will be a good thing.

AN HON. MEMBER:
He is saying thank you.

MR. WINDSOR:
For bringing it up.

MR. SIMMS:
He should resign as Caucus Chairman (inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
We have another initiative, Mr. Speaker, a \$450,000 initiative to send the Minister of Development around the world a few times, to Asia.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is gone now.

MR. WINDSOR:
Is that where he is gone now.

AN HON. MEMBER:
An Asian flu.

MR. WINDSOR:
I was going to call it the Furey Travel Fund. Now I can see it is the Easter Break Fund. Gone to Hong Kong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. WINDSOR:
Now, Mr. Speaker, we talked about all the things that are taken away. The Minister of Social Services was very proud of it, very proud of the fact that he got fifty new positions in the Department of Social Services. Can we look, Mr. Speaker, at the salary details by Department. We see that those fifty positions were positions that the Minister added last year that he had not budgeted for last year. So he increased his staff complement from 751 to 801 last year. And he is predicting this year that his staff complement will still be 801. And he tries to say in the Budget Speech that we are adding fifty new positions.

MR. EFFORD:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
No, you added them last year. Seven hundred and fifty-one positions you budgeted last year. You finished the year with 801, and you are budgeting 801 for this year. That is 0 new positions. You are not adding fifty this year. All that the Minister is announcing is the fifty that he added last year without Budget

authority.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:

That is absolutely false.

MR. WINDSOR:

Is it? Well I cannot wait for the Minister to tell me how he is going to do it. I will ask the Minister another question. The salary details said the Minister budgeted 751 positions last year. Is that true?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:

No new positions, no more people in the Minister's Department this year than last year, none.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Misleading the House.

MR. WINDSOR:

I am not misleading the House. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Social Services are misleading the House. They are a disgrace to the Province, both of them!

MR. EFFORD:

(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

The Minister of Social Services will get a chance to answer, Mr. Speaker. Sometime in the next month when I sit down, he will get a chance to answer. It will be interesting to see how he tries to weasel around that. Anybody would make a better Minister of Finance than the Minister of Finance. The people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, are ashamed of the performance of the Minister of Finance, yet, he has the audacity

to sit here day after day, refusing to give any information.

MR. SIMMS:

I would like to read the fan mail.

MR. WINDSOR:

I would love to see your fan mail. How many letters do you write to yourself every day?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us get back to the infamous payroll tax that is going to hit every one of us. I have mentioned Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, the price of electricity will increase because of them. The Newfoundland Liquor Corporation, in addition to -

DR. GIBBONS:

(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

Here is the Minister of Energy! I am amazed at the Minister of Energy, that he sits up over there and supports the payroll tax. He supports these measures of taking \$30 million this year from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. He supports increases in electrical rates in this Province, Mr. Speaker. I find that amazing.

Two and one-half million dollars from the Liquor Corporation - the Minister tried to say that will not increase the prices, and what did we see the following week? Up went the prices, Mr. Speaker. We said they would go up. They had to go up. The Minister can play all the games with numbers he wants and say, 'Oh, well, we told them to absorb it from retained earnings,' and all that nonsense. What retained earnings? A Crown corporation, on paper, Mr. Speaker. The bottom line is the Minister said, 'Give me \$81.5

million this year. You only gave me \$79 million last year, give me \$81.5 this year.' That is \$2.5 million out of the pockets of consumers in this Province. The Minister tried to hide behind it and say, 'Oh, we did not increase the price of beer and wines, spirits.'

The agricultural industry is supposed to be exempt from the payroll tax. The Minister has not yet addressed the question of Newfoundland Farm Products. What is Newfoundland Farm Products? Is the Minister now going to negotiate under the table? Is the Minister going to negotiate under the table with Newfoundland Farm Products and give them back some money to pay their share of the payroll tax? Tell us about Newfoundland Farm Products. Learn about Newfoundland Farm Products.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
I can tell you all about it. And the benefit of the Newfoundland Farm Products to the agricultural industry in this Province. Is the Minister of Social Services saying we should close down Newfoundland Farm Products now? Is that what he is saying? Because he better ask the Premier about it because all you got to do is close down a plant in Corner Brook to make Farm Products viable. Maybe that is why the Premier has not closed that one down yet.

