



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 41

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

The House met at 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

Before proceeding with routine business I want to inform all hon. Members that one of our commissioners, Mr. Bertram Lidstone, will be retiring as of today. Mr Lidstone is at the upper galleries to my right. He has been with us in the Legislature for three years and has spent fifty-one years as a public servant. On behalf of all hon. Members, I want to express our gratitude and thanks for his years of loyalty, commitment and dedicated service, and wish him many years of happy retirement.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, as hon. Members are aware, today marks the commencement of Canada's Fit Week. A unique celebration designed to stimulate greater participation in physical activity and fitness. From May 25 to June 3, over seven and one half million Canadians will be participating in this major promotional campaign. Fitness week is also designed to heighten the awareness of the benefits of healthy active living, while strengthening the network of individual groups and organizations offering these programs. In keeping with the first Fit Week launched in 1983, this year's campaign will again feature a number of nationwide mass participation events sponsored by some twenty national

and provincial health and fitness associations, twelve provincial and territorial governments and Fitness Canada. These events range from swimming, cycling, walking, and numerous unique local activities. This year's theme is 'Kick up your Heels.'

In Newfoundland and Labrador last year approximately 70,000 people were involved in numerous events during Fit Week and this year we anticipate that between 70,000 and 100,000 people will be actively involved. An enormous amount of volunteer work has gone into this campaign with over 300,000 volunteers helping out all across the country, including here in Newfoundland and Labrador. What this means is that the success of Fit Week can only be made possible by the dedicated work of these numerous volunteers and their commitments and dedication to the importance of healthy and active living.

Hon. Members may be interested to know that there are over 300 communities in Newfoundland and Labrador hosting their own schedule of events during Fit Week, along with numerous other provincial health and fitness associations. The Community Recreation, Sport and Fitness Division of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, has been actively involved in the co-ordination of these various projects as a means of ensuring maximum participation during the week. Additionally, we provide grants of up to \$500 to more than fifty communities for promotional and organizational activities during Fit Week.

As the Minister with responsibility for recreation, sport, and fitness, I would like

to urge all hon. Members, and all residents of Newfoundland and Labrador, to take part in as many events as possible, and as part of our commitment to active living I challenge all Members to join with me and kick off Fit Week by wearing sneakers all day long today and by getting personally involved with this unique fitness celebration.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all I want to thank the Minister for providing me a copy of his statement in advance. I do want to recognize the hon. Minister's nice pink sneakers which he has on his desk today, but, Mr. Speaker, you cannot do much fitness with your sneakers on your desk - you are suppose to wear them.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) with the red.

Mr. R. Aylward: There were times when those sneakers were blue.

On behalf of the Opposition I want to associate myself with the statement and encourage as many people in the Province as possible to participate in Fit Week. It would probably be a good idea, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister organized some type of program for Members of the House of Assembly because probably we are a group of Newfoundlanders who would certainly benefit by any fitness program. When I look at the belts around peoples' waists, Mr. Speaker, some peoples' waists have so much hanging out over them, I

am certainly sure that most of us in this house could do with some fitness program.

But I do want to make a recommendation to the hon. Minister: if he would reinstate the capital works program for the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth, Mr. Speaker, the communities in this Province, the more than fifty that he gave \$500.00 to, would benefit by providing recreational facilities in their communities so that people who are interested in becoming fit and staying fit would be able to avail of the opportunity to provide facilities for residents of their communities, Mr. Speaker, and the capital works program would be good. To clue up, I just want to recommend to hon. Members of the House of Assembly who are not into running and jogging and things like that, this weekend or early next week I will have ten thousand strawberry plants to be planted on my property. If anyone would like to come in and plant a few of those strawberry plants it certainly would be a good idea for fitness week, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Before calling Oral Questions, I want, on behalf of all hon. Members, to extend a warm and cordial welcome to fifty-two students who, among other things, are studying Democracy. They are from Ascension Collegiate, Bay Roberts, and they are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Ed Neil and Mr. Claude Taylor.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member

for Humber East.

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Premier. Yesterday in Question Period the Premier said he really does not understand what is happening within Quebec, but now he does see the possibility of Quebec separating from the rest of Canada. My question is what would be the effect on Newfoundland and Labrador if Quebec were to separate?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Let me correct the misstatement by the hon. Member. I did not say I did not understand what was going on in Quebec. What I said was I did not have an adequate level of personal knowledge of what was happening in Quebec to make an intelligent judgment. I could ask people to accept as a sound judgment, so I qualified my comments by saying I rely on what others say, I rely on my observations. I understand what I see, I understand what they say, but I do not know from my own personal knowledge that it is so. So I cannot speak authoritatively from a personal knowledge point of view, and there is a significant difference between that and what the hon. Member suggested.

The matter is causing a great deal of concern across the country, but we still must make our decisions on the basis of what is right for the future of Canada, what is right to preserve Canada as a Federal nation and to preserve and protect the position of Newfoundland and Labrador and its people for the next decades and century as citizens of this country. We have to make sure that we put in place and keep in place a constitution that will

provide us with an opportunity to be full participating citizens of this country.

Now part of the equation in what we do is, of course, what will happen if Quebec decides it does not want to be part of Canada. I cannot say with any degree of certainty what that will mean. Canada will go on, but I cannot really imagine how Canada will be without Quebec. But Canada will go on, I have no doubt about that, will continue as Canada, and I do not know what the relationship with Quebec will be - I am unable to predict that with any degree of certainty.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Premier expect there would be serious negative consequences for Newfoundland and Labrador if Quebec were to separate?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Yes. My judgement is yes there would be serious negative consequences if Quebec were to separate. Would they be as serious as locking us into a constitution where we are bound forever to be the beggars of Confederation, waiting for handouts from Ottawa and told that you better be careful what you say or how you express your opinion because, remember, you have to rely on Ottawa for half your Government revenue? Well, I have said before in this House I will not be the leader of the Government that sells the dignity and self-respect of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador for short-term gain.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Premier says he does expect there would be serious negative consequences for Newfoundland and Labrador if Quebec were to separate. If that should happen, Mr. Speaker, does the Premier expect the other nine provinces would stay together in a confederation?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I do not know how low the hon. Member thinks the intelligence of the people of this Province is, that they have to try and sell this proposition by this kind of plaintive fearmongering. Let us look at the Meech Lake issues on the basis of what is right for the future of this country and its people as a federal nation, where every citizen has the reasonable expectation of living in an equal status with every other citizen, and where every province is equal to every other province.

Mr. Hewlett: (Inaudible) my father's pension.

Premier Wells: I am not going to sell the future of the people of this Province and their opportunity for dignity and self-respect for the hon. Member's father's pension.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hewlett: You have already sold us down the drain (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I want to remind hon. Members of Beauchesne 409, section 3, which says with respect to Question Period, explaining what a question should be, 'the question ought to seek information and, therefore, cannot be based upon a hypothesis, cannot seek an opinion, either legal or otherwise, and must not be argumentative or make representations.' Hon. Members ought to know what that is saying to us.

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Premier if he agrees with the economists and the investment dealers who say that the current political instability in Canada is driving up interest rates and hurting the national economy; and, second, whether he believes the economic harm is having a worse impact on Newfoundland and Labrador than other regions of Canada since our economy is, perhaps, the most fragile of those of all the Provinces?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Again, Mr. Speaker, it calls for opinions which Your Honour has just ruled out, but the hon. Member has asked the question and I am hesitant to simply not answer it. I know it is a breach of the rules, but in responding to a question that breaches the rules I may have to breach the rules to answer it.

My own expectation, and it is only that, because again I do not know the minds of the foreign investors in New York or Europe, I can only go by what I hear from talking to

businessmen and others, I can only judge by what the Minister of Finance announced here yesterday, that the Government of Newfoundland floated a bond issue for \$150 million, US dollars, at a very favorable rate. Notwithstanding the adverse effect of the impact of our fisheries on our economy, Moody's and Standard and Poor's confirmed our credit rating and I think that displays great confidence in this Government and its financial management policies, and great confidence in the future of the country. I do not think that kind of fearmongering should enter this element of the Meech Lake debate. I say again to the hon. Member, consider the opportunity for the people of this Province to ever have a reasonable economic, political and social future by putting in place a national political institution that will give them an effective say in the exercise of national power and national decision-making. Those are the kinds of things that are important.

Let us build this country on the basis of a recognition that all our citizens are equal, all our provinces are equal and that Canada is an unified federal nation. But, at the same time, let us be concerned and genuinely responsive to the proposals of Quebec to address their legitimate and fair concerns, because they should be addressed, but let us do it in a fair way, that preserves the federal nature of this country and recognizes that there are 20 million people outside the boundaries of Quebec just as deeply concerned about their personal future, the well-being of their children, and the security of this country as anybody who lives within Quebec. Let us do it

with mutual respect, let us not do it out of fear or under pressure from what one province says: you must do it this way, or else we will cause this terribly unacceptable catastrophic result. That is an illogical, improper way to address matters.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My questions have been about the risk for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians from the current political instability within Canada. My final question for the Premier is whether he believes holding out for a distinct society clause in the preamble of the Constitution rather than the body of the Constitution is worth the risk to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: The hon. Member is ill-informed. I have not held out for it. I have suggested that is the proper place for it to be, but I have also put forward proposals as to how it can be addressed within the body of the Constitution. The hon. Member is not fully informed. That, perhaps, is not her fault, but it is inaccurate to say that I have held out for the recognition of Quebec as a distinct society to be only in the preamble.

I have, at the request of Senator Murray and others, and in response to the Charest proposals, put forward possible add-ons to address the concerns of Newfoundland without making the changes Newfoundland had originally suggested as the proper way to address the problem. So it is wrong to suggest that I have

held out for that, it is inaccurate.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms. Uerge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A final supplementary. Would the Premier table his latest constitutional proposal?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: From my point of view, yes, but I think I will wait until Monday. I will be meeting with the Prime Minister this weekend. He has it, and if he in his judgement thinks it is the right thing to do rather than deal with it at a First Ministers' Conference directly, I have no quarrel with tabling it. I will do so immediately on Monday.

My reluctance to discuss Newfoundland's response in detail to each individual item was consistent with what all the other Premiers are doing. They are not discussing the detail of it through media discussions, because that can only have the effect of hardening positions and making subsequent discussions and negotiation impossible. I have no quarrel with putting it forward. As a matter of fact, I would like to make it public. But what I think I will do is wait until I have an opportunity to speak with the Prime Minister on Sunday, and do it on Monday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social Services. I have been concerned about statements which have been made by the Minister concerning Coach House, statements

which have been made to me by officials in his department, and also statements which have been made in the Province by professionals.

My question to the Minister is what do you do with young people who sometimes want to harm themselves or harm property, but especially those, of course, who want to harm themselves? I want to ask the Minister is a group home or a foster home the type of facility for these young people? Mr. Speaker, I am troubled because of what I hear from the Minister, and I am troubled by what I hear from professionals, and I would like to ask the Minister, does he really believe he is doing the right thing?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my hon. critic that I have been troubled about the Coach House for the past three years, since 1987. I have been troubled to the point where, when I was in Opposition, on numerous occasions we made a number of attempts to meet with the then Minister to try to discuss the problems, but he would not meet. Since becoming Minister, I certainly have been more troubled about it because I have had a better insight into what was actually taking place down at the Coach House. We have done everything humanly possible with the officials of the Department of Social Services and the management board and staff of the Coach House to try to come to some resolution that would solve the serious problems which were taking place.

On a day-to-day basis there were

continuous problems within the environment of the Coach House. The Royal Newfoundland Constabulary had to be called in, and the neighbours were quite concerned. There were a number of issues. Am I satisfied with the decision made? Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am quite satisfied with the decision made in closing the Coach House. Will the proper care be given to the young boys or girls who need care because of their severe behavioural problems? Yes.

The Director of Child Welfare, Mr. Terry Stapleton, in whom I have a great deal of confidence, has already developed an interim plan, but that is not the future. He has already called together officials of the Department, we have already met with the present staff of the Coach House, we plan to meet at a later date with the management board and the staff, together with officials of the Department and other organizations within the community, to develop a long-term plan which will be the best for young boys and girls with this particular type of behaviour.

And he is quite right, something serious could happen. That is the reason why we made the decision to close the Coach House before something more serious happens in the future than happened in the past.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, when I questioned the Minister the last day he said the program was in place. Now he says there is a plan in place and the program will come later, yet he has decided to close the house. Mr. Speaker, I understand that recently a young person at the Coach House

attempted suicide by hanging and had to be cut down. Will the Minister confirm this? And is this the type of person who can be supervised in a group home or in a foster home? And why is it the Minister closed down Coach House without ensuring adequate programs and facilities were available for such needy cases as the case I have just mentioned?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, there are quite a number, and I am not about to list off the number of types of serious things which have happened in the Coach House over the past three years. The only thing I can honestly say to this hon. House of Assembly is that I am able to stand in this House and say I have closed the Coach House before, as I said in answer to the original questions, before some young person lost his life, rather than close it in reaction to something more serious happening. It was exactly that to which I was referring. Yes, very, very serious things have happened over the past three years, and that is the reason why we made the decision to close that particular facility.

Will the boys and/or girls be better looked after in a group home or in some foster home? Nobody has said to date that they will be going into a particular group home, nobody said they will be going into a particular foster home. We have an interim plan already in mind for now, for the shorter period of time.

