



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 43

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Tuesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

29 May 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if by leave we could start Question Period first and if there are any Ministerial Statements, revert to them later on.

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

Mr. Simms: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I don't think we would have any problem with that. We understand the Premier has some meetings, so we are quite prepared to begin with Question Period, followed by Statements.

Oral Questions

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

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my questions are for the Premier. When the Premier was on his way to Ottawa to meet with the Prime Minister on the weekend, why did he make a blistering speech personally insulting the Prime Minister and the other leaders who have been supporting the Meech Lake Accord? Why did the Premier, just hours before he was due to have a strategically important meeting with the Prime Minister, with the nation holding its breath, utter the provocative statement and I quote: 'They were aware that what they were doing and what they were proposing was the wrong thing to do'?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, my speech in Halifax, that speaking engagement in Halifax, was committed long before ever any arrangements were made to go to the meeting with the Prime Minister. The thing that prompted the particular speech was the attribution by two fellow Premiers of what I considered to be a claim of dishonourable motives on Newfoundland's part, that Newfoundland, in its actions, was not honouring its obligations, or I, in particular, was not honouring my obligations to my colleagues. That was attributable to one Premier.

I know what my obligations to my colleagues are and I know whether or not I am honouring them. But I place my obligations to the people of Canada and to the people of the Province who elected me, to meet my obligations to them, in a higher priority.

Secondly, there were statements by another Premier to the effect that not only had I erased the signature on the Accord, I had invalidated the legislation. I had no power to do any such thing, and did no such thing, but it attributed a dishonourable motive which it was necessary for me to correct. Now the hon. Member just referred to that one particular phrase: 'They were aware that what they were doing' - that what they were doing - 'and what they were proposing was the wrong way to do' - is what the words say - 'and they had attempted to cajole, etc.' I had it transcribed since, so I know what the precise words were. Mr. Speaker, let me start out with perhaps an apology to all of my fellow Premiers for any misrepresentation that may result

from my inappropriate words, because they were not appropriate to the occasion. It was not a written text I was delivering, I was speaking just from head notes. When you look at the whole context of it -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: I would like to answer the question. If the words are mixed up with the junk I am hearing opposite, it will just come out a worse mess. I would like the freedom to answer it accurately.

Mr. Speaker, what I was addressing, and what I was attempting to address but did so less than accurately, for any difficulty I have caused my fellow Premiers, I most sincerely apologize. What I was addressing was the fact that having agreed on what they would suggest would be included in the Meech Lake Accord and in constitutional amendments, they then set about attempting to pressure Canada to accept it for other reasons than arguing it on the merits of it, because they knew they could not persuade the people of Canada that it was the right thing to do on its merits. That was the intent of it, but I readily acknowledge that the words as they were expressed do not make that intent clear, and to the extent that my words could in any way be used to express a criticism that those First Ministers knew they were doing something that was wrong but went ahead and did it anyway, I apologize to them. That was not the intention.

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

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was the context and

the timing of the Premier's provocative remarks in Halifax on his way to meet the Prime Minister that worried so many people in the nation. Let me get back to the Premier's sense of timing in this whole process. Why did the Premier give notice of his intention to rescind our Legislature's ratification of the Meech Lake Accord right after Premier McKenna's companion initiative, and hours before the Prime Minister was due to go on television to address the nation?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I am making notes because there are two questions here which need to be addressed, Mr. Speaker. It was the context and timing of my remarks. The context and timing was not of my choice, it was chosen by Premiers Peterson -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Ms Verge: The remarks were of your choosing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Premier Wells: You did not ask the remarks, you asked the context and timing. I am answering the questions the hon. Member asked. Why the context and timing of my remarks? The context and timing were not of my choosing. It was Premier Peterson and Premier Buchanan who choose to attribute to me dishonourable motives the night before and on that very morning, which made it necessary for me to answer them immediately and I did so. So the context and timing were not of my choosing, it was of theirs.

Secondly: Why did we choose to

move in the way in which we did, at the time in which we did, with respect to rescission? For the primary reason, Mr. Speaker, that we could not allow it to continue much longer. Because if people are taking June 23 as a specific time frame by which certain things had to be achieved, then we had to make the position very clear.

Ms Verge: (Inaudible) the Prime Minister?

Premier Wells: No trouble. I knew what the Prime Minister was going to say. He told me they were not going to address Newfoundland's concerns. So Newfoundland moved when we did, having announced it in the Speech from the Throne, and it was entirely the appropriate thing to do.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Back to the Premier's timing. Why did the Premier wait until the eve of the First Ministers' Conference, last November, to release his constitutional alternative, dropping it like a bombshell instead of circulating it weeks ahead of the First Ministers' Conference and giving others a chance to assess it and address it with him?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I do not know who else had it, but the Prime Minister had the position well before; I sent it to him well before. I have no quarrel with

that.

The position we had taken was made known, I spelled it out in the House here in May of 1989 - May of 1988, I am sorry. It was spelled out in the House. It had been discussed in a variety of ways. Now I do not know if the hon. Member is suggesting that it was somehow related to the fact that there was a First Ministers' Conference about to take place. I guess that necessitated it being done clearly by that time so that people would have it for discussion purposes, yes, but that is all.

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

Ms Verge: Mr. Speaker, yes, the Premier gave it to others hours before he sat down with the First Ministers at a national televised forum. Mr. Speaker, the Premier's sense of timing is as impeccable as that of a saboteur.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms Verge: My final question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Premier planning as his next act of sabotage, on the eve of the First Ministers' Conference expected at the end of this week, calling his referendum?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: The hon. Member's comments are offensive, not to me alone, they are offensive to the people of Newfoundland; they are offensive to the people of this Province that Government abandoned, whose concerns that former Government abandoned when they brought the Meech Lake legislation to this House and approved it against the will of the majority of the people of this

Province, without regard to proper public debate, and had ten minutes here and fifteen minutes there and an hour somewhere else over a four month period. They snuck it through and put it in in that way -

Ms Verge: What about public hearings in the past year (inaudible)?

Premier Wells: - in that way, with no chance for an adequate public debate and sabotaged the future of the people of this Province. I will not be responsible for that kind of sabotage of our people's future, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Tobin: You are going to sabotage the country, not the Province.

Premier Wells: Let me answer specifically, because I believe the people of the Province, with great respect, not the hon. Member, but the people of the Province are deserving of an answer to the question as to what the Government intends with respect to the calling of a referendum. I have given it a good deal of thought, I have talked to other Premier's about it, as to whether it would be helpful to the process -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: Let me start again, Mr. Speaker. I have given it a good deal of thought, I have talked to other Premier's about whether it would be helpful to the process -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: Just in case that was not heard, I have given it a good deal of thought and I have

talked to the other Premier's about whether or not it would be helpful to the process to call the referendum now. And, after assessing all aspects of it as fairly and fully as we can, and after hearing the comments of the other Premier's, I believe it would not and that we should follow our original intention to call the referendum only - only - if Manitoba and New Brunswick also will authorize the implementation of the Meech Lake Accord as it is and Newfoundland is the only Legislature which has not proceeded, or has not approved of it. Only in that circumstance would we think it appropriate to call a referendum.

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

Ms Duff: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to address my questions to the Premier.

By way of preamble, I would just like to say that I have been, as one interested and concerned Newfoundlander, watching very closely the role that is being played by our Premier and, subsequently, by our Province, in this whole Meech Lake process. It does appear to me, for whatever reasons, that our Premier is bound and determined to sabotage any agreement on the Meech Lake Accord as it stands. Everything I have seen leads to that conclusion.

I would like to ask the Premier if he could tell this House what he considers to be the most likely scenario if, in fact, there is no agreement on the Meech Accord by the deadline date of June 23? What is the Premier's view of life after Meech Lake?

Premier Wells: I am a bit

offended by the use of the word sabotage, because that attributes a motive. So I need to address that. I am a bit surprised to hear it coming from that particular hon. Member, quite frankly. I would have expected something somewhat different. But, anyway, I have to address it, the matter has been used. I will tell her that she shares that view with, I believe it is, 13 per cent of the population of the Province; another 64 per cent endorsed fully what this Government is doing. So I take some degree of comfort in the fact that the vast majority of the people of this Province, and I also believe the vast majority of the people of Canada, think that this Government, and perhaps me in particular, since she attributed it to me, are taking an approach that is consistent with honesty and integrity and concern for the future of the people of the Province and the future of the people of the country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Premier Wells: And the hon. Member's comments that would impute a motive to deliberately sabotage for the purpose of some ulterior motive, or whatever motive, but sabotage carries within itself an unacceptable motive.

An Hon. Member: So does parasite.

Premier Wells: It does not, if the hon. Member understands the word properly. If he looks at the proper definition of the word, then he would understand.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: Let me start

again, Mr. Speaker.

It is necessary to address it in these terms to respond to the improper motive attributable as a result of the hon. Member's question, and attributable in a totally unacceptable way.

The Government of this Province, Mr. Speaker, is concerned about two things. It may do me great harm in this Legislature to say it and put it in this way, but I have done it elsewhere and I must be honest enough to do it here. I think our responsibility is to the nation as a whole first, and we must put first and foremost the interest of the nation as a whole. And while it may be preferential from Newfoundland's point of view to do it a particular way, in putting forward our particular position we must take into account the interest of the nation as a whole. That is the policy this Government has followed, and I have followed personally.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we must protect the long-term interest of the people of this Province because we have been elected and entrusted with the responsibility to do specifically that. And the motivation of the Government is to ensure that the people of this Province can, over the next ten, twenty, thirty, fifty, one hundred years, live in Canada with the dignity and the self-respect that can only come from a measure of political, social, and economic equality that we have not been able to achieve in forty years of Confederation because of the national political institutions.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member

for St. John's East.

Ms Duff: It is very interesting, although not a new speech, but it totally failed to answer my question which was: What does the Premier consider to be the most likely scenario if, in fact, there is no agreement on Meech Lake by the deadline date of June 23? And what is the Premier's view of life after Meech?