There is your answer to farm products if you are concerned about the cost of subsidy going into that industry. Ask the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture about it. Is the Minister of Forestry prepared to close down the abattoir in Corner

Brook? No, of course he is not. Of course he is not because the Premier would flick him out of Cabinet so quick he would not know what hit him. I think there are seventy-five employees in that plant in Corner Brook. If you close it down not only would you eliminate those seventy-five jobs in Corner Brook -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
That is the answer. You wanted to hear the story on farm products, now I am telling you. You do not like the story now. You do not like the story when we give you the facts because you did not know when you asked the question. You have to learn in this House that you never ask a question if you do not know the answer.

That is right. Never ask a question I say to the new Member of St. John's South, if you do not know the answer. You will get yourself in trouble if you do not know the answer. Remember that.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
I say to my friend from St. John's South, remember that. It is good advice. The Minister of Social Services has just bit off more than he can chew.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:
Yes, we can make farm products viable. Eliminate the abattoir in Corner Brook, eliminate all of the poultry industry in the West Coast by doing so, and the swine industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how about Tourism, the Minister of Development and Tourism is gone. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, quite honestly that I am really concerned about the tourism industry in this Province as a result of measures taken by this Government in this budget, particularly this payroll tax.

The tourism industry, Mr. Speaker, is a growing industry. The industry which probably has the single greatest potential for growth over the next few years outside of the mega projects such as lower Churchill or Hibernia. The tourism industry has the greatest potential for growth.

Now, we know the Minister of Finance's position on the tourism industry. He said it several months ago. He said the tourism industry is a seasonal industry at best. That is what he said. That is what he said last year. The hon. Member for Carbonear recalls that. The poor Member for Carbonear is so ashamed of the Minister of Finance that he cannot contain himself. He is ashamed of him because I believe he knows. As a former President of Hospitality Newfoundland, the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island certainly knows that the tourism industry is not a seasonal industry. It can be a twelve month industry with any effort and with any support. What support did we get from this Government? A tax on all the payrolls. The tourism industry is primarily a service industry. It is labour intensive, probably the most labour intensive industry we have. I think it is the third highest job creation industry in the Province. I think it is fourth in terms of net return to the economy, and it is third in

terms of job creation.

AN HON. MEMBER:
What is?

MR. WINDSOR:
Tourism. It is the third highest employer in this Province, and growing very quickly. It has the greatest potential of any industry and the greatest potential for rural Newfoundland, where we need more job creation, where we have the greatest unemployment in the Province. I say to hon. colleagues who have fishing districts, you are all going to have problems in your districts with jobs and employment over the next few years because of the problems we are facing in the fishery industry. I say to you, do not forget the tourism industry, not as the great saviour of the fishing industry, not to burn your boats and take over a hotel, but I say to you that the greatest potential you have in rural Newfoundland to create employment is in the tourism industry. I heard the Member for Placentia on radio the other day talking about the ferry going to Argentia. I agree with him. I think it will be one of the greatest things for that area of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:
I realize that my friend from Port aux Basques may not be totally happy with that, but there is give and take with all of it. I say to my friend from Port aux Basques, look a little further and you will see an increase in tourist traffic because you have the alternate route, because you have a loop, that it will not be necessarily counterproductive to the people of

Port aux Basques. It will increase the tourist activity in this Province so that everybody will benefit, and what is good for Argentia will also be good for Port aux Basques and vice versa. For God's sake, let us get together on it and let us not be so parochial. We are talking about an industry in this Province. Let us attract people to this Province and let us see how we can work together to take advantage of those tourists in the best possible way.

The Tourism Industry, Mr. Speaker, has a tremendous potential, and putting a 1.5 per cent payroll tax on the tourism industry is clearly a disincentive for that industry; it puts us again at a disadvantage to other parts of Canada. When people in the United States, tour operators, are putting together packaged tour plans, Newfoundland versus Nova Scotia versus New Brunswick versus Prince Edward Island. We had enough difficulties before. The only thing that saved us is that we have so many natural resources to offer, there is so much here people want to see, so many reasons why people would want to come to Newfoundland. But when you look at it from a cost point of view, you have the cost of the ferry service across the Gulf - I assume CN Marine is going to pay payroll tax now on the labour component of that - you have the cost of goods and services in the Province, 1.5 per cent paid on all those services; everything there will be increased, you have the cost of liquor now gone up. And do not think that that is not significant in putting together a tour package, as most tour packages include a certain amount of beer and wine, a welcoming cocktail and this sort of thing.