The Coach House will not close until June 30. I have a great deal of confidence in the people

in the Department of Social Services, enough confidence to know that they will bring in a long-term plan that is best for the future, not just something reactionary. I am not going to be pressured by the Opposition or by anybody in this Province into making the wrong decision. The right decision will be made and the right care will be given to those young boys and girls in the future, unlike the former Administration, which just put them out there and forgot about them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, as the house now stands, there are seventeen professionals, most of them with degrees - there is only one or two without degrees - all in the professional and social sciences, which are needed there. Mr. Speaker, there is no planning for where the people are going. The Minister admitted it when he answered the last question. Would the Minister consider replacing the home, since it is not the structure which is inadequate, nor the staff, nor the concept, or as a last resort, and there is another angle to this, and I think we have demonstrated it here; the Minister has admitted that these are very serious cases. If we are not going to put them into a well-supervised environment, would he consider sending them to another Province? There are institutions in Ontario which are very, very specialized in this type of field. Would he consider sending them out of the Province or, better still, do the right thing here in the Province?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Mr. Speaker, it is a job to keep from smiling when such a serious situation is taking place down in the Coach House. I listen to the Member opposite knowing full well that his Government developed the plan for the Coach House then let it develop into the situation it is in by doing absolutely nothing for a number of years. When the then Leader of the Opposition - now the Premier - and myself went down and visited that particular facility we were totally shocked out of our minds by what we witnessed in that particular facility, what was happening to the young boys down there. And now I have a critic who has all the answers for those young people.

Well, let me tell the Member opposite that as Minister of Social Services I know full well about the past history, about the present history and about what is needed for the future of those young boys. We do have a plan. We have in mind what is best, but I am not going to announce it until I am completely satisfied that we have explored all possible pros and cons regarding the future of those young people. Will I open up another facility like the Coach House? Absolutely not. Absolutely not. The plan the Director of Child Welfare and the officials of my Department have in mind is something that is best for the future, and when we have it completely investigated and we are completely satisfied with it, then I will make an announcement to this House of Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, nobody

is asking the Minister to open up a facility such as Coach House. Mr. Speaker, a public person, who was a consultant, said it is worse this year than it was any other year. The Minister's plan is to close it in thirty days with no program ready. As well, Mr. Speaker, in his public statements about the institution, I am going to ask the Minister if he is implying that in the population of this Province, 600,000 people, there are only four boys and there are no females whatsoever with this type of problem? Mr. Speaker, this is very serious. These young people, because of their disposition, often cannot be kept at the Janeway Hospital, and because there is no juvenile version of the Waterford in this Province, is the problem of the young people who are not there but who are in the Province being adequately met? How can the Minister do it, I must ask him again, in group homes and in foster homes as he is planning to do, and as he told this house he was going to do in his original statement.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Social Services.

Mr. Efford: It is quite obvious that their former in Administration must have confused their minds so much that they do not even understand an answer to a question. First of all, I did not say we were going to put them in group homes, I did not say we were going to put them in former foster homes. Therapeutic foster homes possibly, with professional people and proper support services in place. That is one of the plans we are considering for the future.

Are there more in the Province than the four or five boys who

were at the Coach House? Yes. Are there any females, young children, young girls in the Province with behavioural problems? Yes. Would we consider sending some of them to the mainland, to where there are proper institutions for care? Yes. We already have applications for two particular people, where psychiatrists of the Department of Health have advised us that this is the only alternative, that there is absolutely no treatment here in Newfoundland that we can possibly give.

Mr. Hodder: That is a home you are sending them to.

Mr. Efford: One of our problems is that there is a shortage of medical staff, psychiatrists, in the Province to adequately deal with the number of children. I mean, that is something we have to contend with. But there are many more than four, and there certainly has to be something developed for the future of those young children. And I intend to do that. I can assure the hon. Member opposite and everybody in this Province that those boys and girls who have very severe behavioural problems and who need this special type of care, will receive it.

If you were to talk to some of those young people they, themselves, will tell you they did not get anything out of the Coach House, any proper programing that really helped them, and we have talked to parents and we have talked to a number of people. But the proper care will be given, as much as the Opposition questions it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. My question is also to the Minister of Social Services, but I want to remind the Minister before I get into my question, that when the previous Government opened the Coach House, it was opened on professional advice, and I am assuming now, it is closing on the Minister's personal advice. That is what I got from what you just said.

In saying that, Mr. Speaker, a couple of nights ago I watched an interview conducted by Debbie Cooper, of CBC, with a gentleman, Art Sheilds. He is from Ontario and has two homes, or he is in charge of two homes there, on Park Hill, and the people in those homes have severe behavioural problems as well. His homes have served the situation well. I want to know, Mr. Speaker, the status of the original five occupants of the Coach House. Where are they?

An Hon. Member: Good question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure I understand the last part of his question. The status of the five boys put there originally, when it was opened?

Mr. Parsons: Yes.

Mr. Efford: I cannot answer that, Mr. Speaker. I will certainly check the files of the Department of Social Services, go back and check and see whether - the original five boys, in 1987?

Mr. Parsons: Yes.

Mr. Efford: I can certainly have the Director of Child Welfare dig out the files, but one thing I

will tell the hon. Member, I will not, and I am not allowed to as Minister of Social Services or anybody else in the Province, talk about the confidential files on young people we have within the Department of Social Services. I can give some basic information as to what a young person has gone through and the status of that young person, without giving any name or any information. I will not release to the public any particular information.

Was the decision made by me solely as Minister of Social Services? Absolutely not. The Director of Child Welfare, the officials of the Department of Social Services in consultation with other experts around the City of St. John's, have discussed this at great length and the advice was given to me. I do not make decisions alone in the Department of Social Services, I seek the advice of the people, the expertise of the people who know best. And that is the change in the Department now. That is what we call real change, unlike the past, change for the betterment of those young boys and/or young girls.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not ask the Minister for anything that was confidential. I mean, I am not that stupid. I know you cannot release anything confidential as it pertains to an individual. I did ask the Minister and I will ask him again now, if some who had been residents of that home since it was opened who were placed in homes or other institutions, have they been changed around or are

they still residing in those same homes or institutions, the ones who have left? You stated in the House last week that we started off with five and you told us then there was only one left. I am wondering where the others went. Have you gotten homes for them? Are they still in the same homes you put them in in the first instance?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now I understand the hon. gentleman's question a little bit better. First of all, I think you are misunderstanding the concept of the Coach House. First of all, the five boys and/or girls - there was a mix when the Coach House opened in 1987. Nobody who went to the Coach House stayed there for any great length of time. In fact, the original concept of the Coach House was to put them there for a brief period of time, probably six weeks to two months, to do an assessment as to where they should go in the community.

But, as it turned out, most of them went there and received whatever treatment was available through programming. So they could have been there for two or three months; one could have left and gone back with his or her family, or went to another area of the Province, or could have gone into a foster home or whatever, depending on the amount of rehabilitation they received. So it changes from time to time. And I would have to go back through the files and check to see the original admittance to that particular group home, and how many have been admitted over the three years since it was opened,

up until the time it will close. And I can give a full history of what actually happened to some of the young people.

I know, particularly from my involvement back when I was in Opposition, that a number of the boys were taken and placed back with their parents: one was from the hon. the Member's District, in Carbonear, another was from the hon. Member's District, in Conception Bay South. I had a personal involvement with them. Because of the lack of service and the lack of treatment they were receiving in the group home, it was found that they were better off back with their family members, and that is what happened to them. But I am not going to give detailed confidential information. But if the hon. Member wants me to, I will get some basic information from the files and I will bring it to the House of Assembly to give you an idea.

The hon. Member should also know that he approached me at one particular time about a major concern he had for his constituents, the neighbours down around that area, because of the problems they were having in that particular vicinity.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: That is why I am asking the questions, because I do have concerns. I have concerns as well for the well-being of the people who are in that home. As you say, some of them were rehabilitated. In that sense, the home must have worked. Again, because of that interview, it was clear that the biggest problem at the Coach House was the change in

staff from Social Services for which there was no supervision, Mr. Speaker. In fact, supervision was non-existent. Now I want to ask the Minister if the problem at the Coach House and the eventual closing was caused, to a great extent, by his Department, and he, being the Minister, was the person responsible for the great hardship which has been caused to some of those individuals?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Mr. Speaker, I am totally disappointed, and I suppose shocked to a certain extent, in the hon. Member. Because he knows what he just said in his question is leading into an accusation that the Department of Social Services directly caused problems to the staff and the operation of the Coach House.

First of all, that is absolutely wrong. We are not the employers of the staff at the Coach House. There is a management board set up by the community, a volunteer board, who seek funding from the Department of Social Services to operate a facility such as that. At no time did we ever interfere with the operation of that particular thing to cause problems.

We did have a social worker, by the way, a full time social worker on staff down there. Just think about it, Mr. Speaker, seventeen employees to deal with a maximum of five boys, most of the time only four. But seventeen in a small setting like that down there, in that particular facility, that particular dwelling house, which is really what it was.

Now, the Opposition can stand there from daylight to dark,

twenty-four a day, fifty two weeks a year, three hundred and sixty five days, but there is no way I am going to change my mind. We did not cause any problems. We tried to work with the staff on a number of occasions. I met with them on several occasions. We tried to institute new ideas, and we kept repairing the facility, the damage that was being continuously done. We know the right decision was made in this particular instance.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. John's East Extern.

Mr. Parsons: Mr. Speaker, I did see the Minister because I had concerns at that particular time, and I was approached by people from the area. But again, going back to that interview, I did not realize it was a staff problem. I ask the Minister, over this past year, because of that staff problem, wasn't he the responsible person? You should have seen that the staff was adequate to handle what was going on at that particular home. Is it your responsibility? Whose responsibility was it or is it?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: First of all, there was seventeen staff members down there, seventeen in one small facility for five boys. They asked us for more. They wanted another \$178,000. You could have put all the staff you wanted in there, it was going to make no difference to the proper programming for those young individuals. You could put twice the staff down there and it would make no difference.

Was it the responsibility of the

Department of Social Services? Indirectly we are responsible for all matters when it comes to young children in the Province. There was a management board set up down there - the hon. Member knows that - and we deal directly with the board. The management board comes directly to the Department of Social Services, and we met on a number of occasions.

We could have met from here to eternity, it was not going to change what was not happening or what should have been happening to the young boys. The care will be given.

The problem with the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, is they are afraid, they are afraid something positive is going to happen for a change. That is the problem. But I can assure hon. Members that something positive is going to happen. The young boys and young girls will receive the proper care. We are already working with the staff. Yesterday I had a meeting with the staff of the Coach House concerning the future of those young individuals and they agreed to be a part of working out with the Director of Child Welfare and other officials of the Department of Social Services what is the best program. In fact, they agreed at that meeting, Mr. Speaker, that we made the right decision. The staff agreed yesterday at the meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Question Period has expired.

O O O

Ms Cowan: Mr. Speaker, we were speeding along so quickly - I have a response to a question.

Mr. Speaker: We will have to ask the House if we can revert back to Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given.

An Hon. Member: I have been waiting nearly three months.

Ms Cowan: He has not been waiting three months, by the way, Mr. Speaker, he has been waiting a week.

I wish to table the invoices that have been requested by the Opposition in regard to the adjustment program for fish plant workers.

Petitions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Pleasantville.

Mr. Noel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It gives me great pleasure today, Mr. Speaker, to introduce a petition on behalf of the Newfoundland and Labrador Patient's Rights Association. A number of members of that association are in the gallery, along with some members of the chiropractic profession, to witness the introduction of this petition, and to encourage Members and the Government to attend to their interests.

I introduce the petition in the knowledge that it is our Government's intention to bring in legislation to satisfy the requirements of these people and the profession. I think it is appropriate to have the petition before the House to indicate the degree of support amongst the public in general. The petition contains almost 3000 names from

all around the Province and it reads: To the Hon. House of Assembly of Newfoundland in Legislative Session Convened, the petition of the undersigned residents of Newfoundland and Labrador; that the Newfoundland and Labrador Chiropractic Association has been actively advocating adoption of legislation to regulate the practice of chiropractic. That Newfoundland is the only jurisdiction in North America in which such legislation does not exist. That legislation would set educational requirements and regulatory standards, and provide for proper use of appropriate diagnostic tools for the treatment of back problems, headaches, neuralgic arthritis, shoulder problems, and joint dysfunction throughout the body. Therefore, your petitioners urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to introduce legislation to govern chiropractic in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely and enthusiastically endorse the concerns of these people. I have been surprised in the course of my involvement with this petition, and prior to that, by the number of people you meet every day who have derived tremendous benefit from being treated by chiropractors. Just in this building, yesterday, I believe it was, when I was speaking to some people about this petition coming before the House, just in a group of people who work here in the building there were three out of seven or eight, I believe, who were together at the time, who either had experienced chiropractic services themselves or had close relatives or friends who had, and were very supportive of it.

It is important for us to bring in legislation to govern this profession, Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure that the profession is able to regulate itself in order to ensure that they have the diagnostic tools that will help them serve the profession better. They need access to X-rays, which they do not have now. Sometimes a patient will go to a chiropractors office and before the practitioner is able to treat the person he will have to have the person go and have an X-ray taken, and in order to do that the person has to go see another doctor. This may be a person who is in very acute need of being dealt with and instead of the chiropractor being able to do an X-ray on the spot and treat the person appropriately, that person might have to go and wait for a long time to see another doctor who will authorize an x-ray, he will then have to go to an x-ray facility and wait to have that x-ray taken and then they will have to wait for the report to go back to the doctor, and very often they could be in considerable discomfort during that period.

It is also necessary for the profession to have access to laboratory testing in order to ensure that their diagnosis is correct and that the treatment they recommend and carry out is the treatment appropriate to the illness with which they are dealing. There are an interesting number of statistics associated with the situation of the profession in our Province and as was said in the petition, we are the only jurisdiction in North America that does not have appropriate legislation, they have it in Sweden, in Great Britain and Peru and most of the Scandinavian countries, most of the advanced

countries in the world, and I think it is high time that we adopted it in this Province.

Chiropractors, as everybody knows, diagnose and treat back problems, headaches, neuralgia, arthritis, shoulder problems and joint dysfunction as I said in the petition. One out of every three Canadians visits a chiropractor. Eighty per cent of the population experience back pain at some point in their lives and thirty per cent suffer back pain at any given time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: By leave, by leave.