Now the Premier might have been happier if I had said that it was his bound and determined attempt to make sure that the Accord did not pass for the most lofty reasons in the world, because he may believe in his heart that it is bad. But, whatever the reason, the fact of the matter is, our Premier is determined not to get an agreement by the 23rd, so I want to know what he thinks is going to happen when we reach the 23rd?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The Chair realizes the delicacy of the topic with which we are dealing, but I remind hon. Members again, as I have on a previous occasion, of Beauchesne, 409, Section (3), which says: 'The question ought to seek information and, therefore, cannot be based upon a hypothesis, cannot seek an opinion, either legal or otherwise.' I would suggest that question is in the area of hypothesis and seeks an opinion, and the question ought to seek information.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. I will attempt to answer the hon. Member's question. What I did was answer specifically what she asked - an attribution that I was bound and determined to cause it to fail. Well, I say to the hon. Member and to the entire Province and to the entire nation, the hon. Member knows full well that that is not so. I am bound and determined to try and find a resolution of this matter, but try and find one that protects the interest of the people who elected me to do just that.

I am not prepared to sell the future of the people of this Province. If the people of this Province want to subordinate their future voluntarily in that way, they will be given an opportunity to do so in a referendum. But, Mr. Speaker, we stated our position prior to and during the recent election, and we campaigned, knowing with the -

Ms Verge: You did not. You did not even mention it in the campaign.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: The hon. Member can state her false claim any time she wants to.

Ms Verge: It is not a false claim.

Premier Wells: But the statements are very clear. I stood in this House, Mr. Speaker, maybe nobody else was listening, on May 18, 1988, and stated if there is an election between now and the proclamation and Meech Lake has not be proclaimed and we are elected, we will bring a resolution to rescind.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Premier Wells: I was asked about it numerous times during the campaign and I addressed it. But those people opposite, Mr. Speaker, who had sold out Newfoundland's future were not prepared to fight an election on that basis.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I again remind hon. Members that questions and answers together are for seeking information and not for debate. I ask hon. Members on both sides of the House to remember that Question Period is for information and not for debate.

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

Ms Duff: Does the Premier believe that in the next round of constitutional talks, if Meech Lake fails, the demands that have been brought to the table by Quebec will be as reasonable as the demands made on behalf of that Province by Premier Bourassa in 1987?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I cannot predict what Quebec may demand at any one point in time. All I can say is that those of us who are in a position of responsibility for responding to the demands must take into account our obligation to protect the fundamental principles by which this nation has been established and governed. We have to preserve the nation as a Federal state, where all of its citizens are equal to all others and where every province is equal.

Now if some particular province

wants to demand that there be complete inequality, they can demand it. That does not give us the right or the obligation to acquiesce in such unacceptable demands. We must put the interest of the nation as a whole first, but, Mr. Speaker, we must also, at all times, be sufficiently generous and understanding and accommodating to fairly and fully respond to those legitimate demands in a way that addresses those demands as fully as it is possible to do so, provided that in the process we do not destroy the fundamental principles on which this nation operates.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, because of the Premier's desire to sabotage the future of this country, is he aware that the leading bank economist has predicted that his actions and the actions of others who have that same desire have caused the interest rate to rise by a full percentage point?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, since the Premier refused to answer, he has obviously accepted that he is responsible for it. Is he aware, because of the uncertainty in this country which has been created because of his actions on Meech Lake, that the dollar has also declined?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: The hon. Member is totally wrong. It is probable that the value of the dollar may have declined somewhat by reason of uncertainty. I am not

personally responsible for the uncertainty and I refuse to accept that personal responsibility. There are others in this country who are participating in this discussion, and collectively they have not agreed on a resolution of the matter. That has caused a great deal of uncertainty. So it may well be that due to that uncertainty, for which I may have some responsibility along with all others, that has contributed to a reduction in the value of the dollar.

But let me tell the hon. Member and all Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that if I had known beforehand that actions I would be taking might cause a reduction in the value of the dollar, I would be concerned about what might be the consequences for this Province and for the nation. But then I would say, what are the consequences of your not taking that position? Does that result in a situation where the fundamental principles of this nation, the principles of equality of its citizens and equality of the Province, and the maintenance of the nation as a federal state for the next hundred years are at risk by your lying down in a cowardly way and failing to express your opinion because somebody is going to criticize you? Would I say the devil with the future of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, let them have an earned income that is 58 per cent of the national average and have to rely on national handouts for the next fifty years because I am afraid that somebody is going to criticize me because I may contribute to some reduction in the value of the dollar? No, Mr. Speaker. I put the long-term future of the people of this

country and the people of this Province ahead of any such unimportant consideration by comparison.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, a leading economist today predicted that the interest rates have gone up by a full percentage point, which will cause a \$30 a month increase on a \$50,000 a year mortgage for people in Canada, including Newfoundlanders. Let me ask the Premier, as a result of this action, which has caused the additional burden on mortgage payers in this Province, will his Government subsidize mortgage payments to the tune he has caused them to rise?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we would be in a position to do so if we ever achieve effective Senate reform so that our people could earn an acceptable living in this country, instead of the poverty to which their actions would condemn them forever, to be beggars of the nation, going to the Federal Government asking for handouts!

Mr. Tobin: (Inaudible) on Churchill Falls. You were part of the Government (inaudible) Churchill Falls.

Premier Wells: Let me go back and repeat, Mr. Speaker. I would be

concerned, Mr. Speaker, I would be very concerned if I were not convinced that failing to address the interest of the people of this nation and the people of this Province would condemn them forever to a future of having to rely on the Federal Government for handouts and equalization payments, without having the reasonable expectation of having political and social and economic independence that would come from the kind of Senate reform that is necessary to provide for political, social and economic equality and justice in this country.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier as well. The Premier said recently that he would rather have a poor Newfoundland and Labrador than have a Newfoundland and Labrador part of Canada, under the Meech Lake Accord. My question for the Premier is has he commissioned any studies to determine just how poor Newfoundlanders and Labradorians will be if rejection of the Meech Lake Accord leads to a break-up of the country?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: No, Mr. Speaker. His representation is totally wrong, but I will tell the House precisely what I said.

Mr. Matthews: (Inaudible) you remember what you said?

Premier Wells: No. The misrepresentation of what I said is what bothers me. Now let me start again, Mr. Speaker. The position represented by the hon.

Member is totally and completely inaccurate and does not at all reflect what I said. What I said was, given a choice between the possibility of poverty and the dignity and self-respect that comes with political, social and economic equality and justice on the one hand, or a level of financial comfort resulting from handouts without the opportunity to have the dignity and self-respect to provide for it ourselves, but to be perpetually subordinated to this kind of handout, given those choices, I know what I would choose and I know what I would recommend.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order, please!

Premier Wells: Let me start again, Mr. Speaker. I know very clearly what I would choose, and I know what I would recommend to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) that is what you would choose.

Premier Wells: Let me start again, Mr. Speaker, and emphasize, because I do not want this incorrectly stated, given those two choices, I know what I would choose and I know what I would recommend to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. But, Mr. Speaker, I will not cause it to be imposed on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador against their wishes. So, unlike the former Government, I will not press something on them which they do not want. I will give them the choice to choose it in a referendum, and if they want it, they can have it. If they want dignity and self-respect, they can

have that too.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, with all the repeating, the Premier still did not answer whether or not there have been any studies commissioned.

My supplementary to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Some time ago, he talked about the possibilities, or that he would look seriously at some kind of affiliation with the United States of America rather than remain a province of Canada under the Meech Lake Accord.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Matthews: Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't help it if the Premier says things he does not remember today. But everyone in the Province heard the Premier say it.

My question again is, has the Premier commissioned studies or surveys to determine whether Newfoundland and Labrador would be better off affiliated in some way with the United States of America, or would we be better off being part of Canada with or without Meech Lake?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, it is totally and completely false and inaccurate what the hon. Member said.

Mr. R. Aylward: Everything is false.

Premier Wells: That is right.

As a matter of fact, I have said just the opposite on numerous occasions. Economic union or being a state of the United States is not a matter that I have given a moment's thought or expectation to. It is not in prospect or not in consideration, and I am not going to be involved in any consideration of it. Now that is the position that I have taken. This fraudulent representation which has just been made by the hon. Member is completely without any foundation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me go back and explain exactly what was said. It took place in my office, down underneath here, where I can hear all this desk thumping, with a group of businessmen from Quebec and I pointed out to them the desperate situation Newfoundland was in compared with the people in central Canada; I pointed out to them the economic impact on our people and our having to rely on handouts. And he said, 'Well, don't you think you will be worse off if Quebec separates from Canada and the only option open to you is to become a state of the United States?' Those were his propositions, not mine. I frankly said to him, 'As a matter of fact, if we end up being a province of Canada under the Meech Lake Accord as it is, in economic terms we might be just as well off.' That is what I said. That was the full context of it.

Now, for the hon. Member to convert that into what he just said, shows an abysmal ignorance of the facts, or, otherwise, an attempt to distort the reality and misrepresent the truth.

An Hon. Member: We believe him.

Some Hon. Members: Of course you

do.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Question Period has expired.

I assume, since we agreed to not follow the Orders of the Day to go to Question Period, we now go back to Statements.

Before going to Statements by Ministers, I would like to welcome to the House a former Cabinet Minister, a former M.P., the hon. John Roberts, from Ontario.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

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

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, today I had the pleasure of participating in the kickoff for National Transportation Week, which will run from June 3 to June 9 this year.

I would like to take this opportunity to salute the many Canadians who keep this great Province, and great Nation, on the move. Well over one million men and women from coast to coast work to provide our country with an efficient and reliable multi modal transportation system.

The transportation industry in Newfoundland and Labrador has undergone significant progress over the past number of years, and we are continuing to make more

improvements every year to its infrastructure and facilities.

In 1990-1991, approximately \$104 million will be spent on construction work across Newfoundland and Labrador. This includes upgrading and further four laning of the Trans-Canada Highway, and reconstruction and resurfacing of the Argentia access road. Construction is continuing on the Trans-Labrador Highway, and improvements will be made to many of our secondary highways.

This year will also be a significant one in the marine sector, as we introduce a new ferry for Bell Island, and continue design work on a new ice-breaking ferry for Fogo Island. In addition, Marine Atlantic's new ferry, the M.V. Joseph and Clara Smallwood, will begin its service between North Sydney and Argentia.