We see 1.5 per cent going on all the labour in hotels and restaurants, which will go into those tour packages, and in the bus tours, when you see gasoline taxes increasing. Every one of those taxes, Mr. Speaker, will negatively impact on the tourist industry, and that is sad - that is sad.

It is sad that that industry, Mr. Speaker, which has so much potential, should be dealt such a blow at a time when we have an opportunity to really do something.

DR. KITCHEN:

Gloom and doom. Gloom and doom.

MR. WINDSOR:

Doom and Gloom. Mr. Speaker, there are four or five conversations going on. My time is coming to a close. I am going to conclude now. Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude, out of sheer frustration, primarily - sheer frustration. We have gotten absolutely no answers from the Minister of Finance, no answers whatsoever. I will have another chance. We will have an amendment here, and I will have another chance to deal with some of the real issues; I will deal with them in other forms. But I do not believe that one should unduly control -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

I do not think you should stop. No.

MR. WINDSOR:

I am under a lot of pressure from my colleagues to keep going.

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, keep going.

MR. WINDSOR:

My good friend from the tourism

industry, in the gallery, he knows what I was just talking about. He is one of the better entrepreneurs in the tourist industry, creating jobs in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

Now, Mr. Speaker, out of sheer frustration at not being able to get information from the Minister of Finance, I think we are getting our message out clearly to the people of this Province.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see the Minister of Agriculture making fun of an important agricultural industry in this Province. There is no wonder they close their doors, Mr. Speaker, out of sheer frustration at the incompetence of the Minister of Agriculture.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have exposed the Minister of Finance. We exposed his Budget leak. We caught him in the act, trying to change the Retail Sales Tax system; he wanted to tax children's clothing and books and heating fuels and food. That is what he wanted to do. We caught him at that, so he had to institute his payroll tax. He did not know what he was talking about. He still does not know what he is talking about when it comes to the payroll tax. He still does not understand it.

He is going to go out now and talk to each Crown Corporation and pass them a few dollars under the table. I can see the kind of an intelligent response we are going to get from the Minister of Finance when he gets on his feet. If what he is mumbling over there now, Mr. Speaker, is any

indication of the kind of intelligent response we are going to get to legitimate questions we are asking about the Budget, then I wonder why we would waste our time, Mr. Speaker. We see the Government is going to take us on its back anyway. The Budget will go through, I have no doubt about that. The Minister of Finance does not have enough integrity to resign when we show him to be incompetent, and when we show clearly that he tried to deceive the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WINDSOR:

He may not like it, Mr. Speaker, but my Budget was an honest document. It was an honest document, it came up front to the people of the Province; the people knew what they were dealing with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

They knew what they were dealing with. Not this dishonest, fraudulent document that the Minister tried to put forward as a people's document, as a people's Budget. One that puts emphasis on health and education and development, will do more to destroy employment opportunities in this Province, more to destroy business industry in this Province, and less to help health and education than any Budget document ever brought down in this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I will now adjourn the debate.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A few announcements for hon. Members. The Estimates Committees first of all, there are three things that have to be dealt with. I think Municipal Affairs is tomorrow at 7:00 p.m. in the House, I think on Thursday it is Justice in the House and Environment and Lands at the Colonial Building, both at 7:00 p.m. Education is already started, but tonight, at 7:00, Education will be continued with. I think that is here in the House. I think that is the summary of the next couple of days in terms of the Estimates Committees.

I would also like to announce tomorrow is Private Member's Day. We will stop the clock, please, Mr. Speaker. Tomorrow is Private Member's Day, and the Opposition resolution, I understand, is the seal fishery. That could be verified by the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, just for Members' understanding, it was the resolution that was given notice of today. It is not on the Order Paper, obviously, but it will be tomorrow. It is the one the Leader of the Opposition introduced today on the sealing industry, or the sealing question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 2:00 p.m.