Mr. Noel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. I think the House would do well to listen to some of the additional facts that have been compiled. There are 3,000 members, active members of the Chiropractic Patient's Rights Association in this Province, and thirteen practicing chiropractors, eleven of whom are members of the Newfoundland and Labrador Chiropractic Association. Legislation would set educational requirements and regulatory examinations for chiropractors who wish to practice in the Province.

Chiropractors see approximately ninety to 100,000 patient office visits yearly in this Province and one of, I think, the most convincing points to be made in the favour of the legislation required is the cost effectiveness it will have for medical services in our Province. The majority of chiropractic practice is directed towards back pain, thirty per cent of workers' compensation claims are for back

pain. Due to excessive cost of chronic cases, these generate sixty per cent of all Workers' Compensation Commission costs. The Workers' Compensation Commission studies suggest a forty-five to fifty per cent saving in the cost of treating back pain by using chiropractors within the system.

Government enquiries in Sweden and Australia - and I will just be another minute - have demonstrated that the treatment by chiropractors is an extremely cheap method of health care, it does not spiral costs through ancillary and specialist services, and on average a dollar spent on chiropractic services causes no further costs. Mr. Speaker, I believe the case for this legislation is convincing and I trust this hon. House will agree. Thank you very much, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I take pride and I am pleased this morning to rise in the House to support the petition so ably presented by the hon. Member for Pleasantville. I think he has covered the chiropractic issue very well and I guess the best thing I can say about this particular petition and the request from chiropractors and patients of chiropractic in the Province is that I guess if you have experienced it yourself, then you can best speak about it. I visit a chiropractor regularly. I went to all other sources of finding relief for back pain and severe muscle spasms, if I go regularly, which they call me to do, then I am okay. I didn't find anything else that worked that well for me, so I guess based upon

that you can only speak as you find and I am very supportive of -

An Hon. Member: Does this come from your soccer days?

Mr. Matthews: It could be from my soccer days, yes, it could very well be, I don't know. I was a pretty gentle player myself, it was the other players who played against me that roughed me up a bit and maybe that is why I am suffering today, but I just want to say, very seriously, Mr. Speaker, that I would just like to urge the Government to get on with bringing forward the appropriate legislation. I understand that the Bill has not yet been brought to the Legislative Review Committee and I don't know if we will get a chance to get it forward and dealt with before the House recesses for the summer, but I would certainly urge Government -

An Hon. Member: We will be sitting all summer.

Mr. Matthews: I would hope we are going to stay open all summer, but watching the tactics of the Government House Leader and the night sittings and so on, we would think he wants to get out somewhere around the end of May, which he is not; we are not going to allow him to do that. But, whether or not we get this piece of legislation to the legislature and passed before we recess for the summer, or I would urge the Government to at least bring forward this legislation to be dealt with this fall, so that we don't have to wait any longer.

I want to go on record, Mr. Speaker, in recognizing the group in the galleries this morning, and to go on record personally, in support of bringing forth

legislation and to, as well, express the support of the Official Opposition in support of legislation on behalf of chiropractors.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Health.

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague from Pleasantville for the outstanding job he has done in presenting this petition to the House today. I also want to say that on numerous occasions, that Member, as well as others of my colleagues, have from time to time spoken to me favourably about bringing in legislation to control the profession of chiropractic in this Province, Mr. Speaker. It has been quite a concern.

Now, I have good news for the people of the Province, for chiropractors and patients of chiropractors. The legislation is, indeed, on the way.

Now, there has been some impatience on the part of people, and I can understand that, because it seems we have been slow in formulating this legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we had to start from scratch, as a Government, when we came in, and try to straighten out some of the mess which was left to us, in the health care of this Province. And we have been busy in the last twelve months opening hospital beds, Mr. Speaker, we have been busy hiring additional nurses; we have been busy reorganizing the health care system; we have been busy formulating legislation to control the profession of chiropractic in this Province.

Now, the Government have made a decision on the general guidelines we are going to follow with our legislation. We now know where we intend to go, what we are going to do about the X-rays, as the Member for Pleasantville talked about. We have put in place a broad parameter. The legislation is being written, the 'i's' are being dotted and the 't's' are being crossed, even at this very moment, and I would certainly hope that, in the course of time, legislation will come forward, first before the Legislative Committee and then, before the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should say that the legislation sometimes is being referred to in the media as for chiropractors. Now, technically speaking, that is not accurate. The legislation which controls medical doctors, physiotherapists and other professions in the Province, the legislation is for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. It is so that any person who visits a chiropractor can be assured that he is visiting a professional, a person who is qualified to carry out his profession. So, strictly speaking, it is not for chiropractors, other than that chiropractors are members of the general public.

So, Mr. Speaker, the legislation is on the way. I am pleased that the Opposition have finally decided to support this legislation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Decker: When that particular group of people were in Government, Mr. Speaker, they had a markedly different opinion about chiropractic in this Province. I sat in this House on the other

side when the position, as a Government, was expounded by John Carter.

An Hon. Member: Oh, no! That is not true.

Mr. Decker: He said it. He was never once contradicted, Mr. Speaker. His position was the position of the Government and, consequently, they never acted.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I remind hon. Members that in the presentation of a petition, hon. Members are not to engage in debate. They are to restrict themselves to the material allegations of the petition in terms of who it is representing, and in terms of the number. I would ask the Minister, please, to restrict himself to the proper regulations.

The hon. the Minister of Health.

Mr. Decker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When you see people who have changed their tune, it is difficult for me to maintain my cool and I have to draw that to the attention of the people. And maybe I did get carried away in the heat of debate with the rhetoric, but I could not miss the opportunity of reminding hon. Members of where once they stood. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is indeed on the way and now that the opposition have changed their position, they will no doubt assist us as we bring that legislation through the Legislature Review Committee and ultimately before this House and I would like to have that through before this session. If the House goes on into July, I have no doubt that we will get it into this

session. If the House does not sit until July, it will probably be well into the fall sitting of the house before we get it done.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Warren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition from the residents of Postville. Again, it concerns health care. And their concern, Mr. Speaker, is about the health care that is administered to those people by the Grenfell regional health services. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting just listening to the Minister of Health, who said that his Government is opening hospital beds around the Province. It was only yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I returned from Ottawa where I met with Federal officials. I have been advised, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has put on hold the two nursing clinics in Davis Inlet and Hopedale. Two nursing clinics that are in the Coastal Labrador Agreement and which were planned for construction to begin this year. This Government has decided now to put those two nursing clinics on hold.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a sad day for the people of Davis Inlet and a sad day for the people in Hopedale to realize once again this Government that calls for a real change, is not going to improve health conditions for the people in my District in particular. And, Mr. Speaker, the people in Postville are saying to their Government, to get on and improve health care, because not only the people on the Labrador coast, but the people throughout Newfoundland and Labrador needs the best health care possible. If

this Government does not continue to bring about improvements in health care then I think, Mr. Speaker, they are doing injustice to the people who deserve it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The Chair does not want to be too restrictive in terms of presentation of petitions, but the Chair has a duty to ensure that the rules and regulations in this House are followed. All hon. Members know that in presenting a petition they should immediately proceed to the prayer of the petition, and from there on follow on with whatever information will support the prayer and get into the numbers on the petition and so on. So, I ask the hon. Member if he would, for the benefit of the Chair, please proceed with the prayer of the petition.

Mr. Warren:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition is that we are concerned with the health care that is presently available. Concerns have been expressed that patients are not receiving the proper health care, wherefore we support an inquiry into health care in Labrador. Mr. Speaker, this is basically what I am saying. Here the people are asking for an enquiry into the health care in Labrador, and at the same time this Government, instead of trying to improve health care - we have two nursing clinics presently that are practically unfit for patients to be even seen in.

And, Mr. Speaker, this Government now knows there has been an agreement signed by the Federal Government and the Provincial Government on a Coastal Labrador

Agreement and now the money has been identified for those two nursing clinics. All of a sudden I am left to believe that this Government now for this year is again delaying the construction of those two clinics. It is a sad day indeed, Mr. Speaker. It is a sad day, Mr. Speaker, that this Government will not proceed with the new hospital in Happy Valley, Goose bay, a sad day indeed, Mr. Speaker. I have said in this House before, it was this Government's intention that if NATO went ahead in Goose Bay, the hospital would go ahead. But, Mr. Speaker, there is more people in Labrador than people with NATO. There are other human beings living in Labrador who need health care.

Mr. Speaker, if we have to wait for international countries to give financial assistance in order to build a hospital for our own people in the Province, then there is something drastically wrong with this Government. I refer this petition, Mr. Speaker, to the Department of Health, and would hope that the Minister and the Government would take immediate action to assure that health care is improved on the Labrador coast, and secondly, make sure that construction starts as soon as possible on the two clinics at Hopedale and Davis Inlet.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, very much.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of my colleague's petition from the community of Hopedale. I think some forty people signed this petition from Postville. Mr. Speaker, I want to

congratulate the Member for Torngat Mountains in so ably presenting this petition on behalf of his constituents, who do have a very genuine concern about the health care in their communities.

I visited Hopedale several times, as Minister of Northern Development, and I found the people in Postville to be a very conscientious, hard working group of Newfoundlanders who are not looking for a free ride, Mr. Speaker, they have said to me many times that all they expect from Government are services that would normally be expected by any resident of any part of Canada. They were not at the time looking for highways to be built in and out of Postville. They are very practical people. But they do expect a reasonable mail service; they do expect a reasonable coastal and air transportation service; and they do expect Government to provide them with a reasonable health care system, so that the health of the people in the community, the men and women and children of that community will be looked after. And, Mr. Speaker, they are afraid that the Government, particularly this Government, with its cutbacks in all programs under their control, are going to cutback on this.

Now this is one item that the Provincial Government cannot blame on the Federal Government because health care in this Province is the responsibility of the Provincial Government. And when my colleague came back from Ottawa last week and told me that the Provincial Government in this Province has put on hold the clinics for Davis Inlet and Hopedale, two other communities which I visited several times while Minister of Northern

Development, I was shocked, Mr. Speaker, because I understand the Budget that was just passed in this House of Assembly with a new tax, 1.5 per cent of all payrolls in this Province over \$300,000, this new tax was suppose to be dedicated to education and health care. Yet we find, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has put on hold a very necessary health clinic in Davis Inlet and a very necessary health clinic in Hopedale.

Why pass a new tax if you are going to cut back on health care and we know that there have been cutbacks in education, especially teachers in hospitals which provide a very essential service for the sick children of this Province, Mr. Speaker, so we see that the Government of this Province is cutting back.

We also see that for the health care of the people of Postville there is a definite need for a new hospital in the Goose Bay area, in the Lake Melville area, to service the whole coastal Labrador and central Labrador areas. Mr. Speaker, I understand that part of the problem of building this hospital or financing the hospital was that Government was waiting to see if NATO was going to have a NATO training centre in Goose Bay, and they were waiting to do the planning. Now that the Government knows there will not be a NATO training centre in Goose Bay, Mr. Speaker, they should get on with their planning immediately and get the new hospital built in the Lake Melville area, so that the present facilities that are there can be upgraded to the benefit of the people, not only in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area, but to the people who are flown in by helicopter or air ambulance from

the coastal communities, from Nain to Hopedale.

Mr. Speaker, the health care of Labrador is cost-shared; the Federal Government provides financing through native people's agreements to build such facilities. I am surprised to see the Provincial Government, who suggests they are trying to provide better health care - they made an effort to improve health care by hiring extra nurses, I will give them credit for that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Baker: Motion 1, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Motion 1, adjourned debate on the Budget.

The hon. the Member for Menihek.

Mr. A. Snow: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Last night when I finished up, or started discussions on the -

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if, before the hon. Member gets into the burden of his speech, he will allow me to interrupt to welcome students, because very often they leave and we do not get an opportunity to welcome them.

On behalf of all hon. Members, I would like to extend a warm and cordial welcome to fifty-five grade X students from Mobile High School, on the Southern Shore. They are accompanied by their teachers, Florence Dunaway and Jim Lynch. We extend you a warm welcome.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. A. Snow: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure, when you made reference to the burden of my speech, whether it was your burden because of my speech or -

Mr. Flight: The burden is over here.

Mr. A. Snow: The burden is over there? I realize the burden you people on that side of the House put upon the people of this Province through your Budget has been incurred by many people in this Province, especially the burden which has been borne by the residents of western Labrador, in the District of Menihek.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible) seventeen years of Toryism.

Mr. A. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to welcome the students from Bay Roberts, I believe it is, and other parts of the Province, and Mobile. I hope you witness democracy in action and can go back to your classrooms and debate it yourselves and see the merits of this great system we live in.

Mr. Speaker, this Budget that was brought down by this particular Administration and hailed as a great Liberal Budget -

Mr. Efford: And it was.

Mr. A. Snow: Maybe. You can hear people interjecting now and suggesting, 'and it was.' Mr. Speaker, to some Districts it may indeed have been liberal. Of course, one would have to define liberal. Ordinarily, a Liberal in the Canadian sense could be a little different than a Liberal in another sphere or another influence.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. A. Snow: Yes, I will attempt to explain it. A small 'l' liberal in the United States probably would not be as acceptable to the populace of the United States as a small 'l' liberal in Canada.

An Hon. Member: There are no small 'l' liberals over here.

Mr. A. Snow: No, you are very right, Sir. You are very, very correct. There are no small 'l' liberals on that side of the House. They started out as small 'l' liberals during the election, but when they brought down their Budget on March 15, there was not a small 'l' liberal on that side of the House then, they were small 'c' conservatives.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Ms. Verge: Regressive conservatives.

Mr. A. Snow: Regressive conservatives, not progressive conservatives.

Mr. Hogan: How many Members (Inaudible)?