As a Province, our economy is largely reliant on all forms of transportation. Furthermore, transportation will continue to play a very major role in all future developments in Newfoundland and Labrador.

The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador proudly joins other Governments in this Nation to proclaim and endorse "National Transportation Week". We are proud of the transportation industry and we wish continued success to all individuals involved in the ongoing efforts to upgrade and improve the transportation services for all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

As Minister responsible for transportation in Newfoundland and Labrador, it is my distinct pleasure to declare provincial

support for, and a continuing commitment to National Transportation Week in Canada from June 3 to June 9.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

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

First of all, I want to thank the Minister for providing me with a copy of his Statement. I want to suggest that the Opposition, too, are proud of the transportation industry in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and we congratulate and endorse The National Transportation Week. But the hon. Member's words ring hollow, Mr. Speaker, about his support of the transportation industry and transportation in this Province when we see that he has reduced the Provincial Budget from some \$50 million the last year we were in power to some \$30 million.

Mr. Speaker, he wanted to cancel the road to Petit Forte, which does not show a great support for the transportation industry. He is trying to negotiate away the money for the Outer Ring Road in St. John's, which does not show great support for the industry or transportation in this Province. He has also delayed construction of the upgrading of the Trans-Canada Highway in the Humber Valley area, which does not show great support for the transportation industry of this Province, and he has yet to state the Province's position, on the year-round ferry service for Argentia which again shows not much of a commitment to the transportation industry of this Province, Mr. Speaker.

Petitions

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

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to present a petition calling on the Government to reinstate funding for the hospital school in western Newfoundland for the two Department of Education teaching positions at Western Memorial Regional Hospital. Mr. Speaker, this petition is really in two parts; there is an original petition addressed to this hon. House of Assembly signed by eight or so residents of different parts of the Province, people who work in and around this Chamber. And then a photocopy of a petition signed by about 140 people in the Corner Brook area, mostly employees of Western Memorial Regional Hospital. As I understand it the original of that hospital employees petition was sent to the Minister of Education, a copy was faxed to me this morning, and with Your Honour's permission I would like to proceed to read the text of that hospital employees petition.

'We the ...

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I appreciate the hon. Member's informing the House as to the form of the petition because there have been some petitions presented that have not been in the proper form and the correct procedure always, of course, is for the Member presenting the petition to inform the House of its nature and then by agreement we can proceed. So I appreciate the hon. Member's telling us of the form and now it is up to hon. Members whether they

allow the hon. Member to proceed with the petition.

Ms Verge: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not consulting Your Honour in advance.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member did quite all right.

Ms Verge: It was my understanding that in this session there was an agreement that the rules for the form of petitions would be relaxed. In any case I do have an original in the correct form which is signed by eight or nine people.

The text of the hospital employees petition, a copy of which I am about to table, is: We the undersigned are very concerned that the hospital school administered by the Department of Education at Western Memorial Regional Hospital is being closed. The school program which consists of a classroom for pediatrics and one for the Child and Adolescent Guidance Service called CAGS is an integral part of the childrens care. Its absence will be very detrimental to the children of the west coast. We ask the hon. Phil Warren, Minister of Education to reconsider this regressive step.

Mr. Speaker, the letter accompanying the petition says, and I will quote excerpts, the people who have signed this petition are extremely concerned over the decision to close our school in Western Memorial Regional Hospital. We have seen this school in operation over the years and realize its value to the sick children on the west coast. And then this is the really important part of the message, Mr. Speaker. The school is a haven for children who are in unfamiliar

and frightening situations. It gives them a chance to get away from the nursing and medical environment, and to get involved in activities which are familiar and non-threatening. Recovery time is quicker and the emotional trauma of hospitalization is considerably less because of the school program here.

Parents and children alike are relieved to find that they do not have the added worry of time missed from school while in hospital, that they do not have to scurry around trying to contact teachers or get books and assignments. The hospital teacher provides that service for them.

And then it goes on, Mr. Speaker, to say many of our children come to hospital on a regular basis for treatment of chronic illnesses such as diabetes, asthma or leukemia. For these children it is particularly important that their education not be interrupted every time they come to hospital. The teacher knows these children and provides a constant educational program for them.

Last year we had nearly 2000 pediatric admissions, 2000, Mr. Speaker, and as many as 450 of those children attended our school. It would be an administrative nightmare if they tried to decide which of them qualified for a tutor, first of all, and then to actually attempt to provide individual tutors for these children.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in attempting to defend the Government's Budgetary decision to eliminate the Regional Hospital Schools, to eliminate all the hospital schools outside St. John's, the Minister of Education, in grasping at straws, has said

the home tutor program will substitute. Mr. Speaker, as the hospital employees have said in their letter, that is no substitute. The home tutor program regulations allow for a maximum expenditure of \$150 per month. Now, Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher yourself Your Honour will realize that many substitute teachers in our Province with superior qualifications and experience earn \$150 a day for substituting in the classroom.

The Minister of Education in other discussions, has said that school boards will substitute service to hospital patients. Mr. Speaker, school boards have not been consulted about this, and school boards do not have the wherewithal to provide services to hospitals. School boards are stretched to the limit already and their burden has been added to because of the underfunding provided in this Budget, because of the fact that their operating grants have been cut effectively when inflation is factored in.

Mr. Speaker, the most feeble attempt at defending this regressive Budget decision was the Minister of Education's statements that some hospitals in the Province do not have teachers, and therefore it is not fair for Grand Falls, Corner Brook and St. Anthony hospitals to have teachers. What the Minister failed to point out is that the Department will continue to employ all thirteen teachers at the Janeway in St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, that is a direct contradiction of the Liberal campaign promise to equalize educational services throughout the Province, and it seems to be a

move by the Minister of Education to equalize west of the overpass by downgrading instead of upgrading. Mr. Speaker, I heartedly endorse this petition urging the Government to reverse its terribly regressive Budget decision, which will lead to the closure of all the regional hospital schools outside St. John's, and which will have a harmful affect to the education and health of young people who are hospital patients, both inpatients and outpatients.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, do I have equal time, because I want to provide some facts about the situation here? I am rather amazed at a number of things in the hon. Member's comments. She has not been listening for the last two or three weeks in this House when I have indicated that the Department have directed my officials to start working with school boards between now and the end of August to ensure that students who need care, educational service in the hospitals, will get it. We have no intention of denying students who need educational programs, who are in hospitals for extended periods, from receiving the care that they deserve and they need.

I have not provided all of the facts, but I think it is important to put it on the record now the numbers of students involved. There are four teachers we have heard the Opposition talk about in the last few weeks. We are talking about four teachers -

Ms Verge: (Inaudible).

Dr. Warren: - very important teachers. I did not say a word when the hon. Member was making her comments, could I have the same courtesy? Could I have the same courtesy, please, from the hon. Member?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

That is an accepted tradition of the House that when an hon. Member is speaking and asks for silence, then that should be granted. I am sure that hon. Members will acquiesce to the request of the Minister of Education.

The hon. the Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The enrolments are going down dramatically from what the hon. Member mentioned, the 400. I have the latest figures for 1989 - 1990. The number in Grand Falls, the daily average was six students, one teacher. The daily average in St. Anthony was three students in 1989 - 1990; the daily average in Corner Brook was ten students in 1989 - 1990; two teachers in Corner and one in St. Anthony and one in Grand Falls. Many students spend much longer periods of time at home than many of the students who go into hospital, but I have guaranteed the people in the area, and I have asked my officials to start the investigation, that we will provide educational programs to students who are in hospital for extended periods. I am going to report to the individuals concerned. I will respond to the petition. I will write everybody who has written me. I will provide the data on the numbers of students and the numbers of teachers involved and our plans to

ensure that students who need educational programs next year get it.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to have a few words in support of the petition from the 150 or so names of people from the west coast asking the Minister and the Government to reconsider this decision. It is a follow-up to representations that I know he has received from the central Newfoundland area on the same topic. He makes much to do about the daily average of students in the hospital, on a daily basis. But he neglects to point out the fact, and this was pointed out to him by the Hospital Board I know in central Newfoundland, many of these young people are people suffering from very serious illnesses which require them to come back into the hospitals on a regular basis. He has received representations from the Board, he has received representations from the professionals, the nursing profession in particular in these hospitals.

He has now received a representation in the last day or so, of which I received a copy, from the pastoral group which services the hospital in central Newfoundland, and they make the point that the importance of the child receiving a proper all-rounded education is what is important here. That is what the importance is in terms of this whole issue. It is not simply cutting out a program. Why cut out a program that is having a good affect? Why cut out a program that is positive and successful? If you want to extend

some semblance of a program to other hospitals then that is a separate issue, but the Government continues to cancel programs without having a substitute program in place. We have seen it with the Youth Diversion Program in Grand Falls, no substitute in place. We have seen it with respect to some other issues that have been raised recently in the House, the Coach House, no program in place, and we now see it with respect to the pediatric hospitals. So, if all the professionals say the Minister is wrong, that this is a backward step, and is hurting the situation, if the boards are all saying it, and if the pastoral people who provide pastoral services to students and patients in the hospital are saying it, and now the people, through this petition, are saying the same thing, when is this Minister going to wake up and realize that what the people are saying is right.

Do not cancel a program that is giving such benefit to those regions of the Province we referred to, and if he wants to do something else in other hospitals then proceed to do it, find the funds to do it elsewhere, but do not cut something that is having a tremendous impact positively on the people and on those young people that have to participate in those hospital visits on a regular or frequent basis.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I stand today to present a petition on behalf of approximately 150 people from the community of Beau Bois and Little Bay in my District. The prayer of the petition is to call upon the Government of

Newfoundland and Labrador to upgrade the road and have it paved from Little Bay bridge to, and including, the community of Beau Bois. Mr. Speaker, that is a very reasonable request from the people of Little Bay and Beau Bois, indeed reasonable to the extent that it was included to be part of the Budget of 1989. That was included in a Cabinet document until this Government got in power and decided they were only going to provide paving and water and sewer work to those who voted Liberal, and to throw to the wolves the people who decided to vote for the Conservative Party in the last election. That is what is taking place, Mr. Speaker, since this Government came to power.

They preach fairness and balance, and at the same time they do not know what the words mean in terms of their action. Many people may not be aware of where Beau Bois and Little Bay are situated in the District. I am sure the Minister of Development is not, Mr. Speaker. Do you know where Beau Bois is? I did not think he did, Mr. Speaker. Let me tell him that Little Bay is part of Marystown, as a matter of fact, and the road that started from Creston Boulevard, the Marine Drive road, was started and completed to the Little Bay bridge, the bridge was constructed, finished, and then the continuation was to take place from the Little Bay bridge to resurface and to upgrade and pave the community of Beau Bois, which will not cost a whole lot of money. As a matter of fact the estimates on that road there were approximately, Mr. Speaker, yes, resurfacing and paving from Little Bay bridge to Beau Bois, approximately 2.5 kilometers. It would cost \$300,000 to complete

that job.

That was a project that was ongoing in the District of Burin - Placentia West and is a project that should be completed, but in the last two years, Mr. Speaker, we have seen that this Government has decided to put no money at all into the road from Little Bay to Beau Bois strictly on a very parochial partisan stance. I see the Minister of Transportation outside and I ask him to come in and listen to what I have to say because this is vitally important to the Minister of Transportation. It is extremely important to the people in my District. When one considers the people of Beau Bois and Little Bay, the trawler captains and the trawler crews, they probably pay more money in income tax per capita than any other community in this Province, so I say to the Minister of Transportation, through this House, and on behalf of the people, that the people of Little Bay and Beau Bois are Newfoundlanders. They are hardworking Newfoundlanders. They have paid their way and they deserve better from this Government.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe they deserve, and I know they deserve, the paved highway that was included, by the way, in Cabinet submission T15-89. It is time for this Government to honour commitments that were made by the previous Administration instead of trying to destroy everything. We have seen how they have tried to destroy other issues that were pertinent to this Province. The Minister of Transportation has done the same to the communities of Rock Harbour, and now he is doing it to Beau Bois and to Little Bay. Not only that, Mr.

Speaker, we can take it further than this because that is not nearly what is needed in the District of Burin - Placentia West to complete the roads that are desperately needed there, and I ask the Minister of Transportation, on behalf of these people to consider, to seriously give consideration to the paving of this road.

This is important enough for the people there to go door to door and collect names on a petition. They have been eating dust long enough. It is now time for this Government to honour the commitments that were in place by the previous Administration, and if the Minister wants to know where it was, it was in T15-89 in the Cabinet submission, that's where it was, and that's something, Mr. Speaker, like the airline strip to Winterland.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, yes, I did promise it in the election. I promised it and we were going to honour it because we had committed it, not because the politicians, but because the bureaucrats in the Department of Transportation said it was needed and it was on the priority list and I am now asking Your Honour the same thing!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed. Order, please!

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

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you very

much, Mr. Speaker. I want to stand in this House and support the petition so ably presented by the hon. Member for Burin - Placentia West. Mr. Speaker, it is a fairly minor amount of money for a fairly important improvement to the transportation system for the people of Beau Bois, I believe is how it should be pronounced, and Little Bay. How ironic that on the day the Minister of Transportation announces his rhetoric I guess, announces his support for the transportation industry and for transportation generally in this Province, that we have a petition from 150 residents of a smaller community in our Province looking for improvements to their transportation, not only do they deserve the improvements requested, Mr. Speaker, and I realize that money is tight in this Province but in 1988/89, I believe, when the capital works program was prepared and recommended by the staff of the Department of Transportation, this project was included and it would have been completed so that the people of this area of our Province could have had their improvements in their transportation completed by this time.

Mr. Speaker, this being National Transportation Week, I expect that the Minister of Transportation will now stand in his place and honour the commitment that was given by the previous Government, by the Department of Transportation at the time, to improve the transportation needs of the people of this area of the Province, by continuing the work that had already been started, so that the people of Beau Bois and Little Bay could have the same transportation standards that are

deserving of all residents of this Province.

This lack of improvement to the transportation of this area, is a direct result of the removal of some \$20 million a year from the capital works program of the Department of Transportation, and many of the small projects similar to this one would have been completed by this time and the residents of the area would not have to petition Members of this House of Assembly to try to get some basic services, such as an improved transportation system for their part of the Province.

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

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am always glad to see that the people of the Province recognize their right to go from door to door and take up the names and petition this House because really, it is their House, and a petition I suppose, is the oldest right that we have in the English parliamentary system, where people have the right to let their elected representatives know the concerns they have and the ones they want addressed in this House. So when we hear the Member for Placentia West talk about a petition for the people of Beau Bois and Little Bay, I can appreciate the fact they would like to have their road paved, but I might point out there are people who live in a lot of areas in Newfoundland who would like to have their road paved. There are 3,000 kilometers of gravel road, Mr. Speaker, all over Newfoundland that has to be upgraded.

And as for the Member for Burin - Placentia West saying it was

promised during the last election, I would not at all be surprised but it was promised during the last election, because the promises that were made during the last election by that Government over there, in their desperate grab to hold on to power, if they were all kept, Mr. Speaker, there would not be an inch of gravel road left in Newfoundland. So it is all very well for Members over there to stand up and say it was promised during the election. Sure it was promised during the election as were fifteen stadiums promised during the election. And everything else that they wanted was promised. There are Cabinet papers to cover it all.

But if the previous Government had not nearly bankrupted the Province in the seventeen years they were in power, we might have been in the position today to carry on some programs and to upgrade the paving a lot faster than was ever done before.

Mr. Speaker, the situation that we found ourselves in was we took over a Government that was bankrupt by seventeen years of misrule by the Members opposite.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gilbert: So here is what we have now, we have to stand up and make the sanctimonious pleas that they decided they were going to do something when they were in power. They promised anything, Mr. Speaker, in order to hang on to power. But I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I sympathize with the people of Beau Bois and Little Bay and it will certainly be taken under consideration and put in the list for future consideration by the civil servants of the Department, not like they used to

do it with the politicians getting their grubby hands into it and putting pavement in the way that people vote. We do not do that, Mr. Speaker. It is done on a priority and needs basis, and if the road to Beau Bois and Little Bay comes up under the priority and needs basis of this Department next year, do not worry, Mr. Speaker, they will get it, if not rest assured that we have their concerns and we will be looking after it.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Speaker: Motion 1, the Adjourned Budget Debate, and I believe that the hon. the Member for Kilbride adjourned the debate and it looks like he is anxious to carry on.

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

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

I have only five or six minutes left in this debate. When I finished last night I was going to take the Liberal Members for St. John's area to task about a slur that their leader passed on the constituents in their ridings, in their Districts in this part of the Province, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, I am going to leave that for a minute because I only have a few minutes left and I want to say a couple of words about Meech Lake. I would say that probably up to about a week or so ago I was like many people in this Province who are sick and tired of hearing about Meech Lake. I was of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, like many Newfoundlanders, that we have elected leaders in this country whose job it is to lead and to

govern, and I was willing to let them go about their work, if they would go about their work and settle this issue, so that we could get on with the more important needs, I say, to this Province, of economic renewal and economic revival that the Liberal Government promised, Mr. Speaker.

But over the last -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I want to bring to hon. Members' attention that there is a lot of loud talking going on, particularly to my left, and this sort of disrupts the debate. If hon. Members want to talk, have a meeting, they should go outside.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: While we are in the House here we should be listening to hon. Members. When we do this we sort of get out of control and nobody can hear what is going on and most of all it makes it very difficult for the person speaking.

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: A good ruling, Mr. Speaker.

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

There are just a couple of points I want to make on this Meech Lake. One of them being, that over the last week or week and a half, my constituents have been talking to me in a different frame; they have not been saying so much to me that oh, Clyde is right, let him get on with his business. Yes, I support him. He knows what he is doing. He is a

constitutional lawyer. I was hearing all of these comments from my constituents up until the last week or week and a half, Mr. Speaker, and two constituents, in particular, made the point to me of their change in heart of what they had believed would be okay, to allow Clyde to look after what is happening.

One of them was a fairly elderly gentleman, and he went over a little history to me. First of all, he started by telling me that he is getting scared. He feels scared. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is a big statement for a senior citizen in this Province to make. Senior citizens should not have to feel scared, Mr. Speaker, about what is going to happen. But he said, he felt this way several other times when there were major issues in the world that he also felt scared about. And I remembered some of them, Mr. Speaker, when he mentioned them to me, although it hadn't come to me. But he said there was a time in our history when the Cuban missile crisis was on the go and it left a very uneasy, scared feeling with him that something might happen to cause a war between America and Russia, at the time.

Mr. Speaker, he also had that same scared feeling at the time, in his words, and I hadn't thought of it this way before, John F. Kennedy was assassinated. There was an unease in his heart and mind of what might happen to the world.

He also had the same type of uneasy feeling, he was telling me, at world trouble, in major flare-ups such as Vietnam and other areas. He had this fear he could not explain because it didn't directly affect him, but he

certainly did have fear in him.

He told me this fear has once again been rekindled, because the fear he has now, a very legitimate fear I think, is that the best country in the world is about to split, Mr. Speaker. Canada is the best country in the world, and he feels that unless there is some agreement on Meech Lake in the near future, Canada will no longer exist as we know it and have known it in the past. That is what gives him this fear, the same fear he had during major world crises in his past.

Mr. Grimes: (Inaudible).

Mr. R. Aylward: The hon. the Member for Exploits - I can't get off track now, Mr. Speaker; I would like to debate it with him - is not allowed to get up and speak his mind in the House, so he has to try to keep shooting back and forth. He should be up.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read from a copy of a letter sent me by a constituent of mine. I know him fairly well actually, we went to school together at St. Bon's. It is a letter to the Premier, and again expresses the feeling of fear or uncertainty that is changing over the last week and a half. The letter to Mr. Wells reads: 'Your approach to the Meech Lake Accord appears to be totally inflexible and even dangerous to the country itself. You should realize that your vision of Canada may not be attainable and that you may have to settle for the best you can get. I fear that by the time you are finished, we Newfoundlanders may be part of a common market, a sovereignty association or, even worse, the United States. Under any of these situations,

Newfoundland will lose greatly. I think it is unjust, if not dishonest of you not to inform all Newfoundlanders of the gamble you are taking with your ultra hard-line approach.' Mr. Speaker, these are very harsh statements for this person. You would have to know this person -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

Mr. R. Aylward: One last sentence in this letter, Mr. Speaker: 'Canada is the best country in the world and the resultant major loss to the Newfoundland economy at a time when political leaders require and must display trust and tolerance, you appear to be opposed.'