Mr. A. Snow: Yes. The hon. Member for Placentia -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The Chair has witnessed over the past couple of days what it considers to be extraneous interruptions, interruptions which do nothing to promote the level of debate, interruptions which, indeed, trivialize the debate. This is not permitted in the rules of the House. I have told hon. Members before, if there is a question which they would want to

ask the Member who is speaking there is a correct procedure for it, by the hon. Member courteously and politely asking the hon. Member if he or she would permit a question. The hon. Member speaking has the right not to permit a question. And if he does not permit a question, no one else is permitted to interrupt. I would ask hon. Members to please cooperate, and please refrain from interruptions which tend to trivialize the debate.

The hon. the Member for Menihek.

Mr. A. Snow: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The hon. the Member for Placentia made reference to my being one of the founding Members of the local New Democratic Association in the District of Labrador West. Yes, indeed, I was one of the founding Members of the local Association, and I am quite proud of it. I still have my card as a matter of fact. I guess we all become -

I guess if you were to refer to me as a Conservative, quite often, in this country, my philosophy would be a bit left of the centre. I could be called a red Tory. I guess a lot of that is because of the environment I was raised in, here on the Island portion of the Province. Indeed, going to live in Labrador after that I became a New Democrat and now a Tory. And I do not apologize for that. I think I am a product of where I was raised and where I lived in Labrador. Because we do have a social conscience, and I learned that in Labrador.

We, in west Labrador, probably produce more in the wealth of this Province, more economic accrual to this Province, more wealth to this Province than any other single

District in this whole Province. We probably generate more revenue into this Province than other District. And I have seen over the years that while we have a tremendous quality of life in western Labrador, the Provincial Government and, indeed, the Federal Government, have not really participated in improving and maintaining the quality of life we have had and are attempting to still maintain and improve in the future. I do not suggest that the quality of life necessarily decreased in value with the election of this Liberal Administration, indeed, previous administrations also did not do a heck of a lot to improve the quality of life in western Labrador. Most of the reason for the high quality of life in western Labrador is because of what the residents and the companies put into western Labrador. That has made that quality of life what it is today.

It is unfortunate that I have seen this feeling of alienation developing within Labrador. Over the numbers of years I have seen us go through changes politically in a sense of expression of our frustration, in how we, knowing that we generate such wealth for this Province and country, do not see governments coming in to help and improve the quality of life in western Labrador.

I have seen that frustration develop more and more. I saw it develop into a political movement in the early 1970s, a political movement that elected to this House a Member representing the New Labrador Party, a party that was expressing the frustrations of Labradorians because of the inattention from the Government of the day, the Government located in

St. John's, not just the inattention to the problems of western Labrador, but the inattention to the problems of coastal Labrador and central Labrador. And I am sure other hon. Members sitting here who represent Districts in Labrador, the District of Torngat and the Districts of Eagle River and Naskaupi, can also articulate the feelings of their residents when they say there is, again, a high degree of alienation appearing in Labrador, in the people's feelings. They feel they are being cut off.

I just want to explain to this House why the people in Western Labrador feel especially alienated from the rest of this Province because of this particular Budget. One of the reasons the people in western Labrador are feeling alienated from the Island portion of the Province is because, as I have said earlier, they produce such wealth for this Province, yet they see a Government service which was delivered for years being removed. They saw this Government bring down a Budget on March 15 which increased the amount of revenue that is going to be taken out of the District of Menihek, to the tune of about \$3 million. About \$3 million annually in payroll tax is going to be removed from the District of Menihek. This is wealth the people of Menihek are producing, and they are seeing this directly removed from Menihek with no improvement of service.

Provincial Government delivery of service in Menihek has been decreased.

Mr. Baker: The money came from Montreal.

Mr. A. Snow: The hon. the Member for Gander suggests the money comes from Montreal. The money does not come from Montreal. That wealth is generated by the miners in Western Labrador. It is generated by the miners in Western Labrador, by the people who work, not the parasites the Premier talked about. These are some of the producers, the miners of this Province, who were attacked by this Government with the payroll tax. Then we saw the Government remove a service to the people, the Labrador Air Passenger Subsidy Program. In order for a person in western Labrador to travel to the Island portion of the Province, an adult, it will cost them \$724.00. We had somebody stand in this House and suggest the people in Labrador, yes, they do have difficulty in travel, but it is not much different than somebody in St. Anthony. This upset a lot of people in Labrador. There is a distinct difference in travelling from St. Anthony to St. John's than from western Labrador, Wabush or Labrador City, to St. John's, from Nain to St. John's - a distinct difference than travelling from St. Anthony. There is a \$1,000 difference for somebody who has to come out and visit an ailing mother or father, or for students who would like to go home to visit their parents and come back and finish their education in St. John's, because we do not have adequate post-secondary education facilities in Labrador. There is a distinct difference.

As a matter of fact, the difference for a family of four to travel now to St. John's rather than if they had travelled prior to the removal of the subsidy, is they have to pay an additional \$450.00 - \$450.00 they have to

pay, because of the removal of this subsidy. Now that is not much to a person who is sitting in the Cabinet and is given a free car by the taxpayers of Labrador and Newfoundland, but \$450.00 is a lot of money to a person who resides in Labrador and works in the mines, or works in the service industry. It is a lot of money, that extra \$450.00 they have to pay. They realize their electoral district produces more wealth for this Province than any other electoral district in this Province, and then they see the attack this Administration placed upon them. No other district has been attacked and had a benefit removed from it as did Menihek. No other single district has been attacked by this Administration in the removing of services as Menihek has, a district which produces such great economic wealth.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if times were different, and if the 48 per cent of the people elected in this Province had been sitting on that side of the House today and bringing down a Budget, it would have been a lot different for the people of Menihek. Indeed, it would have been a lot different for people travelling from other parts of Labrador, because the subsidy was available to all residents of Labrador who would travel to the Island portion of the Province.

We can see the feeling of alienation developing now in Labrador which started to occur in the late sixties and early seventies, and that is wrong. Because we are one Province. While we might be geographically divided, we are one single Province, one people, made up of different peoples from different

racess and religions, but, indeed, one Province.

When you hear some of the reasons which have been brought up in this House as to why the subsidy had to be discontinued, you can see why the people of Labrador are so frustrated, because the reasoning which has been raised holds no water.

As an example, one of the reasons raised in this House as to why the subsidy should not be continued was the fact that the Provincial Government employees are going to be given a travel allowance to travel to the Island portion of the Province. The people in Labrador who work for the Provincial Government are now, it was suggested, going to be paid a travel allowance to travel to the Island portion of the Province, so the people of all of Labrador have to pay for it.

Because what they are suggesting is that because they give the employees a bonus or a raise, in the minds of the employee in Labrador, and indeed the resident of Labrador, they give them an equalizer.

The major employers who employ people in Labrador, the major mining companies, the Federal Government, their employees have had that benefit for years. Now we see that finally the Provincial Government recognizes that their employees in Labrador should be getting a benefit, but, they suggest, we will give you the benefit, but the people of Labrador have to pay it. Now, that is completely unfair.

Here we are in Labrador, underserved by delivery of Government services, and now they

expect, because they pay equally to their employees in Labrador, that only the people of Labrador have to pay that raise. And that is completely unfair.

They take a \$400,000 vote of money that was in travel subsidy, give it to the employees as a benefit, and then suggest that only the people of Labrador pay it. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker, that is fundamentally wrong; it is unfair to treat people in a District like Labrador so unfairly.

There was also the suggestion that one of the reasons why the subsidy was cut out, or removed, was the fact that people who did get a trip from their employers, such as the Federal Government, or the mining company, would apply for a subsidy, get the money from the Provincial Government and then, indeed, be making a profit.

I will not stand here in my place and suggest that somebody may not have abused this particular program but I will say this: It is wrong to discontinue the program because there was minor abuse of it. What you do is cut out the abuse. I would suggest to you that people throughout this country have been abusing the privileges of a lot of our programs which are available, such as UI. But we did not cut out UI. It would not be tolerated. What we do is cut out the abuse on a particular program at any level of Government; we do not cut out the program. Maybe that is what should have been done. Undoubtedly, that is what should have been done.

Mr. Speaker, another thing brought down in this Budget which I thought very unfair was that there was no increase in the amount of

money it was suggested would be spent for a crisis shelter in western Labrador, a crisis shelter which has a history in western Labrador since 1982, operated strictly by volunteer efforts from the local community, by the people, by the local town councils, by the unions and by the mining companies. In 1985, they received funding. After three years of complete local support, the previous Administration saw fit to participate through the Department of Social Services. Today, we are seeing, because of a lack of funds being dedicated by this particular Administration, that crisis shelter closed.

There is a need in western Labrador for a crisis shelter. Otherwise, the people of Western Labrador never would have started it in 1982. It is unfortunate that this Administration sees fit to cast away their Liberal promises and bring down this conservative Budget and behave, as I have never seen any Government behave in this particular Province, so conservatively. It is unfair to the people of western Labrador, it is unfair to the people of this Province. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Before I recognize the hon. Member for Ferryland I would like to, on behalf of hon. Members, welcome to the gallery this morning, Jerry Dinn, the former Member for Pleasantville and a former Cabinet Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

Mr. Power: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. Before I begin my comments, I would like to welcome all my young constituents here from Mobile Central High School, the school at which I taught for five years. I know most of the young ladies and gentlemen. It is a pleasure to see them here, and I hope they learn something about the democratic process.

In the few comments I have to make about the Budget Speech I want to, Mr. Speaker, compare what is in the Budget document here and what is in this document, this Liberal manifesto which came out during the election campaign in 1989. This document was, in many ways, fraudulent; in many ways it promised so many things it could not and has not delivered, and will not deliver. This Budget document we have, as well does a wonderful job of deceiving the vast majority of Newfoundland's people. But the deception only lasted for a few weeks. The blush came off the Budget pretty fast when we found out what really was in it.

Mr. Speaker, since last April there have not been any real changes in this Province. That is the fundamental flaw with this document, and with the fundamental deception that went on in the election campaign of 1989. When the election campaign was held, all we heard about was a real change, a change for the better, things were really going to change.

The other day, when the Member for Stephenville was speaking, he talked about how unreal things are and he used the word unreal many, many times, and the word 'unreal' is much more symptomatic of what has happened in this Province in the last twelve months. What has this Government done? What does

this Budget do for the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador? How many people in Newfoundland are better off in the fishery today than they were twelve months ago?

Look at what has happened down in the District of Ferryland, where we had problems in the plants in Fermuse and in Ferryland, and in St. Mary's - The Capes with the other two plants owned by Universal Fisheries. Not one single cent of assistance has been offered by this Government. When they asked for a loan guarantee, it was refused. When they asked for any kind of extensions of the loans which were outstanding, they were refused. When new operators were interested in going in and putting in new proposals, they were told there was no money for the Universal group of companies; you can forget it. We are simply not supporting the fishery. We already have too many fish plants; we have too many people depending on the fishery; and the people are going to have to diversify and find jobs somewhere else.

Now, what I want to know from this Government: In this Budget process, where you are spending \$3 billion, I know the District of Ferryland has been maligned by the Liberal party and the Liberal Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. I know you have not helped the fishery. Where our district has traditionally over the last ten years been able to get in excess of \$2 million for water and sewer, for paving, for special projects, this year we got \$20,000 - \$20,000. There is not one single square foot of pavement going to be laid in Ferryland District this year, there is not one single community getting water and sewer money, and this is supposed to be a Government which

relies on the wonderful cliché you use, fairness and balance?

Go down to the community of Ferryland and look at the health problems they have with their water and sewer, yet you see not one single cent, and not one single cent for the community of the Goulds, one of the fastest growing communities in eastern Canada, not a single cent for water and sewer. So when you talk about fairness and balance, this Budget document certainly doesn't bring fairness and balance to the District of Ferryland.

And when you talk about some of the industries in this Province, it really makes you wonder how this document could have been purported to be fairness and balance for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to change in this Province, the real change, I want to give you one glowing example: The Minister of Energy is here now and I would like him, maybe somewhere later on in the budgetary process, to comment on the second page of the Liberal document on policy, the manifesto for the Liberal Government in the 1989 election campaign. It is page two. The highlight: One of the first things this Liberal Government was going to do as soon as they got into power, when the Conservatives were out, the Liberal Government, as per page two of their manifesto - it is called Churchill Falls and Labrador Hydro Power - says, "There are two major problems in relation to the development and use of hydro power in Labrador. One is its inability to deliver the power to its ultimate market in a manner that would provide Newfoundland with the benefits of

the development and sale of the power." To those who may not understand, it simply means transfer of power across provincial boundaries. In the Constitution of Canada, we are supposed to have interprovincial trade without any barriers. In western Canada, you can put a pipeline carrying liquid gas from Alberta across Manitoba, Saskatchewan and anyplace else you want, and you can do it because of the Constitution of Canada.

We have always been blocked in Newfoundland. We were blocked in 1968 or 1969 when we did the Upper Churchill first, when the old Liberal Government gave away the birthright of all the young people in this gallery and all the young people in this Province. But, at least, you realize you made a tremendous mistake back in the 1960s, when the present Premier was a member of the Cabinet. He is trying to rectify a mistake he made, so he puts it on the front page of his document.

The second part of it says, "Secondly, Newfoundland and Labrador has so far been unable to access the power that has been developed within the Province to meet the needs of our own people."

The second paragraph of this document is very interesting when you see what has happened in the last twelve months, the last six months in particular, with the Meech Lake Accord.

This is the statement of the Liberal manifesto: "Both of these problems could have been resolved if the Government of this Province had taken the right course of action in the first instance instead of seeking futile court confrontations with the Province

of Quebec."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to go back a little bit to the Churchill Falls Agreement and ask a question of the Minister of Mines and Energy that maybe he will answer, and maybe the Premier might sometime. How much progress have we made since this Liberal Government took power with reassessing or accessing some of the Upper Churchill power? How much money in revenues are we going to get in excess of what we were getting in April of 1989? What progress have we made with the Government of Canada to get our constitutional right to transmit power across the provinces? How has the Premier's quiet, somewhat cynical quiet, the irony of the Premier's version of diplomacy, the Premier's version of getting the rightful benefits for Newfoundland and Labrador, how has the Premier's system worked, the Premier's system of fighting Meech Lake, of demanding things which, at least in the short-term, are unreasonable and are not based on any factual interpretation of law in Canada as we know it, the Premier's demand that we have to have Senate reform; we have to have a duly elected Senate?