Some Hon. Members: No leave!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman does not have leave of the House, so I ask him to take his seat, please.

Mr. R. Aylward: That is the letter, Mr. Speaker, and I will ask this gentleman to send this on to the media if hon. Members don't want to hear it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I refer to hon. Members, and the hon. Member ought to know differently, that when the Speaker rises, an hon. Member ought to take his place immediately. The Chair cannot tolerate that kind of thing; the Chair has to enforce the rules of the House. When the Chair makes a decision in this respect, then the hon. Member ought to take his place immediately. The Chair was

looking frantically for the quotation in Beauchesne, but I am sure all hon. Members are aware of it and know that it is there.

Mr. R. Aylward: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I was looking at the letter and I did not hear you. Hon. Members were making so much noise, I did not hear you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question. Question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in this debate. For the benefit of hon. Members opposite who missed the letter my colleague for Kilbride would like to read, I shall read it into the record for him. It is to Premier Wells, and it is from Kilbride. It says: 'Your approach to the Meech Lake Accord appears to be totally inflexible and even dangerous' -

An Hon. Member: You can't read that, can you?

Mr. Tobin: I can read what I like.

- to the country itself. You should realize that your vision of Canada may not be attainable and you may have to settle for a lot less than you can get. I fear that by the time you are finished, we Newfoundlanders may be part of a common market, a sovereignty association, or the U.S. Under any of these situations, Newfoundland will lose greatly. I think it is unjust if not dishonest' - I will repeat that - 'I think it is unjust if not

dishonest of you not to inform all Newfoundlanders of the gamble you are taking with your ultra harsh approach.

Canada is the best country in the world, and any new arrangement will result in a major loss to the Newfoundland economy. At a time when political leaders require and must display trust and tolerance, you appear to be the opposite.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what has taken place in the last week in this Province as it relates to Meech Lake. In the last week, Mr. Speaker, when people are concerned, people heard on the radio the Premier shouting across to the Member from Green Bay 'I don't care about your father's pension.' 'I do not care about your father's pension,' is what the Premier said.

Some Hon. Members: Shame! Shame!

Mr. Tobin: And is it everybody's father's pension they do not care about, or is it just one Member? I know what he said. We all know what he said. That is what the Premier said. He does not care about the pensions to the old age people in this Province, Mr. Speaker. His ego is too big for him to care about the pension of anyone in this Province. He has one ultra commitment, and that is the destruction of this country. Everybody else can fall by the wayside in his attack, Mr. Speaker, on the unity of this country which has been a great place to live for in excess of one hundred years. That is where the Premier of this Province is coming from. He does not care. For an old age pensioner in this Province, the Premier stands and says, regarding Meech Lake, I do not care about your father's

pension.

Mr. R. Aylward: Shame!

Mr. Tobin: What despicable tactics, Mr. Speaker, for the Premier of this Province to be using on such an important issue. Does he care about the UI people depend on, or is he going to throw that away too? Does he care about the Medicare system in this Province, Mr. Speaker? I suggest he does not care about the pension of an old age person, he does not care, Mr. Speaker, about the pensions of anyone, or Medicare for anyone.

Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker, will not be hoodwinked by this Premier into believing that separation from Canada will not result in the loss of their social programs. The Premier of this Province will never be let, Mr. Speaker, mislead the public of this Province by such tactics. They will know the truth. The truth will be told by people on this side and in this Province who support a unified country, who believe, Mr. Speaker, in a Medicare system. We are not all rich people like the Premier. There are poor people in this Province, and they should not be crucified and basically be put to ruin because of the destruction of social programs to satisfy the ego of one man in this Province. It should not be allowed to happen, and it will not be allowed to happen. And there are other issues.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Yes, and the Minister of Social Services should be very concerned lest the Canada Pension Act is scuttled, if 50 per cent of that is taken. Every dollar the Minister of Social Services

spends, Mr. Speaker, is in jeopardy at this moment if Canada is destroyed. Do not lose sight of that. Mr. Speaker, he couldn't keep the refugees here, and he was attacking them basically every day because they were here costing us money. What happens if the Premier is successful in destroying this nation? What happens, Mr. Speaker, to the Canada Pension Act? What happens to the fifty cent dollars this Minister spends when there is no country?

Mr. Speaker, last week I heard a statement, or a release, from the UIC office in Marystown.

An Hon. Member: Sit down, boy. Sit down!

Mr. Tobin: What was that?

An Hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Tobin: When you become Speaker, I will sit down. The way you have been getting on in the House in the last few days, I do not think there is any worry about you being Speaker.

Last week, I heard a release from the Marystown UIC office which said that for the first quarter this year - the Minister of Development should listen to this because he is one of the people responsible for it - the Marystown UIC office paid out in excess of \$14 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, \$14 million! Do you know what is going to happen in one or two months time? Do you know what is going to happen? There is going to be a shrimp trawler sail into Marystown, constructed for FPI, which was built where? She was built in Norway, Mr. Speaker, because this Minister and this Government refused to provide a

subsidy to the Marystown Shipyard and, in so doing, they sent back millions of dollars to the Federal Treasury. Millions of dollars went back to the Federal Treasury because this Government refused to subsidize the shrimp trawler. Why, Mr. Speaker? Why? We have built trawlers. We went to Ottawa, negotiated agreements and built trawlers, yet this Government refused to subsidize the construction of that shrimp trawler. To me, that is a sad commentary on this Government and this Minister.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: And I can get back. That is why there is so much unemployment in this Province.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Yes, that happened in the last year. I can tell you right now, Sir, without any fear of contradiction, that if this party here was the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, that shrimp trawler would have been constructed in Marystown. It would have been. Now, the Minister of Development knows that is true.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: No, I would say something further, that the Minister of Development had a job to get it even if the union had to take no wage increases, and the collective bargaining system had been thrown out the window, as it was when the Premier was Minister of Labour back in the sixties. If all of that had to take place, and as we are seeing taking place now with the President of Treasury Board, when you hear on the news and read in the papers what the

collect bargaining process is doing in this Province -

Mr. Grimes: (Inaudible) know what is going on.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, you ought to talk. You ought to talk, the way you got on when you were President of the NTA, and now you are trying to put their pensions on the table to negotiate.

An Hon. Member: Strip it.

Mr. Tobin: Strip it. You ought to talk. They have seen your colour, and the colour of the Minister of Employment. We have seen your colour, how you treated the teachers since you became part of this Government. You should hang your head in shame. You should hang your head in shame for the way you used the NTA to come into this House and then turned your back on them when you got in here. There is a name they call people like that, but it is unparliamentary and I will not use it. But I hope you know what it is. You should be ashamed of yourself.

An Hon. Member: Tell him what it is.

Mr. Tobin: No, I will not tell him what it is because it is unparliamentary. Unlike my colleague from Placentia, I cannot get away with unparliamentary stuff. Not to suggest, Your Honour, that you let him away with it or anything like that. But I do not have the knack, Mr. Speaker, to shout things across this House and not get picked up on it like my colleague from Placentia. He is constantly at it. Mr. Speaker, I will not say it because it is unparliamentary. Whenever I say something

unparliamentary - most of what I say that is unparliamentary is true, but despite the fact that it is true, if the Premier asks me to withdraw it, I withdraw.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, the Member for Exploits should not interrupt or interject when someone is speaking about the state of labour relations in this Province because of the way he used the NTA, the tactic he used to get into this House, and then come in here and turn his back on the teachers the way he has and allow the President of Treasury Board to try to strip their pension plan, Mr. Speaker, is unbelievable. No wonder my colleague for Grand Falls had to place non-confidence in this Government. I just picked up this Budget highlight document and I glanced through it for probably the twentieth time and it says, the following expenditure reductions are being implemented. Everyone should listen to this, the following expenditure reductions are being implemented. Do you know what the first one is? Expenditures for travel supplies and operating items have been kept to a minimum. The fleet of vehicles operated by the Province will be reduced.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fleet of vehicles will be reduced for the Province. Do you know something, when they said that they were being truthful, because the fleet of cars were being reduced for the Province, but we on this side did not have any dreams that they were going to pay themselves \$8000 of the taxpayers money to buy a car for themselves, and then supply a credit card to go with her. We never realized when they were saying it was going to be reduced for the Province they meant it was

going to be increased for themselves. We never even thought about it, Mr. Speaker, it never crossed our minds. When this Government over there can sit down while the Minister of Social Services cuts the funding to the community living to \$38,000, while the Minister cuts the funding to Grand Falls, while the Minister does all of this, and while the Minister of Education cuts the schools for the sick children of this Province, while he cuts that program, while the Minister of Education who pretends, and does a great job at pretending how concerned he is about the educational needs, when he turns on the sick children in this Province in a way that I never thought would happen, I never thought the Minister of Education would do it.

They stand by him when all this happens and then vote \$8000, plus a credit card for themselves to buy gas and everything else.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: He was not in Cabinet. Satisfied the way it was. Our Leader thinks it should be the way it was, believes strongly it should be the way it was. The fact of the matter is the Minister of Development wants to go on the defensive, and so he should. He should be ashamed of himself. He gave himself \$8000 a year to buy a car, \$16,000 this year.

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Tobin: Yes you will. No wonder we put non-confidence in that Government. The Minister of Finance gutted everything that stood.

An Hon. Member: Lies.

Mr. Tobin: It is true. I am not telling lies. I know the dates. You are receiving \$8000 1 June and on 1 April you are getting another \$8000, this fiscal year. I know that the Minister of Transportation is not very happy with the Minister of Finance.

An Hon. Member: Why is that?