For some of those students, especially the younger ones from Mobile, in the gallery, who may not understand what an elected Senate means to Canada, Mr. Speaker, it means, basically, that in the U.S. they have worked out a very good system. They have a Constitution. They have had twenty-eight amendments to their Constitution over a period of time, and they try to balance out the power of people with the power of jurisdictions. It simply means that if you have a really large province in Canada, like Ontario

with its eight million people, I suppose, and Newfoundland with 500,000 or 600,000 people, then, obviously, Ontario is always going to have more to say in the parliamentary democratic process. Sometimes, when the numbers are imbalanced as much as they are in Canada, with Newfoundland being - PEI is much smaller; PEI only has 140,000 people, I believe, so in relation to Ontario, they are even worse off. But Rhode Island is a really small state of the American union. California and New York are tremendously large states. So, to try to balance out how a country is run, to make sure everyone is treated fairly, they, in the U.S., decided to have an elected Senate where each state had two senators. Ontario may have eighty-four Members of Parliament, Newfoundland has seven and PEI has four, so, obviously, in the Parliament of Canada voting patterns are going to favour Ontario, and the large Province of Quebec, as well. But a duly elected, equal and effective Senate, where every province has the same number of senators, balances the thing out. So Newfoundland would end up with five senators, Ontario would have five senators, or whatever number they came up with, and then it is supposed to be balanced. So, as you pass laws through the Parliament, the democratic process of Canada, you end up with an elected Senate which has some say and which balances out the constitutional unfairness of numbers and population and demographics. But this Government and this Premier, in his own way is destroying Canada. If he does not realize that - I know he is supposed to meet with the Prime Minister on Sunday. We have talked to him in this House, some of the Liberal caucus have talked

to him to change some of his ways on Meech Lake, but he is not going to do it. But he has put Canada -

Mr. W. Carter: (Inaudible).

Mr. Power: And the Minister of Fisheries can say I am wrong about where he has put Canada. But Canada is at the edge of an abyss that we are very likely going to fall over, and if we do fall over, if on June 24 Meech Lake has not been passed, there will be a rush of persons in Quebec who are going to really be happy that they have an excuse to leave Canada, and some who are going to say the hell with Canada anyway because it simply does not work for the French speaking people of Canada. I have argued that case here in the Meech Lake debate, some of my colleagues have on this side, and I know quietly on the other side some persons have lobbied the Premier to be a little bit less relenting about trying to solve all the constitutional process at one constitutional meeting.

As I mentioned earlier there are twenty eight amendments to the American constitution. Constitutions change over time. It changed in 1982 when it was repatriated from Britian. It will change again after 1989 and 1990, Meech Lake was simply one step in a long process of building a country. The Premier wants to make it a final step, the only step, the last step and that in the constitutional process will not work. So here we are in this Liberal manifesto saying that we are going to change a very unfair hydro agreement with Quebec. The other day when I was here, and I got some press last weekend, unfortunately the press covered not the important part, they covered what was news but they did

not cover the important part of what I said. And I said that Sprung was a disaster, was a waste of money. It was a folly that we got into for all kinds of strange reasons. It was a waste of \$22,000,000.00 of the taxpayers of Newfoundlands money. And as a Conservative party we have to take the blame for that. One of the reasons we are on this side of the House is because the public of Newfoundland gave us the blame and said listen you are not doing things the way we expect them to be done.

One of the reasons, the Liberal party was turfed out of office in 1971 was because of this Upper Churchill Agreement. That people realized that Joey Smallwood and his Cabinet, of which the Premier was part, the present Premier, made a tremendous mistake. But the real historical significance of the mistake is not in \$22,000,000.00 in one year, in one Administration and Sprung, its \$700,000,000.00 every year as long as the price of oil - \$400,000,000.00 every year that we have lost on the Upper Churchill Agreement. And all these persons in the gallery and every other young person in Newfoundland and Labrador, one of the things that they will bear to the day that they die, they will pay taxes every year that they work and every week that they get paid. They will pay taxes for services that they should not have to pay.

They will pay more money in income tax, they will pay more money in SSA tax, you have to pay to Newfoundland because we lost so much revenue. That guilt and that blame is on the Liberal party of Newfoundland and Labrador, the Liberal Government of the day. Some people say that you cannot

have perfect foresight. But not having a reopener clause in a fifty year contract, until the year 2019 or 2027?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, on a point of order.

Mr. Walsh: Not to interrupt the Member for Ferryland while he is in full flight, but I would not want the students in the gallery or anyone else who might be listening to be lead to believe that the only people in this Chamber who voted for the Upper Churchill was the Liberal Government of the day. It was a unanimous choice of this House to do that, including I understand the hon. John Crosbie, Senator Gerry Ottenheimer who was in the House at that time, and a number of other very prominent Tories.

If I am incorrect then I apologize to the Speaker, but a unanimous decision of this House was made as to who would and would not support that resolution, and they all did. Now if I am incorrect in that, by all means carry on. But it was a choice of this House, and if my memory is correct the hon. John Crosbie was the Minister responsible for that portfolio at that time. So lets make it very clear to the students that it was a unanimous decision of this House that that contract be entered into.

Mr. Power: Mr. Speaker to that rather frivolous point of order by the Member.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

The hon. Member for Ferryland,

Mr. Power: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. There is no point of order. The Members opposite have a chance to speak in this budget debate. In this Budget which they so proudly lauded the Minister of Finance on when he delivered it. This Budget which was supposed to be the best piece of goods Newfoundland had ever seen. You all have a chance including the Member who just rose on that silly point of order to speak in the Budget Debate. You have a chance to defend your Government and what you are doing.

Here is the other part of the silly point of order he brings up. The silliness of it is, its not what the Opposition did in 1968, and it is not what the Opposition does in 1990. It is what the Government does. The Government shows leadership, the Government shows the direction, the Government has to take the Province in a certain fundamental way to make sure we develop properly, so you cannot blame five Members of a Conservative Opposition in 1968 for taking part, and for signing an unanimous agreement in this House.

If that were true and if that logic prevailed, then why is not Meech Lake passed in Newfoundland, because the Liberal Opposition in Newfoundland voted for Meech Lake. Some of the Members that are presently on that side, who are now tearing this country apart went over there, and a Premier issued a directive that Meech Lake was not going to be passed, that all this thing is the elected Senate I was just talking about, the distinct society clause was unfair to Canada, the spending powers in provincial jurisdiction was wrong, and the Premier of this Province issued an edict to all the Members opposite, including

the ones who had sat over here in Opposition and voted for Meech Lake and spoke on Meech Lake.

Mr. Speaker, it would be very interesting to see the Members who are over there now, who actually voted for Meech Lake on this side, and see their two speeches. The speech they made when they were here supporting Meech Lake, and the speech they made when the present Premier laid down the law and said Meech Lake is not going to be supported. That would be a very interesting speech to have somebody compare.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Power: It does not matter. One is enough. If you are going to be right you should be right and stand on your principles, and not on the directions of one person. What happened here was the Liberal Party supported Meech Lake when it was voted on in this House until it was changed, changed by a Premier who has a misguided notion of constitutional process, who wants to solve all the problems to make up for all of his past sins in one fell swoop, and change the whole democratic process of Canada. It will not happen, by the way. Meech Lake may not happen and Canada will be changed, fundamentally changed forever, and if people think it cannot happen, for anybody who studies, and there are some history teachers over there, for anybody who studies history and thinks that countries cannot be broken up, look at what is happening in Eastern Europe.

Where is East Germany today, and where is East Germany going to be? Where is Latvia and those countries going to be? Parts of Russia are breaking apart. It is

going to be a different world, a different map. Some people think that that only happens in Eastern Europe and in Communist countries and that it cannot happen in Canada. Who says that we cannot have a separate country of Quebec? Unfortunately, a totally English country of Canada is not a good idea. It is not what many Members opposite think.

An Hon. Member: We agree.

Mr. Power: You agree that you do not want Quebec to leave Canada? But you are facilitating it in everything you do. It is just like these documents, you say one thing and you do something else. You said in your election campaign you were going to do something with Upper Churchill and Labrador power and what has really happened? Will the Minister of Energy tell this House and the people of Newfoundland, somewhere along the way, has Clyde Wells, is this Premier's process to diplomacy, any worse than the futile, his words, the futile court confrontations of the former Government when we went to court using a legal process to try and get Upper Churchill and get our reasonable rights for Newfoundland? So the futile court confrontations of the former Government, but what about the futile Meech Lake confrontations of today? What about the comment of the Minister of Finance, which I would not even repeat in front of the young people in the gallery. This comment by the Minister of Finance, one of the senior Ministers in this Government, that we are using Meech Lake, and his comments have gone all across the country.

The Liberal Party is probably more popular in Newfoundland because

the Minister of Finance made those comments. When he says we are using Meech Lake to get even with Quebec on Upper Churchill hydro power, that we are getting even, we are going to settle the score, we are going to get our fair share, and for once we are in a position of control, the Liberal Party in Newfoundland is more popular because of that.

An Hon. Member: The Minister retracted that statement.

Mr. Power: The Minister retracted it, but it was said, it was believed, and a lot of Newfoundlanders, unfortunately, many of them ill informed about the Meech Lake process, listening to the Premier's misguided approach to the thing, are saying they believe what the Minister of Finance said, that it is time for us to get even, and that is very, very unfortunate. What is happening in Quebec today and what is happening in Canada is a crisis. A lot of people do not realize what a crisis it really is, and I think a lot of Members opposite think that it is not going to happen. They think that countries will not break apart, it does not happen, and it will never happen in Canada. But, the reality is that it will happen in Canada, and it will be facilitated by this Premier, this Government, and Members of the caucus, who are saying on one hand we do not want to break Canada up but on the other hand they are making it very easy for Quebec to leave Canada.

And when Quebec leaves Canada, we will be stuck with an English dominated Canada, dominated primarily by Ontario, and I assure you that it will be just as difficult for Newfoundland to get its equal place in Canada with an

English only country, dominated by one tremendously large province with, I believe, just about fifty per cent of the population in Ontario, and if you think that that is going to be any easier for us to get a fair shake in Canada, then I say it is not very likely to happen.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Power: Why have we been second class citizens? Again the Premier is going back and trying to correct another Liberal mistake of 1949. It was the Liberal Government of Joey Smallwood of 23 years that got us into Canada with the rules that we entered Canada with.

Now if he made a pile of mistakes, which I think he did, such as giving away the rights to fisheries control in 1949 but keeping control of health and education, I think it would have been done a lot better. I think our standard of education in this Province would be a lot higher if education was a Federal responsibility. We would have more funds, we would have more balance across Canada, we would have a better argument for transfer payments and equalization.

I think this year in the Budget we get \$230 million from the Government of Canada for education and health transfers, mostly going to post secondary. But it is not nearly enough. Our standard of education is lower in Newfoundland than in any other part of Canada.

So, again if we made mistakes in 1949, they were mistakes made by the Liberal Government and now trying to be corrected. And the reality is - again I hope the Minister of Energy does tell us

somewhere over the next few days that we have made tremendous gains, that the Premier's approach to Quebec has really got us a better share of Upper Churchill revenues, got us access to take our power across the Province of Quebec. But I suspect that an awful lot of what the Premier is doing today is going to come back to haunt Newfoundland somewhere down the road.

The Hibernia negotiations that are pending, the only thing that I ever hear about Hibernia is that it is all signed, sealed and delivered with the exception of Meech Lake. Is Meech Lake going to jeopardize Hibernia? If Hibernia is jeopardized this Province has the one shiny economic light that is shining since this party took over the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, will be put out. It is the only light that you have, they put out all the rest of the lights, there are no economic lights in the fishery anymore, forestry is certainly not great. Tourism, you are only building on the process that we have established, we did establish in the last few years of our Government of having a very active, interesting, aggressive tourism marketing scheme to get some people to come visit our Province and to stay here for a longer period of time. And that has worked. It is one of the few things that has worked.

But the economic lights of this Province, one is Hibernia, and all I hear is Meech Lake, and all the Members opposite hear it, is Meech Lake going to jeopardize Hibernia. We can only hope and pray that it does not do it, but I mean the reality is that the Government of Canada has committed

\$2.6 billion to the Hibernia project. That is a lot of money, and who is to say that the Government of Canada may not change its mind and say that is just too much money for us to have in one project at this stage in our history when everything is in turmoil and chaos. And that would be blackmail possibly, but it also might be economic sensibilities on behalf of the Minister of Finance of Canada to say to commit the Government of Canada to \$2.6 billion when there have just been riots in Quebec, when there has just been tremendous pressure to leave Canada that maybe it is not the sensible thing to do.

Now, hopefully it will never happen. I am a very strong believer that that will not happen, that the deal which should be on its economic merits, that it is done, the companies are interested, the Government of Canada has made a commitment, and the Government of Newfoundland has made certain concessions and certain commitments as well, and it should work.

But, Mr. Speaker, those are the economic lights. What I see here, this real change, this Liberal document that I have here, and I could read it but it gets almost - it is so silly, it is ironic and cynical, the things that you said on school tax, on health care, on social services, on the resource industries. You said so much in your document, so much to get elected and so much of it has not happened.

The Minister of Finance has done his second Budget. There is nothing in that second Budget which is going to make a substantial change to Newfoundland and Labrador. When I look at the

jobs in this Province - I heard the President of Treasury Board saying the other day that we had 6000 full time jobs more in this January than we had last year. Mr. Speaker, who does he think he is fooling? Does anybody in this Province, on either side of this House, in the galleries or anyplace else, really believe that Newfoundland's unemployment rate has substantially reduced since the Liberal party took power in Newfoundland?

The only substantial employment that is there is for the Economic Recovery Team, and they have hired twenty or thirty people and spent a couple of million dollars. But in real terms, are there more people working in the fishery today or less? The answer is there are less. Are there more people working in forestry today or less? There are less. Are there more people working in any of the industries that we have with the exception probably of tourism? The answer is less. That is what you have done for Newfoundland, and know it has happened, and it is very unfortunate, there are less people in fishery, less people in forestry.

An Hon. Member: Your point is though, that the Federal Government are the ones who gave away every bloody fish that we had out there, and will continue to do it. Why don't you stand there and tell the truth, not only to the people of Newfoundland but to the students also.

Mr. Power: There is all that has happened with this Administration.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Power: You have three

approaches to economic development. One is the House Economic Recovery Team, which may or may not prove beneficial. The other is, you blame all past mistakes on this side of the House when we were the Government, and we should have rectified all our problems, and your third and most common scenario of all your economic development schemes is to blame Ottawa.

This Government has not put one cent yet into the fishery crisis, except for the \$14 million you promised to the two big fishing companies. Two fishing companies which are primarily owned by interests outside Newfoundland. Two large fishing companies which are responsible in many ways for the overfishing, who benefited from the overfishing, but when it comes to the inshore fishery - Mr. Speaker, if you just give me a second, I will find in this book about inshore fishery support. There is a page here -

An Hon. Member: What about Sprung?

Mr. Power: Sprung was a mistake.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Power: Thank God you are not, and you should not.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Power: But you are putting it in National Sea and FPI. You are putting it into large companies when small companies cannot get help. All I am saying is - okay, let us help National Sea and FPI - but what is the Governments approach to the fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador. It is ad hoc, it is simplistic, it is reactionary. You react to a crisis in Twillingate, by giving

someone, which I think, is a bit of a sweetheart deal, I'm glad you did it because the plant in Twillingate should stay open. But you should also make the same rules for everyone else.

The Minister was here yesterday, and he was saying; I am a very popular Minister in Twillingate, and a Tory won't be seen down there for a hundred years. Well, maybe that is true, but if the Minister is not careful, there is going to be certain parts of Newfoundland where there is not going to be a Liberal seen for a hundred years as well.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Fisheries on a point of order.

Mr. Carter: The hon. Member should not be allowed to mislead the House. I am not saying he has deliberately been misleading, but first of all, he talked about the Province putting \$14 million into the hands of National Sea and FPI. That is not correct. He knows, as the House knows, that has gone into the hands of the workers. Not one cent of that money will end up in the coffers of the two large companies. In fact, in the case of FPI, it is going to cost them about \$3 million. That is money that is going into the hands of the workers.

Now with respect to a statement which he attributes to me yesterday in the House, he did not give it in the right context. I said to the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I think the record should show what is correct. I have a right to a

point of order. When I said that I might be popular - I did say, Mr. Speaker, that the Member's of the Opposition would not be very popular in Twillingate, because obviously they opposed the opening of the fish plant, but I said I would probably be popular in Branch, where I arranged to have a fish plant reopened up there. That is the context in which I said it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Member for Ferryland.

Mr. Power: Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order, and I continue. That was the analogy he used, that he is popular in Branch because he opened a plant, and he is popular in Twillingate because he opened a plant. He and his party, are very unpopular, very unpopular, in Ferryland, Fermuse, and a couple of plants in St. Mary's Bay that did not get any help from this Government, have not got any help and have been refused on many occasions.

All I am saying is, yesterday, his comments about the fishery, I ask what is in this document to make the fishery better? I do not see anything in this \$3 billion, where there is support for the inshore fishery. I do not see any support for individual plants. I do not see any loan guarantee program to help companies through difficult times that may not be of their own doing. There are things that happen in the fish business, as within any export business; currency changes, markets, exports, all kinds of things can change that does not necessarily

mean the management of the company is bad.

And all I am saying is, in that document there is not a tremendous support for the inshore fishery in Newfoundland. What ad hoc policy the Minister of Fisheries is implementing is done on a very ad hoc, reactionary basis. He waits for something to happen, and then he tries to do something about it. The only other -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Power: Well you could not help Fermeuse because they were very poorly managed and they lost money. But when new operators go to Fermeuse - such as a former Liberal Member of this House, who is up in Fermeuse today trying to get a plant going - is that Member, that ex-Member, that member of the business community now, member of the fishing community - if that person comes here and says we need some help, we need some assistance to make Fermeuse work, we need a loan guarantee, we need some lease payments, is he going to be treated exactly the same because he happens to be in Fermeuse as Twillingate was treated? And that is what I see. I do not see that happening. I see the Minister very arbitrarily deciding which places are going to be helped and which places are not. And I am also very alarmed and very concerned at the downsizing, the undersizing, and there are too many people in the fishery business. You are putting the horse behind the cart in this case. Because what you are saying is we should diversify, we should have more jobs, but you have to get out of the fishery. The reality is to keep them in the fishery, keep the fishery at least

at a subsistence level for many individuals and, then, when you have the economy diversified, there are lots of places for them to go. Right now there is nowhere to go. So you are talking about diversification, you are talking about getting out of the fishery, and it does not really work.

An Hon. Member: Who owns the Fermeuse plant? Who (inaudible).

Mr. Power: The Canadian Saltfish Corporation.

An Hon. Member: The Canadian Saltfish Corporation.

Mr. Power: Listen, are you telling me that poor old Mr. Trainor down in Fermeuse, who has worked in Fermeuse for thirty years and has fifteen years to work, really cares and really is going to forgive the Provincial Government for not coming to the assistance of he and his family, his young children who may have to work there? These are the realities. If the Federal Government says we are not doing anything for Fermeuse, there is still provincial responsibility on the President of Treasury Board, the Premier and the Ministers concerned. You have a provincial responsibility. And somewhere along the way, in the last fourteen months, it has not sunk in with Members opposite, especially the Ministers, that Newfoundlanders still require the Newfoundland Government to protect them in many instances. When Governments outside will not do it, you are going to have to go the extra mile. And you are not willing to do it; you have said in many ways you are not willing to do it.

Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of

minutes I have I just want to say again that the document that was purported to be the election manifesto of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador, their outlook, their directional changes to make this real change they talked about, has not happened. In the second Budget document of this Government, there is really nothing in it. All that has happened is they have changed the faces, they have become administrators of departments. They do not have any real ideas to change the economy of Newfoundland. Show me a new program this Government has brought in in fourteen months, a brand new program!

In employment what did you do? You rehashed a program we had there. We had it twenty weeks or fifty weeks, and you made it twenty, twenty, and twenty weeks. You do it that way so you might get a bit more long-term employment.

What other employment programs have you had? What have you done in fisheries and secondary processing? You talked about aquaculture in your Liberal manifesto. There is a section in this document which says zero, zero, zero is the amount of money that is going to one section this year, for some support.

Mr. Speaker, when you talk about misleading the House, we all interpret what any other Member says to suit ourselves. All I can say is that in this Province today, in May 1990, conditions are not significantly better, there has been no real change. The Government has made it more difficult for someone to get a post-secondary education by raising tuition fees 10 per cent,

something which I would never, never condone when I was a Minister, and we never did while we were Ministers. 10 per cent in one given year is simply too much.

The only way this Government is going to change the history of Newfoundland and make some real change is in the education field. But I do not see, again in this document, any tremendous support for the Minister of Education, either in the post-secondary sense, or the primary sense, or the pre-school sense. There is no real money for change.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Some Hon. Members: By leave! By leave!

Mr. Power: Just so I can conclude, Mr. Speaker. All I am saying is that in this document, with \$3 billion, you really have not used any new ideas. And it is unfortunate and sad, because the people of Newfoundland expect and need and demand some of those real changes, and somewhere down the road this Government will pay a price for deceiving the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Before I recognize the hon. Minister of Fisheries I would like to welcome to the gallery this morning, on behalf of hon. Members, forty Grade VIII students from Bay Roberts Amalgamated, in Bay Roberts, accompanied by their teachers, Gordon King and Boyd Bartlett.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Also, I would like

to welcome to the House of Assembly thirty-five Grade VI students from Inter-Island Academy, New World Island, accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Ryan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the opportunity pass to take issue with some of the comments made by the Member for Ferryland, especially as it relates to the fishery, because he would give the impression that the Government just absolutely turned its back on the Southern Shore, in his District, the plants in Fermeuse and St. Mary's and Riverhead and Ferryland.

Mr. Power: (Inaudible) \$20,000 (inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, he knows as well as I do that that is not true. He and I have talked about it privately, outside the House. I am not going to betray any confidences that are between us, but I know where he stands on that issue, and he knows I know, with respect to the Fermeuse operation. The Fermeuse operation, Mr. Speaker, was a company that was operated by a Portuguese company incorporated in this Province, the principals of which were Portuguese. They ran the company into bankruptcy; they ran up a very substantial debt with the Canadian Saltfish Corporation. In fact, I do not have the exact amount, but I believe it is in the order of \$15 million.

An Hon. Member: Fourteen and a bit.

Mr. Carter: Fourteen million-and-something. The end result was that by the time the company took stock of itself, it was over \$20 million in debt. And, yes, they had already owed the Province \$2.3 million by way of a loan guarantee. They came to us, Mr. Speaker, for an additional loan guarantee, first for an extension on the existing guarantee and for a new guarantee, sufficient working capital to carry them over this year.

On the basis of every bit of advice we received from officials in my Department, Finance, Development and others, it would have been crazy for the Province to have given that company an additional guarantee, and the Member knows that. The Member for Ferryland understands that, Mr. Speaker, but yet he will stand in his place here today and he will try to give the impression that because the Fermuse plant is not going to reopen, at least not yet, that it is the Province's fault. He knows better. And that is what surprises me, because I have a lot of respect for the hon. Member and I would expect better from him.

Mr. Power: I asked you for support and (inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, he asked me for support. But unlike the previous Administration, unlike the previous Government, we show some respect for the people's money. We do not flick it around, Mr. Speaker, and put \$20 million in operations like Sprung. And he knows, too, that that had absolutely no chance of success. Yet they were willing to keep propping up that company, even at the expense of \$20 million or \$25 million, whatever the eventual figure works out to be. That is

not the way this Government is operating.

Mr. Speaker, in the past number of months we have given substantial loan guarantees to fish companies. Some day next week, I am hoping to table a list of the companies we have helped. We are not playing politics with it. You say it has been kept secret. Of course it has been kept secret, because we are not giving out loan guarantees and then going to the public trying to capitalize on it to try to make political hay.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize our responsibilities and we will be publicizing a list of the loan guarantees we have given out since we took office. I think you will have to agree, once you see the list, that the companies we have helped are in a good position of making it.

He talked a moment ago and he inferred that I gave the plant in Twillingate a sweetheart deal. Now there is nothing further from the truth. Let me tell you what happened. Mr. Speaker, the plant in Twillingate employs, during the peak of the fishing season, about 500 people, 500 people who have absolutely no chance of getting a job elsewhere. I guess, to put it bluntly, the fish plant in Twillingate is the motor which keeps the economy of Twillingate and the whole Twillingate plant running. It is the lifeblood of Twillingate.

Now, that plant, of course, was owned initially by FPI. When FPI restructured, and with the blessing, by the way, of the then Tory Government in this Province - at least the hon. Member was a part - they allowed FPI to divest itself of some of their less than

profitable plants. In fact, there was something like sixteen plants, I believe, which were deemed to be less than profitable, and the Government of the day allowed them to divest themselves of these plants. Twillingate was one of those plants, and so was Fermuse.

That is probably where the problem started in Fermuse, as it did in Twillingate, because the operator who took over the Twillingate plant, Beothic Fisheries, a fine Newfoundland company headed by a fine Newfoundland entrepreneur, Mr. Boyd Way, ran it for a year and incurred a loss, I believe, in excess of a million dollars. They decided to divest themselves of the plant; Oceana Seafoods walked in; they were given a \$1.9 million loan guarantee by the other Administration, of which, again, the hon. Member was part. A loan of \$1.3 million was arranged through the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation; they took back a first mortgage on the property. That company, for a variety of reasons, not the least of which, of course, had to do with the shortage of resource - I say not the least, but there were other problems too - that company lasted for one year, ended up with a \$1.7 million loss, and went into receivership.

Now, if what the hon. Member is saying is correct, Mr. Speaker, if I wanted to make myself look good in my District, or if I wanted to enter into a sweetheart deal, I could very well have arranged for the Oceana Seafood Company to get a loan guarantee; I would have certainly pressured the Government and used what influence I have to ensure that. But, no, I put my political life on the line. Because when Oceana Seafood went into receivership, I had no

thought whatever as to what would happen in Twillingate. I didn't have the faintest clue that Dr. Ches Blackwood would come along or, indeed, anybody else. So I was willing to put my political life on the line, because I knew we were doing the right thing. Because to have propped up that ailing company, Mr. Speaker, would have been wrong, and in the long-term it would have done more damage to Twillingate and Twillingate District than anything else I could have done. So, we pulled the plug on Oceana; we allowed the company to fold up.

There was a lot of uncertainty in the community. I contacted most of the leaders in the community and explained what was happening, and I asked them to bear with me, that we were doing our best to find an operator. And I give them credit, they did. They didn't come in here and parade on the building; they didn't go public and start bad-mouthing others. They kept their cool and they trusted the Government, and I am happy to say we didn't let them down.

But, Mr. Speaker, the so-called sweetheart deal we entered into with the new company: Dr. Ches Blackwood is probably one of the best, if not the best small inshore fish plant operator in Newfoundland today. He used his own money. In fact, I approached him and asked him would he be interested in taking over the Twillingate plant, not thinking for a moment that he would answer in the affirmative. Mr. Speaker, it was a chance meeting.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, may I have silence? If he wants to make

a speech after he can, but not while I am speaking.