Mr. Tobin: Because the Minister of Finance bought a Chev in St. John's and did not do what some other people did and bought a Ford in Grand Falls. The Minister of Transportation lost out on a deal, Mr. Speaker. I have a question that has to be answered in this House. It is far beyond me to suggest there is any conflict here but I think what has to happen is that this House has to know how many cars the Minister purchased from the Minister of Transportation, if any were purchased. That is a question that has to be answered. They voted themselves \$8000 a year to buy a car and how many then turned to their colleague around the Cabinet table and bought the car? There is no public tendering now, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: Ask the question tomorrow.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, I may ask the question tomorrow, I may ask that question, I just thought about that. That is a question that has to be answered. What they have done, Mr. Speaker, is, eliminated the public tendering process for cars, that's what they have done, they have eliminated it, and the President of Treasury Board, we see how he connived, we saw how the President of Treasury Board connived to get clear of the

Ombudsman. We saw how they combined to get clear of the Ombudsman. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suspect they have now found a way to get around the Public Tendering Act, and buy the cars out of the tax payers money where they like. Where did they buy them, that's the question I want answered! Where did the Minister of Development buy his car? I would like to know! Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. John's South can get up and speak, he never spoke in the House since last year one time--

Mr. Murphy: I spoke once and I made more sense than you do everytime you get up.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: Well, Mr. Speaker, I missed his speech, because if the Member for St. John's South makes sense, I missed the speech, because since I have known him he never made any sense.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: There is the man who cut back on the President or the vice-president who was here yesterday in the House when my colleague raised it from the Community Living Foundation, slashed their Budget to \$38,000 from what we gave them.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) what he thought.

An Hon. Member: Yes, I did!

Mr. Tobin: Yes, indeed he did. Yes, Mr. Speaker, \$38,000 from \$50,000, you know what that was? Two cars, two cars! That's what he did, he bought two cars out of the money that he cut. He bought his car, bought his car out of the

money he took out of the Community Living Foundation and the Minister of Education, where did he buy his car? The Minister of Health: how many cars did the Minister of Health buy by closing down Grand Bank and St. Lawrence? That's the tack. The sick and the suffering were not important to the Minister of Health, no importance whatsoever. I want a new car. So what did he do? They all bought new cars, so he said I will have to close down the hospital, so in order to satisfy the wishes -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: That's true, that's true! The Minister of Health bought a new car for himself and the Minister of Health also closed down Grand Bank and St. Lawrence. That is a fact! Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you something. Knowing where the Member works I am sure he is not familiar with the truth and I can understand his becoming upset.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: And that's another fact. Mr. Speaker, my colleague for St. John's South should have taken an extended vacation, because his contribution to this Legislature since he came back has been negative. Nothing whatsoever. Okay, skip out and good-bye. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish him well on his vacation to because he is soon going to have a long one. The Member for Bonavista South, the back bench lawyer - he will be there forever. He will be in the back benches forever because the Premier is putting him on every committee possible. The Premier thinks he needs a lawyer on every committee and the poor old Member for Bonavista South, who

campaigned for me, Mr. Speaker, who campaigned for me, who worked on my campaigns, the Member for Bonavista South, Mr. Speaker, he worked on my campaigns, he came to my victory parties, he danced and celebrated when I won the elections. He had a great -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Oh yes, he did, yes, he did. He was so excited, Mr. Speaker, I believe he did the step dance that night by himself and for those of you who missed his dance, you should get him to dance for you some time. Bring him to your party. Mr. Speaker, he did that, the same as the Member for Bellevue, the same as the Member for Bellevue who wanted to run for us, the same as the Member for Bellevue who approached myself and my colleague for Grand Bank, wanted to run for us a few moths before the election, don't kid yourselves, he did that.

An Hon. Member: Tell him more. Tell him more.

Mr. Tobin: I will not tell all. I am not going to tell the rest of it. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure there would be other Members. The Member for St. John's South is pointing at me to point at the Member for Placentia. The Member for St. John's South is over there pointing at the Member for Placentia when I talk about people running for the Conservative Party. Mr. Speaker, the Member did run for the Conservative Party and the Member for Placentia did run for the Conservative Party back in 1972 for the nomination. He found out then, Mr. Speaker, that he would never be elected as a Conservative, and he did not run for us any more. He became a Liberal. He went out and he got

elected as a Liberal. I respect him for doing it, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: The Member for Gander should still run for the NDP. It is the first time ever I have seen a socialist sitting next to a Conservative in a Liberal Government.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I did not know he ran for us.

The Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, was a Conservative one time. Sure he was.

An Hon. Member: He got kicked out of the party.

Mr. Tobin: It came to an abrupt ending, Mr. Speaker. Something that I am not going to discuss.

An Hon. Member: The only person in Newfoundland ever removed from a political party.

Mr. Tobin: I wasn't even around when it happened. I know nothing about it and I am going to say nothing about it.

Mr. Parsons: That is right.

Mr. Tobin: The Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, is -

An Hon. Member: The Member for Placentia ran for us.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, I remember that, I remember the Member for Placentia running for us. I remember he was thinking about running for us in 1979 and I advised him against it. I said, 'Bill, I do not think the Tories want you.' So I advised him, and

that is when he cut it clean. He ran for the Liberals at the same time. If my memory serves me correctly you probably called, but I am not sure, Mr. Speaker. When I am not sure, I will not say it for sure.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Who?

Yes, he did ran for the nomination in 1972 him and Frank O'Leary and Bill Patterson. I will tell you something else. I would have liked to have seen the results of the Member who won the nomination. I would wonder what would have happened to Mr. Smallwood had the Member won the nomination.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: No, Mr. Patterson won the nomination but I would have like to have seen the results if Mr. Hogan had won the nomination.

An Hon. Member: He would have defeated Smallwood.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, any man who is a shareholder in Rolls Royce to ask 'am I the only Liberal.' No, Mr. Speaker, you are one of the Conservatives that are over there.

The Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, is a Liberal, but he is a poor author, Mr. Speaker, if anyone read that book. He does not know much about that.

An Hon. Member: He is not really a Liberal he closed down too many hospital beds and too many hospitals for that.

Mr. Tobin: That is right.

The Minister of Transportation is a Conservative, the worst kind of a Conservative, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: Yes, the worse kind of a Conservative, he is a bad Conservative.

Mr. Tobin: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for LaPoile does not know what he is. He does not know what he is. Billy the Banker, Mr. Speaker, he does not know what he is. As a matter of fact -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: He does not know what he is, Mr. Speaker. He is as confused on the ferry service to Bell Island as the President of Treasury Board, who is a socialist, is on the spray program.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: There is Billy the Banker, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, would you ask the Minister of Education to stop interrupting me please.

Now that is what is taking place in this Province. We have a Government who went out and paid \$8,000 for cars. We have a Premier who wants to cut out all the social programs and join the United States, don't kid yourselves.

Premier Wells: That is not true.

Mr. Tobin: That is true. The question of the Member for Grand Bank today shows it is true, the Premier said we would be better off with the United States.

An Hon. Member: No, no! Go way, boy!

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, the (inaudible) is leaving. The Premier said it is better to be part of the United States -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: He did say it!

Mr. Speaker, ask the Members about Mississippi and some of the other states in the United States. What have they done? They are as poor as church mice. And that is where the Premier wants to bring us. He wants to cut out social programs, Mr. Speaker. Not everybody in this Province has lots of money.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Yes, not only that, through his actions, every Newfoundlander who has a \$50,000 mortgage today, is paying an extra \$300 a month because of the Premier.

An Hon. Member: Thirty dollars a month.

Mr. Tobin: Thirty dollars a month. Because of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, every Newfoundlander with a \$50,000 a year mortgage is paying an additional \$30 a month.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: That is true. Billy the banker knows, Mr. Speaker. That's what is taking place in this Province, \$30 a month on a \$50,000 mortgage because of the Government's desire, Mr. Speaker - that Premier's ego has him committed to the destruction of this country. Don't let anyone forget it. The Premier stood in this House and told the Member for Green Bay, 'I couldn't care less about your father's pension.' That's what he said.

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

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

Mr. Grimes: Defending the Premier, I would seek direction from the Chair, if I could, Mr. Speaker, on how properly to deal with a Member who totally misrepresents what another Member said in the Chamber. I know we are not allowed to say 'You are a liar', it is unparliamentary and I would not do that; however, the Member, in his speech now, at least four times, has said that the Premier doesn't care about pensions, wants people to lose their pensions. Hansard clearly shows on May 25th that the Premier, in responding to that issue, said, "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." That is far from what that Member said, and I would like to, on the point of order, ask, Mr. Speaker, how it is that a Member can stand up and basically misrepresent totally the truth without its being drawn to somebody's attention.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

There is really no point of order. The hon. Member has stood on, really, a point of clarification.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

There is, really, a difference of opinion here, I guess, between the two hon. Members on a statement the Premier made some time ago. There is really no point of order.

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member just read that the Premier of this Province said, I am not concerned about the hon. Member's pension. The Premier said it, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Now, Mr. Speaker, that he wants to answer questions, he confirmed that the Premier said he was not concerned about the hon. Member's father's pension. Ask the Premier is he concerned about everybody else's father's pension. That is the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!
Order, please!

Dr. Kitchen: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Old anti-confederate,
Mr. Speaker!

The fact of the matter is, the Premier is not concerned about the old age pensioners. He said it, the Member for Exploits confirmed it, Mr. Speaker. That's what is taking place here. Is he not concerned, Mr. Speaker? Is the Minister of Finance not concerned about the old age pensioners? Because there are a lot of them living in his District. If you support the Premier, go down and tell them you are not concerned about their pensions. Shame on the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker! Shame on the Minister of Finance! The Member, Mr. Speaker, is not concerned about old age

pensioners.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Tobin: I am concerned about old age pensioners.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Tobin: By leave, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: No leave.

Mr. Speaker: No leave.

Are you ready for the question?

The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, I just have a few comments, a couple of topics I want to talk about. I understand the end of the Budget Speech is drawing near. I expect for the rest of the session we will be on bills and Private Member's Day, and there are just a couple of items I want to bring up and I do hope somebody on the other side will respond. One of the questions which has bothered me in terms of the Meech Lake debate is why is it that every time anybody on this side of the House asks a question about Meech Lake, we are accused of fearmongering?

An Hon. Member: That is all you do.