It was a chance meeting with Dr. Blackwood. I, almost in a frivolous way, suggested he might want to take over the Twillingate plant. After an hour or so, he came back and expressed some interest. But I can tell you now it was not a sweetheart deal. Ches Blackwood doesn't have any loan guarantees. The \$4 million or \$5 million that is going into that plant this year for working capital -

Mr. Power: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: No, let me finish, please.

The \$3 million or \$4 million, and that is what it will take, is money that will come out of Dr. Ches Blackwood's own company. Not one cent of that money is being guaranteed by the Province.

Ms Verge: Is he taking any risk?

Mr. Carter: Dr. Blackwood is taking all the risk. He will have his working capital. He will absorb all of the losses if they are incurred, and I hope they won't be. By the same token, as you would expect, he will benefit from any profits that accrue to the operation. Given the history of the plant, Beothic Fisheries' substantial loss, Oceana's substantial loss, I think Dr. Blackwood is a very courageous man. But I think he will make a go of it; I think he has what it takes to make the Twillingate plant a good success. I am counting on that, and I think the fact that he has his own money into it speaks for itself.

Ches Blackwood will be getting a

nominal management fee for the operation of the plant, as you would expect. In fact, I am told that what the management fee will cost the Government is probably on a par with what it would cost the receivers, acting for the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, to protect their assets.

An Hon. Member: How much is that?

Mr. Carter: I do not have the exact amount, but my colleague, the Minister of Development, who answers for the Development Corporation in the House, he will be tabling a document next week outlining the details. But it is in the hands of the receiver at the present time.

Mr. Power: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: I hear the hon. Member talking about brokerage fees. Mr. Speaker, another fallacy that has been used by the Opposition in their desperate attempt to discredit what we have done in Twillingate. Let me tell you something.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) supported it.

Mr. Carter: You supported it? With that kind of support, we do not need any enemies, I will tell you.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what happened. The hypocrisy of them! The day we announced the company was going into receivership, the Leader of the Opposition was on television and in the newspaper demanding that the Minister resign.

An Hon. Member: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Carter: Demanding that the Minister resign for allowing a plant in his own District to go in receivership. No ifs, ands or buts about it, he should resign. And it is on the public record. Lo and behold! we found an operator for the plant and they are still demanding that I resign.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, they are the most disappointed people in this Province.

Mr. Efford: Yes, that is right. Hear. hear!

Mr. Carter: I will tell you why they are disappointed. They would love for that plant to have stayed closed. Then they would have had a whipping boy; they would have said look, the Minister is not even interested enough, or does not have enough interest in the fishery to get the plant in his own District reopened. That was the ploy. And they were very disappointed, they were keenly disappointed.

Mr. Power: Is there a brokerage fee?

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, there is no brokerage fee. Look, there is not one copper coming from the Government to operator that plant by way of a brokerage fee. Now let me explain. Most of the large fish processing companies in the Province have marketing organizations in the U.S. doing their marketing for them, all right? Your little plant, Universal, they have Bayshore, I believe they call themselves; Quinlan Brothers, they have an affiliation with a marketing company in the U.S. which does their selling for them. It is

purely an arrangement, an internal arrangement between the company, the processor and their agents. If you want to sell a house, you will engage a salesman to sell it for you and you will pay that salesman a commission. But it comes out of your pocket. Any fish brokerage fees -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: It does not have the least bit of connection with the Government. The hon. Member knows that.

Mr. Power: I am asking (inaudible).

Mr. Carter: I am giving it to you now, but the impression was conveyed on Wednesday, I believe, that Dr. Blackwood was getting a huge management fee, that he was getting some other special arrangements, that he was collecting a 5 per cent brokerage fee, and that is totally incorrect.

Mr. Power: You do yourself a disservice by not telling us (inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, let me say this to you in reply to what he is saying. When Oceana went in receivership, Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, to protect their asset on which they had a mortgage of \$1.3 million, appointed a receiver and that receiver undertook, as is the normally the case, to protect the asset in the first instance, and then do what had to be done to enable the person holding the mortgage to realize what they could on a sale or on some arrangement, in other words, to minimize their loss. And I saw no reason, in fact, I suppose it would be improper for me to stand

in the House and to start giving out to all and sundry the working, the dealings that were being transpired with the receiver who is acting under certain laws and rules they have to abide by for a Crown corporation. But I can tell the House now there is certainly no attempt on my part, or anybody's part on this side, to hide anything or to reveal anything - in fact, let me tell you I am so proud of that Twillingate deal that I cannot wait. I said to the House the other day, I am almost willing to buy prime time television and go on and tell it all. I am so proud of what happened. I am so proud of that deal that I cannot wait to be able to reveal publicly all the details pertaining to it. So, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the Fermeuse situation, of course there is a problem in Fermeuse, and we realize that. I am concerned about it, as we all are. But, the hon. Member understands but he did not say as much in his speech. The plant in Fermeuse, as is the plant in St. Mary's, that is now the property of the Federal Government, by virtue of dealings between their agent, the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, OK it is their operation. It is their responsibility. They are the ones who call tenders for new operators, they are the ones who establish the criteria, the guide lines, they are the ones who will sit down in the final analyses and adjudicate or at least assess the various proposals. And they are the ones who will make the decisions as to who goes into what plants.

Now I have talked to the people in St. Mary's and I am very sympathetic to them. If I could snap my finger this morning and

find an operator for two plants in Newfoundland I would have to say that it would have to be for Fermeuse and St. Mary's. I have a long time attachment to both communities, in fact, the plant in St. Mary's, I can take some responsibility for getting it there some years ago. So I understand that negotiations are pretty well concluded now for the operations of the St. Mary's plant, and I am happy for them. And I hope they succeed. I understand also, by the way, that there is a lot of interest being shown in the Fermeuse plant.

An. hon. Member: They got an operator today.

Mr. Carter: They got an operator today? I am delighted to hear that. So obviously most of what we both have been saying this morning is all for nothing, because, Mr. Speaker, the Province is running the fishery now the way it should be run.

If a plant does not show any promise, if a plant is bankrupt, and does not have access to a reasonable amount of raw material, if it does not have reasonably good management, if it does not have reasonable equity into it, then we would be fools to prop up a plant that is heading nowhere but down, and it is a case of throwing taxpayers good money after bad money.

That is our policy, but conversely, if a plant is in a bit of trouble, and if they have reasonable access to a reasonable amount of raw material, if they have reasonably good management, and if they have a reasonable chance of surviving, then the Province will stand behind them. We will stand behind them, as we

have done in many cases in the past few months. Now I will be providing a list to the House within days I expect of the plants that fall into that category. The plants that do have a future. For example, the Twillingate plant does have a future. Given a chance, if the resource comes back, as we think and know it will, then the Twillingate plant will prosper. There are other plants as well. The plant on Fogo Island for example. My hon. friend is not in the House this morning. The plant on Fogo Island received assistance from the Province. Because we have confidence in that plant. We think, given a chance, it will survive.

There are a couple of plants on the Great Northern Peninsula in which we have confidence and we are assisting those plants. There are some plants in Labrador which speaks for itself. We do have a great deal of faith in Labrador, the fishing potential in Labrador and we will do what we can to help the plants in Labrador succeed. Mr. Speaker, if the Member wants to speak afterwards, he can, but I do not enjoy being in a two way conversation. That is not the way the business of this House is supposed to be conducted. Mr. Speaker, that sums up pretty well where the Province stands, I am not going to dwell at length with the Members comments about Meech Lake and the danger of Canada splitting up, this fearmongering that is emanating from the Peace Tower, Mr. Speaker, the emissaries of the Peace Tower are doing their job, and I believe doing it well, because they are instilling fear in the hearts of people. And I can tell you now, Mr. Speaker, that -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

I think Newfoundlanders, indeed Canadians, have a lot more to fear from Meech Lake being accepted in its present form than what they have to fear from the possibility of there being no Meech Lake. Mr. Speaker, I speak as one who started off in this world as a Newfoundlander. I have the distinction, I suppose, unlike some of my younger colleagues here, of starting off as a Newfoundlander and am very proud of the fact. I will tell you now that I did not join Confederation, I did not join Canada in 1949, and I did not relish the thought of Newfoundland joining Canada in 1949 to become a second-class Canadian. I will not accept that status. I will not accept the status of being second-class, and I will not allow my children, and their children, to have that status.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Well, Mr. Speaker, if one would take the trouble to go back over the history of this Province as a Province, and I have probably a distinction that is not enjoyed by any other Member here, in that I sat for seven years in the House of Commons in Ottawa. I was elected three terms, and I have seen firsthand just how people from the smaller provinces are treated. I have seen how people from the smaller, so-called 'have not' parts of Canada are treated, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not proud of some of the things I saw during my days in Ottawa.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: I do not really believe it, Mr. Speaker. There is no way I could be more forceful, or more truthful in expressing the thoughts that I am expressing. The hon. gentleman can say what he likes, and he has a right to his opinion, but I can only tell you as one Newfoundlander and now a Canadian, and proud to be a Canadian, that I want to be a first class Canadian. I want my people to be treated like first class Canadians, and when I go to my own District and see people still bringing water in buckets, and still having to dispose of sewage in the roadside ditches, then, Mr. Speaker, I get very little pride out of that fact.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that is not the kind of Confederation that I want for this Province, but I believe that our Premier is on the right track, and the gentlemen opposite know he is on the right track. He has the courage to stand up for what he believes in. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get any further involved in that, except to say that the fishing industry in Newfoundland right now is going through some difficult times. We all know that. These are difficult times and not because of anything we have done. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the blame, or whatever you want to call it, for what is happening in the Canadian fishing industry today, rests squarely on the shoulders of the Federal Government, not just the present Federal Government, but from this Government and from other Governments, because they are responsible for the fishery. They are responsible for providing sufficient scientific information on which they can base proper information, or proper decisions, and that is where they have failed us, and now we are paying for it.

So, when the hon. gentleman for Ferryland talks about what we have done for the fishery, I can tell him now that he should be aiming his guns at the people up where the problem lies, Ottawa. He should be talking to his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. Crosbie, and remind him, by the way, of his responsibility. He has some responsibility to the Province and I have some very serious reservations that he has discharged that responsibility in the kind of a way that he should have over the past few months, certainly in terms of the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure rebutting some of the comments made by my friend over there. I do not think he meant any harm by what he said. I suppose in debate people are inclined to say things that sometimes they know are not exactly accurate, but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I can only tell him that what was done for Twillingate, I would do for any other community in Newfoundland, equal to what I did for Twillingate. Twillingate got less favorable treatment from Government than most other communities in this Province in the past year or two. There are not too many fish plants in Newfoundland, especially ones that were closed and had to reopen, I do not know of one that did not succeed in getting a loan guarantee.

Almost every single fish plant that I know, where the plant was closed and had to reopen under new ownership, where some kind of a loan guarantee was not made available to them. There might be a few smaller ones but certainly that is the order of the day.

Twillingate did not get that privilege, so therefore I can stand here and in all honesty say that Twillingate probably received less in terms of special consideration from this Government than any other fishing company in this Province in recent times. For that I give the new owners credit, and I can tell you now that any Newfoundlander who is willing to move into a plant, having had two or three years of very serious losses, take it over and put his own money up, then he will have my complete support. I would expect Members opposite to show the right kind of appreciation for that kind of entrepreneurial spirit and instead of being critical and trying to infer that there is something sleazy going on, without trying to infer that there is something less than honest, or some sleazy little side deals, or, as he called it, a sweetheart deal, I would expect them to stand up and give Dr. Blackwood credit and praise him for what he has done. Instead of that, they are now trying to infer that Dr. Blackwood -

Mr. Power: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Ferryland, on a point of order.

Mr. Power: (Inaudible) leaving out certain elements of fact in debate. He himself is doing exactly the same thing now. We are not accusing Dr. Blackwood of being sleazy, being underhanded. He is one of the most respected fish plant owners in this Province. We are not accusing the Minister of Fisheries of being sleazy, or the Government of being sleazy. All we are saying is that

we have asked questions in this House about the facts of the deal in Twillingate to see if we can have it apply in other parts of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The Minister of Fisheries and the Government have given rise to rumours in the fishing industry, and in this House because we don't know the facts, and that is all we want to know. We are happy for Twillingate, we are happy for Dr. Blackwood, and the Government did a good job by getting someone to operate there; but, as people of Newfoundland and, as legislators, we have a right to know the conditions of the deal. That is all we are saying.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order, it is a point of clarification.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, sometimes you can say a lot without saying anything, and when you talk about there being sweetheart deals, now what does that denote, a sweetheart deal? A sweetheart deal denotes there is something underhanded, something special being done for somebody.

An Hon. Member: You were bringing out the data on (inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I have already explained that I have no authority, at this point in time, while the matter is still in the hands of the receivers, to table any information on the deal. They will have to take my word for it. But, until, Mr. Speaker, they have evidence that there was something wrong, why should they condemn a community, condemn a fish plant operator, condemn the Government, by charging that there has been a

sweetheart deal?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: The Leader of the Opposition said it, and I believe the Member for Grand Bank has been saying it - a sweetheart deal, denoting something that is -

An Hon. Member: The Member for St. Mary's - The Capes said it.

Mr. Carter: Yes, the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

- something that is sinister, something that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. John's East, on a point of order.

Ms. Verge: Humber East, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Humber East, I am sorry.

Ms. Verge: Isn't it so, Mr. Speaker, that the receivers are acting for a Crown corporation for Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and, therefore, the Minister must be in a position to know exactly what the terms of the arrangement between the receivers and Dr. Blackwood are, and he should make them available to the people of the Province and other individuals and firms involved in the fishery?

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member is right. The receivers are acting for a Crown corporation, the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation.

But, she is a lawyer, she must know, too, that there are certain rights that have to be protected in a case like this, and she will have to understand, as will the others, that when we are able to, we will table -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Look, if you don't get all the information you want, yesterday, Mr. Speaker, do you immediately wave the red flag and accuse the parties to the agreement of being sleazy or being party to a sweetheart deal? It seems to me they not only lack good sense or courtesy, they lack patience over there.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible), Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has expired.

Mr. Carter: Now, my friends, let's look at the Sprung fiasco. We are now having to appoint a Commission of Inquiry to get the facts on Sprung. They weren't even willing to admit that Sprung existed. They were not even willing to admit that there was any such thing as a cucumber plant. Sprung. They guarded that with their life.

An Hon. Member: No, they did not.

Mr. Carter: Oh, come on! The last people in Canada, you are the last people in Canada that should criticize the Government for trying to hide anything.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Carter: In one year we must have asked a thousand questions.

An Hon. Member: Twenty-six times.

Mr. Carter: Twenty-six times on Sprung. And, of course, we still do not have the answers. Look, like I said, Mr. Speaker, they are the last people in Canada, they are the last people in the world that should ever criticize a Government for not releasing public information. They sat on the Sprung deal for about two years.

An Hon. Member: Was it wrong?

Mr. Carter: Was it wrong? Of course, it was wrong.

An Hon. Member: Why do you do the same thing?

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, let me tell you. The deal between the new company, by the way, Dr. Blackwood's company and - I am not even sure if it is actually signed yet. I believe it is, but I am not sure. If it is, it has only been signed for the past few days. So the former spokesman for Sprung, the guardian of Philip and Dawn Sprung, the people who spawned Sprung, the spawners of Sprung are now criticizing me because we have not revealed all on a deal that is about three days old, yet they sat on a deal that cost the Province \$20 million and sat on it for two or three years. Now what kind of a gall do they have? Or how stupid do they think the Newfoundland people are to fall for that kind of a thing?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Carter: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes, on a point of order.

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister is accusing us of putting out information which distorts -

An Hon. Member: A point of order?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, a point of order.

Mr. Hearn: - the story on the Twillingate deal. It was the Minister's own comment in the House that sparked the comments. He was the one who talked about no lease; he was the one who talked about the management fee; and he was the one who mentioned there might be a brokerage fee. It was only to these comments we were responding. So really it is a point of order because what he is, is misleading the House into thinking that the comments came from this side, when they were sparked from his own words as they can be read in Hansard.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

I would also remind hon. Members to refrain from using the word 'sleaze' and 'sleazy'. I think it is unparliamentary.

Mr. Hearn: Did I do that?

Mr. Speaker: No, no. There were two or three Members referred to the word 'sleazy'.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Even if it is true, it is unparliamentary.

The hon. the Member for Trinity

North.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hynes: Mr. Speaker, I listened with some interest to the Member for Ferryland quoting some of the things that were prophesied by this Administration back in April before the general election, and how some of these prophesies have not yet taken place. And the Minister of Fisheries ended off by saying he was not going to speak about Meech Lake.

I would like to have a few words to say about Meech Lake, because I believe we are in very serious trouble in this country today and it is because of Meech Lake. And if Meech Lake does not pass and if Quebec does decide -

An Hon. Member: The sky is going to fall in.

Mr. Hynes: Yes, Sir, the sky just might so fall in, right on top of your head, Sir.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hynes: Yes, you are right on. The sky is falling and it is falling very rapidly.

When you take - I do not know what the population of Quebec is, but I am sure it is seven, eight -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hynes: How much?

An Hon. Member: Six and a half million.

Mr. Hynes: Six and a half million, seven million people who contribute to the social programs of this country through the form of taxation, when you remove six

or seven million people then those social programs are in deep, deep trouble. They will be in deep trouble.

An Hon. Member: You believe all that do you?

Mr. Hynes: Yes, I firmly believe it. And I think you believe it too.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hynes: The Meech Lake Accord may not have been a perfect document. But in a country of such diversities that we have what can be perfect?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hynes: When the Premier of this Province brought in the rescinding motion he was told by, I guess, just about every Opposition Member who spoke in the debate that he was leading to the break up. It was the beginning of the end of this country, but he went on, he stubbornly pursued his idea and Meech Lake was rescinded and now the country is in chaos. It is in chaos. The Minister of Fisheries said he didn't want to be a second-class citizen of this country, and I don't want to be a second-class citizen nor does anybody in this House or anybody in this Province want to be a second class citizen, but when you look back over the last forty-one years probably we are second-class citizens because the majority of those years we had Liberal Governments in Ottawa.

The Premier himself, during the election campaign, one of the things he went around saying was that the former Premier, I am talking about Mr. Peckford, was always Fed bashing and we had to

have a more conciliatory approach to the whole question of our dealings with Ottawa, that was his word. I have never seen so much Fed bashing in the last seventeen years as I am seeing in this House in the last six months! Every time an hon. Gentleman opposite opens his mouth, it's Ottawa, they bash Ottawa continuously, so if that's the conciliatory approach of this Premier, then Mr. Peckford was, I guess, an angel in that respect. Let us have a look at some of the points that were prophesied during the election campaign by this Administration before they took office. Some that the hon. Member for Ferryland never mentioned such as the School Tax Authority. Very bad, when they were in opposition. The School Tax Authority was going to be disbanded, thrown out, that's what they told the people of the Province, and everybody who pays school taxes who couldn't afford to pay school taxes believed them, but they neglected to tell those same people that if they disbanded the School Tax Authority, they would have to collect \$30 million elsewhere, in another form of taxation.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hynes: That's right. But the people out there who didn't pay or are paying the school tax and finding it very difficult didn't know that. All they were concerned about was, that they would not be receiving school tax bills if this Liberal Government or if the Liberals were elected. The Sprung loan guarantees. The hon. Member for Ferryland, who was Minister of the Department at one time responsible for Sprung, admitted just then in this House, that it was a bad deal, it was a bad deal, he admitted it, but what

did the present Premier do during the election campaign. Elect us and not one, not one red cent of the loan guarantees or whatever they were classified as, will be paid by us, not one of them, and as a lawyer, he knew the difference. He knew the difference. He misled the people in that respect as far as I am concerned. He knew that those loan guarantees had to be paid.

Hospital beds: people yawn over opposite, but again I distinctly remember back in April of 1989 or March of 1989, whenever, that if we were elected, not one hospital bed would close, but they never told the people why hospital beds had to close during the summer months. Not because of the naivety or whatever word I am trying to use, not because of any action of that Government, they didn't want to close hospital beds no more than the present Administration wants to close hospital beds, but they never told the people that they had to close hospital beds in the summer because nurses were on holidays, doctors were away and they never had the professional staff to keep all the hospital beds open and that is the reason. And the same thing happened last summer and the same thing will happen again this summer. Hospital beds will still have to close.

An Hon. Member: And a lot of summers before.

Mr. Hynes: Yes, and a lot of summers to come.

And again, it has been mentioned so often in this House - amalgamation.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hynes: Yes, it is. It is in certain parts of the Province. It is. I fully support amalgamation. The former Minister who I worked with was working towards amalgamation, but he was doing it in such a way that it would come from the grass roots up.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hynes: Yes, and if you go back through the Department of Municipal Affairs you will find out that is exactly the way he was going to go. But amalgamation will fail in this Province because of the way it was brought in by this Administration again. But I agree amalgamation is essential for parts of the Province, but it was not mentioned in the whole election campaign.

First year University courses - again I want to reiterate my question that I put before. Renovations were completed to the Clarendville campus with the intention of bringing in first year University courses this September. And as far as I know not one word whether they are going to be offered or they are not going to be offered has come from this Administration. And you have students out there who are anxious to find out whether they will be attending first year University courses at the Clarendville campus or if they will have to go to Burin or come to St. John's, or go to Grand Falls or Corner Brook, wherever. But the time has come for the Minister to announce whether first year University courses will be offered, or whether they will not, but the decision has to be made and it has to be made very quickly.

One more thing I want to mention is the mobile CAT Scanner, which I

asked the Minister of Health to probably enlighten us on when he spoke in this debate. The mobile CAT Scanner had been planned for use between three hospitals, Grand Falls, Gander and Clarenville. It was forgot about after this Administration took office, and no word has been spoken about it since. I do not know if there has been communication with the administrators of the various hospitals, but they are anxious, and they still would like to have the services of the Mobile Cat Scanner. So again, I am asking the Minister of Health if he will probably enlighten us in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have very much more that I want to add. There are several things I could mention about the District, the salt fish, Mifflins Fisheries Limited, Salt Fish Corporation.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hynes: Pardon?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hynes: The relocation of the headquarters. Many days ago in this House, Sir.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hynes: Most definitely, and I will reiterate again-

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hynes: Yes, I spoke about that in the House. I acknowledge, and I believe, I firmly believe it was a wrong decision made in the beginning.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hynes: Yes, definitely. I

will get the Hansard that it is in. Yes, I believe the wrong decision was made in the beginning.

There was a lot of petitions and lobbying from the Burin Peninsula, and the Government obviously went along with the type of lobbies, and the number of lobbies that took place. I believed that the ideal location was Clarenville, central between Bonavista, Clarenville, and Burin, and I am quite happy, that hopefully, the Government will be relocating the headquarters to Clarenville.

An Hon. Member: It is not there yet.

An Hon. Member: What is not there yet?

An Hon. Member: The headquarters.

Mr. Hynes: That is right.

The White Hills Ski Resort in Clarenville, again, a very positive initiative, much of the planning was done by the previous Administration. Much of the funding was in place, as a matter of fact, and it has proven to be very beneficial. We have a new hotel starting in Clarenville this year and another one in the Terra Nova National Park, as a result of the ski resort. Thank you Mr. Speaker, and that is all I have to say right now.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

Mr. Doyle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased to have a few words to say in the budget debate today. I am rather disappointed, when you get right down to it, that Members on the Government side, like the Member from Mount Scio - Bell Island, has

not been taking advantage of the time allotted to speak in the budget debate, and I believe that the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island has not spoken at all, in the budget debate. I am really disappointed that Members on the Government side are not taking advantage of the opportunity to get up and to support the Minister of Finance in this great document that he brought in, especially the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island. I mean he should be one of the first people to come to his feet and to speak on this budget, to let us all know Mr. Speaker, what the Budget does for the good people of Bell Island. So he should be one of the first people on his feet to speak on behalf of the people of Bell Island. He talks about the ferries, Mr. Speaker, and trying to take credit, the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island has the gall to sit there and try and take credit for the ferries that have been approved for Bell Island, when it was this Member, when he was Minister of Transportation who went over to Bell Island as a matter of fact, had a press conference over on Bell Island and announced the approval of two ferries, Mr. Speaker, for the people of Bell Island. And here it is, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Mount Scio trying to take credit for that, and it is a lucky thing that we had the Cabinet documents available to us, approving the two ferries for Bell Island, Mr. Speaker, lucky we had cabinet documents available to us, as one of the first acts, one of the first things the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island did and the Minister of Transportation, was to try and cancel one of the ferries for Bell Island.

Now that was a dastardly act on

behalf of the Minister of Transportation and the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island. So it is lucky we had the Cabinet documents available to us approving those two ferries for the people of Bell Island. So, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Mount Scio should be on his feet telling us all what the Budget does, and he will have time, but he has been sitting there for the last two or three days and he has been taking little shots, as he is doing right now, taking little shots at our speakers when they get up to make legitimate points on the Budget, the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island is there off to the side taking little shots at us.

An Hon. Member: Then he chickens out.

Mr. Doyle: And then he chickens out when our speakers sit down. He is just glued to his seat and will not get up to let the people of the Province know how this Budget addresses the very legitimate problems that the people of Bell Island have. And incidentally I do not believe that there is probably an area in the Province that has more problems than the people of Bell Island. They have more legitimate problems than any other area of the Province. And they have not had good representation on Bell Island since 1985 when distribution, when I finally gave up that District, Mr. Speaker, and had to run in the Harbour Main/Kelligrews area. So they have not had the top representation that they have been used to ever since 1985.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, we did a lot for the people of Bell Island in approving those two ferries, and we certainly hope that the Member for Mount Scio -

Bell Island will not allow the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Transportation to axe those ferries. And I am looking forward to the day when these boats are delivered to the people of Bell Island, because there is not another group in the Province that deserves it more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned -

An Hon. Member: They are coming on June 11 and 12.

Mr. Doyle: They are coming on June 11 and 12. I look forward to an invitation from the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, I am sure he will give me an invitation to go over. As I have mentioned on numerous, numerous occasions this Budget is a very, very deceptive document, as the Member for Ferryland mentioned in his remarks, and it does very, very little, when you get right down to it, to address the problems of the common man. Let us say the common person. It does very little to address the problems of the common person. It attacks the common person at every turn, and whether it is the payroll tax, or the elimination of the PDD subsidies, or teacher's services, the hospitals, or the Labrador travel subsidy, or the elimination of the Employment Generation Program, it all has the same affect, it hits the common man right where it hurts the most, and that is in the pocketbook. I have been here now for about eleven Budgets and I have never seen a Budget crafted so well as this one, so deceptive, so craftily done. It looks so good on the surface but when you get right down to scrutinizing the Budget and breaking it down, you find out that it is not the document that the Minister of

Finance said it was.

Mr. Speaker, I will adjourn the debate and call it 12:00 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to inform hon. Members that I gave a list of legislation last night and I would like to point out that the Bills I plan to proceed with first, when we get to them, are Bills No. 27 and 30, and there is a committee stage on Bill 31, which is the hydro one on which we have already done second reading. The two Bills 27 and 30 are the first ones I would like to get to in terms of legislation, and also the committee stage of Bill 31. These are in my plans for the very near future, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Verge: They are after the Budget debate?

Mr. Baker: After the Budget debate.

Mr. Doyle: So, we will continue Budget on Monday?

Mr. Baker: As far as I know now. If there is any change on Monday I will inform the Acting House Leader on Monday morning.

Ms. Verge: We will have our real House Leader back by then.

Mr. Baker: I will inform the real House Leader on Monday morning.

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

On motion, the House at its rising