Mr. Hodder: Well, I would like the hon. Member when I am finished, and I will not be so very long, to stand and answer some of my questions. Mr. Speaker, I have been reading the

National magazines, I read the Globe and Mail, as many hon. Members here do, I read Maclean's, I have read every article -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hodder: Yes. I do not believe what I read, but at least I think I am smart enough to be able to draw conclusions from what I read. I have read various newspapers and magazines from across the country, including Saturday Night - I have a subscription to it - and many of those publications, many magazines and our national media and our electronic media, are very concerned about the break-up of this country. Here in the House today Members asked questions about the break-up of the country, and the answers that kept coming back to us were we were fearmongering that there was something wrong.

Well, it seems to me that not very long ago there was a Premier's Conference of Atlantic Premiers in Corner Brook and the Premier of PEI, who is a Liberal Premier, and I think a good man, and the Premier of Nova Scotia and the Premier of New Brunswick, who is certainly not 100 per cent onside on the Accord, decided to form a committee and to put things in motion to study what would happen if the country broke up. Now that was a month ago. We stand here in the House of Assembly and ask questions of the Premier, and we are accused of fearmongering. Well, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to know is what happens to social programs in this country? During the last Federal election, it was that party which used social programs against free trade, and that was as farfetched as you could possibly think. We

have free trade and we have not lost our social programs, nor will we.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Woodford: That is what they said.

Mr. Hodder: Now, Mr. Speaker, because the Government has a majority, do not think you can muzzle everybody. This issue will come up, and it will come back to haunt you.

Mr. Woodford: That is right.

Mr. Hodder: Because if this country breaks up in any way, shape, or form - already, one of the Members who was accused of fearmongering today, when he got up to speak asked about interest rates and asked about the falling dollar. It is something of concern. The fall of the dollar, the value of the dollar.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are items of concern and Members can pound their desks and jump up and down. But when a Member asks what about his father's pension, and the Premier gets up and says I do not care about your father's pension, then -

Some Hon. Members: He didn't say it.

Mr. Woodford: He did so.

Mr. Warren: He did say it.

Mr. Hodder: Yes, he did. And it is on tape.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Woodford: CBC got it on tape.

Mr. Hodder: He said it did not

matter about the father's pension, because this, this, this, and this, but he said it.

An Hon. Member: No. You are wrong.

Some Hon. Members: No. Oh, no!

Mr. Hodder: Or whether it was the other way around, it was a very clear intention, what the Premier said.

An Hon. Member: It is not true.

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, there are at least seven other Premiers who do not agree with this Premier, and there are an awful lot of people who do not agree with this Premier. There are a lot of people who agree with the Premier, but many of them do not know why and do not ever say.

I had a call the other day from a student whom I taught at the Bay St. George Community College in 1968. It was not a community college then, it was the upgrading school. So I got the call on my recording machine. I picked up the phone, and he was calling me from Toronto. I called him back and he said, 'I just called to tell you that I am for Clyde Wells.' I said, 'Well, Clar, why are you for Clyde Wells?' He said, 'Because of the g.d. French'. He said, 'I was on the lake boats and they took all the jobs' and this, and this, and this. Then I said, 'Well, any other reasons?' That is the reason the Premier has the support he has, because of the unfairness of the Churchill Falls contract which that Government did. Not this side, but that Government.

Mr. Hogan: What side were you on then?

Mr. Hodder: The Premier was in that Government.

An Hon. Member: What about you?

Mr. Hodder: I did not know what politics was, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, I saw the light.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Hodder: I saw the light. But the question is, and the question has to be asked, what about social programs in this Province? And forget the social programs. Forget that! What is going to happen to our Newfoundland way of life? What is going to happen to our transportation system? What is going to happen to our equalization payments? They are legitimate questions. They are ones which are fast approaching, and it is time somebody started to think about them; June 23rd is not very far away. When we see the Premier up in Nova Scotia on the eve of the meeting with the Prime Minister lashing out and abusing and maligning his fellow colleagues and his former fellow colleagues, it is time, Mr. Speaker, that some of us decided what we are about here in this Province.

Just because the majority think one way does not say the majority are right. There are lots of times, in my experience, that I have found the majority were wrong, and later on they found out they were wrong.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hodder: Well, if they were wrong they did it five times. That is more than they have done for the hon. Member and, most likely, more than they will ever do for the hon. Member. Mr.

Speaker, my longevity in the House has nothing to do with what I am saying.

Having said that, I do not know if the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations is within the precincts of the House, but I wanted to use this opportunity to clarify something she said in the House when I was away; I was not here in the House, I was travelling with the Committee on Elections and Privileges at the time. While I was away, the Minister happened to make some comments which I read in Hansard. And if she is away today, she is not inside, I would like to make some comments back to her. If she does not see the Hansard, I will make sure she sees it when she gets back.

Mr. Speaker, when this Government came to power they decided that anything we had done was incorrect and now they find they have to do the same thing. One of the programs this Government had was the Private Sector Employment Program. Last year, during the Estimates, down at the Colonial Building, I criticized the fact that the present Government had cancelled that program. The Minister was there and she could not answer any questions I asked her; she referred every single question to her employees, the people on her staff.

An Hon. Member: Where was this?

Mr. Hodder: This was at the Estimates Committees. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was fine, because she was a new Minister. There was nothing wrong with that and there was nothing wrong with her doing it.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, in the

District of Port au Port there are about four businesses of any size. One is a small supermarket, one is the Lourdes Co-op, another is Abbott and Haliburton, another is Oscar Phillips, up in Cape St. George. The rest of the businesses there are either small take-outs, like a hot dog stand, or candy stores, or convenience stores, very small operations, usually one proprietor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, every year since the program has come out, and it was a good program and it was well-responded to, but every year since that program has come out I personally wrote all the businesses - I have a list of every business in my District, whether it is small or big - and explained the program to them. Now, there was some fuss about that, but I did it again this year, even though I never did have any inside information.

An Hon. Member: No, you didn't.

Mr. Hodder: No. Mr. Speaker, when the applications came out, I did it. The Minister, when she was speaking the other day, belittled me. She said, 'The Member for Port au Port, one of the strongest critics of the fact we decided to continue with the program...' Now, I never criticized the fact they were to continue with the program, I criticized the fact they had stopped it in the first place. But the thing was the program was changed by this Government, which meant a lot of those small stores could not avail, that just 20/20/20 was too much for the resources of most of these small stores. So, she got up and said, "Because I felt the man was sincere" - this was in a belittling tone, I am told by my

colleagues - "I went right away and said. 'Let me see what there is here from Port au Port.' Five" she says, "only five." Mr. Speaker, there were five. They all knew about it. They could not take part in it, because of the nature of the District. Then she went on to talk about the high unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, when I went to check, yes there were five applications. But there is one thing we cannot find out in this because of the fact that part of my District comes in under Stephenville, the Kippens area. We know for sure that two were turned down in that area, but we cannot get information on that because the Member for Stephenville has to get it. I do not know how that works. But of the five applications received from the District of Port au Port, two were approved of the five.

An Hon. Member: There were four.

Mr. Hodder: Two applications were approved. I am talking about the private sector. I just wanted to make this point, because the Minister got up and belittled me, my efforts and the District of Port au Port. If she went to check to see and found out there were only five, which was an incorrect figure, and she was worried about unemployment in Port au Port, why, then, did she only approve two? Mr. Speaker, that seems to bother me somewhat. I am sorry the Minister is not here. Of course, it did not bother her that I was not here when she brought the thing up, but I would prefer to -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hodder: Yes. I am quite

familiar with that person. She never wrote the letter. She is not able to do it, not capable of writing that letter.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hodder: Yes. At least there is no picture of me kissing a pig, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, there is the Minister of Social Services who has closed the Coach House to save money, who has cut back on the Community Living group, who pretends he is the best and most sincere Minister we ever had, and he is tearing the heart out of the Department of Social Services. I read in one of the newspapers the other day - now I do not know if it is true or not, and I would ask the Minister to confirm or deny it - that there is a 100 per cent turnover of employees. That is what the Gander Beacon said, that there is a 100 per cent turnover. I cannot believe there is a 100 per cent turnover of employees, but I will ask the Minister to provide the information about the turnover, when he gets up.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Hodder: When I sit down you can get up.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hodder: Okay.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker.

In answer to the hon. Member's question about what was reported in, I assume, the Gander Beacon, the correct answer to the question is there is not a 100 per cent turnover in the Department of Social Services. We have had to make some changes in the staff, mainly because of political patronage by the former Administration, and the fact that people were not qualified to do the job. We have had to change some of the staff, and we are going to continue to do that -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Efford: We are going to continue to do that, because the Department of Social Services is delivering an essential service to the people of the Province. If we find persons in any area who not capable of doing the type of job, then we must make changes. A 100 per cent turnover is a wrong figure, but there has been some turnover.

Mr. Tobin: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Efford: There has been some turnover in the Department.

Mr. Tobin: He just insulted his employees.

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

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, the Minister leaves more questions unanswered, and I think it is something we are going to have to bring up after some research on this. I do not know if the

Minister is agreeing that there is a 100 per cent turnover in Social Services -

Mr. Efford: I said no, it was not 100 per cent.

Mr. Hodder: No, it is only 90 per cent or 85 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Minister now to provide information to the House as to the turnover. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, but in some of my questions to members in the Department of Social Services these days, just telephone an ordinary director in an office or something like that, and do you know what they come back with, Mr. Speaker? They come back and say, 'Refer you to the Minister's office.' Right?

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what happened in this Province back ten or fifteen years ago. That is the exact type of attitude social workers had when they handled issues about Mount Cashel: refer you to the Minister's office; can't speak themselves; muzzled by the Minister of Social Services. There is a reign of fear!

Mr. Speaker, I always understood that as a Member of the House of Assembly I had a right, for instance, to visit a constituent, whether he was in the Waterford Hospital, whether he was in the penitentiary, whether he was in a remand centre, whether he was in a hospital, and that I had the right to ask questions about anything of a civil servant outside of Government policy, or outside of the Cabinet. Now, that was always the understanding, but lately when I was doing some research on Coach House -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Hodder: Yes. I was asking questions that I have a right to do. They were not questions of policy but questions of fact, and as soon as I said I was the Opposition critic for Social Services, before I even asked the question, I was referred to the Minister's office. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not right. This Minister is a master of cover-up.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Hodder: Anyway, I am going to enlarge on that a little later. Mr. Speaker, at the Department of Social Services at the present time they are unhappy and they are trying to get out of there as fast as they can. There is a higher rate of turnover in the Department of Social Services than in any other Department of Government. The Minister has a reign of fear such as has never been seen before. They are told not to speak up, and they are certainly told not to speak to me. They refer me to the Minister's office regardless of what the question is and, Mr. Speaker, that is a very unhealthy situation in this Province, and the Minister admits that he has given the order.

Mr. Efford: I have.

Mr. Hodder: Now, Mr. Speaker, he has given the order that no one is supposed to speak to a Member of the Opposition, and I do not intend to stand for that, and he will not get away with it, but when he was in Opposition -

An Hon. Member: That is Russia.

Mr. Hodder: That is Russia. - he was given the right to go and visit any facility that he wanted

to.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, you were so.

Mr. Hodder: Yes, he was. I would like to ask the Minister, while we are at it, if Members of the Government can ask questions of people in the Department of Social Services? Can Members of your Party?

Mr. Efford: Why not?

Mr. Hodder: Well, why is it that Members of this Party are always referred to the Minister's office? As he just admitted, he said he gave the order, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hodder: That is shocking, Mr. Speaker. I have never known that to happen. You will be there one of those days if your District happens to elect you again. I was in Opposition before. It is not my first time in Opposition. I spent more time in Opposition than most people in this House and I am not ashamed of it, I enjoy it. But, Mr Speaker, I was never, ever muzzled or hampered by any Minister in the Government from asking a question which dealt with my responsibilities or dealt with my District. The Minister over there has admitted that he has issued an order to the Department of Social Services to muzzle, to not to speak to Members opposite. Mr. Speaker, that is shocking, that is frightening, that is the worst thing that I have ever heard in my life.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hodder: Yes, he said it. He is on Hansard. I have him on Hansard. Mr. Speaker, I would

like to see the Minister now stand and tell us about his policy as far as the muzzling of his Department is concerned.

Mr. Efford: Does he want me to answer the question?

Mr. Hodder: Sure.

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

Mr. Efford: I am not rising in debate, Mr. Speaker. I am just rising to answer the question.

Mr. Simms: He may take five minutes if he wants to.

Mr. Efford: Take five minutes?

I sat for the last fifteen or twenty minutes and I listened to the hon. Member give, and I do not think intentionally, I am sure, but it may be incompetence or lack of competence, or whatever is the right word to use, but not intentionally misleading the hon. House of Assembly, so I will correct him. I asked the question, would it be because he is a Tory? I will correct the hon. Member. Do you want me to answer the question? I will repeat again, I am sure the hon. Member is not intentionally misleading the House of Assembly, but I will correct the hon. Member. First of all, in regard to the policy of the Department of Social Services, in regard to anything that comes from a director of a program, or an incident that takes place, I have asked, and I have instructed, that the directors of those particular programs and the policy pertaining to the Department of Social Services, any news media calls, or any information come through the Minister's office.

As far as any MHA, on either side of the hon. House of Assembly, wishes to go to the Department of Social Services and talk, or question a social worker about a particular constituent, as long as they are not getting any confidential information on those files, they have a right to do that. I have never instructed a social worker in the Department of Social Services not to do that. And I say very clearly that the information saying that morale is low in the Department of Social Services, that the turnover is high in the Department of Social Services, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely false. There was never better morale within the Department of Social Services, there were never better working conditions in the Department of Social Services, there was never a time when programming information was getting out more to the people of the Province through the district and regional offices of the Department of Social Services. In fact, it was for the first time since Confederation that all the district regional and departmental managers and directors met last Tuesday night in Gander.

Mr. Tobin: Not true.

Mr. Efford: That is true.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will take part in this debate this afternoon.

Sitting here, listening to the debate for the last while,

particularly the Minister's reaction, from his seat, to the Member for Port au Port, about the directives he had given in the Department of Social Services, I was somewhat alarmed to hear him say that. Because I don't believe that today, 1990, in Newfoundland and Labrador, that is the way things are done. But maybe it ties into what we have seen earlier from the Government with the elimination of the Ombudsman's office, that maybe this trend and this mind set is an extension of the elimination of the Ombudsman, that maybe there is a deliberate attempt or a willingness by this Government not to allow information to get to proper sources. I don't know, but it makes me sort of suspicious when I hear these comments coming from the Minister of Social Services, following behind -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) cut you off, too.

Mr. Matthews: Well, you don't have much to cut me off, I tell you. Nothing from nothing is nothing, so you can't cut me off from that. Let me just say to the Minister - and I know he said it in a joking manner - that if ever I call across to the Department of Social Services and get treated with anything less than how I should be treated, then the Minister will be the first to know it. Whether that comes from someone below the Minister or from the Minister, it won't stop there. But I haven't had that experience yet and I am hopeful I won't have it.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few things I want to touch on in this debate this afternoon. I want to get back to an issue I raised in the Legislature yesterday in a

question to the Minister of Health as it pertains to particularly, the Grand Bank Health Care Centre, as it is called now. That is the new name for it since the Minister of Health eliminated the inpatient services at that hospital.

Now, what is happening in that centre is alarming to me. I have been bothered by the situation since Government announced it was eliminating the inpatient services, and I just want to elaborate for the Minister of Health, even though he is being distracted by one of his colleagues. Yesterday in Question Period, I did not get a chance to ask all the questions I wanted to ask the Minister because time ran out.

What we have at that facility is, patients are being admitted there by their physicians for varying lengths of time, of course, depending on their condition. But the main reason they are holding beds in that facility is to get patients in there to do medical assessments, to see what their problems are, to see if they need stabilization before they are moved on to the regional hospital in Salt Pond. And, what has happened over the last short while is that there has been a directive come from the regional hospital to the Grand Bank Health Care Centre, that the nurse on duty at the Grand Bank facility has to notify the regional hospital if a patient has been in the bed for more than twenty-four hours.

Now, the patient may be in the bed for more than twenty-four hours because the doctor, in his or her wisdom and based upon his or her medical knowledge and expertise, wants that patient there for thirty hours or forty-eight hours

or seventy-two hours. Perhaps in the doctor's judgement, the patient is not stable enough to move to Salt Pond that quickly, so there is great concern amongst the local doctors there, because they don't want to have directives coming from the regional hospital that interferes with their handling and care of their patients.

Now, I didn't raise this issue flippantly yesterday, I raised it out of concern, because it has been brought to my attention by the doctors at that facility, and as well, almost every week, I am advised of and get telephone calls and so on advising me of anything but, pleasant and proper care being offered in times at the regional hospital in Salt Pond because of a number of reasons. One, is a lack of space. Too much pressure being exerted upon that facility because of the population base that hospital is supposed to take care of.

Of course anyone who reflects months ago on debate in this House when I raised the issue here, after the Government made the decision to phase out inpatients services, that I said then, that I had great concern that that facility would not be able to stand the pressure and to offer proper care to that region, and I am sad to say that is now being verified, and I wanted to bring that to the attention of the Minister yesterday, because it is a concern of the medical people in Grand Bank and some of them have been there for a long period of time and it is difficult enough to attract doctors and other professionals to rural Newfoundland. It is very, very difficult. We have had high turnovers in most of our cottage

hospitals, as I am sure the Minister has already acknowledged in meetings that I have had with him and delegations. It is hard to keep them there, but we have a number of doctors there who have been there for a period of time and are interested in staying there, but they will not stay there if this kind of action continues and they feel they are being undermined. They are undermined, they cannot treat their patients the way they want to treat them, because of these kind of directives and that is why I raised the concern yesterday and I hope the Minister of Health checks it out thoroughly and reacts to that over the next short while because I am very, very concerned about it.

There are a number of other things, Mr. Speaker, that I want to speak about today in a sort of non-confidence debate and pertains to the Budget, and as I have said a number of times in the Legislature that I was somewhat taken back when I scrutinized the Department of Fisheries Budget and saw that this year there is less money Budgeted than it was last year, and that did not give me much confidence in dealing with the very serious fishery problems which we have about the Province when you see the Budget of that particular Department less than it was last year. I thought, and I say again, there would be more money this year to address the very serious fisheries crisis in this Province than we have seen. Well there were \$9 million Budgeted in Employment and Labour Relations, I know what the Minister is going to say, for the extended notice period, and as I have said a number of times and I will say it again, we were grateful for that, and I was

personally grateful because what that did, was, at least it gave the people in Grand Bank, a town that I represent, twenty weeks work this year on which - FPI had to give then sixteen weeks this year, anyway, under legislation of notice and so on. They had to be provided with sixteen weeks this year, in 1990, but what Government has done by the extended notice period, is, allow them four more weeks this year which is great and hopefully twenty weeks next year. We hope that happens, but of course that again all depends on the Total Allowable Catch that will be set, hopefully, hopefully before the end of this year and I concur with the Minister in his representation to the Federal Minister to get on about that and have a look at it.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other things that have happened. Educational concerns that have arisen. Representations being made to the Minister of Education, to the Government, to the Opposition from school boards, chairmen of school boards around the Province, by superintendents who say that they are going to find it very, very difficult to operate this year, based upon the allocations of money that each school board has been given by the Minister in his Department in the Budget, because they are claiming that the funding from Government this year will not keep up, I guess with the growth in inflation and other rising costs that they will be experiencing out and about the Province.

And one of the big things, of course, that they are going to be hit with this year is the increase in electricity. And we know what a burden that is already on school boards out and about the Province

in running schools. But as we see again a sort of mindset develop, coming out of this Government, that there seems to be a greater willingness to have electrical rates increased in the Province. There does not seem to be the concern that there has been over the last number of years to sort of keep the lid on electrical rates in the Province, and we are going to see, as a consequence, hardship by school boards to operate schools.

I will not be surprised that, as a result of these rising costs, we will see school boards which will have to close up schools out and about this Province, because the Minister of Education, even though he talks about his commitment to education, and he has a long history in education, Mr. Speaker, which none of us can refute, has a long history in education in the Province.

But I do not think his commitment is as great as he would have people out and about the Province and the educators and the teachers and the superintendents and the school boards believe. I do not think it is that great as he would have them believe. And, of course, he is sitting on a number of reports as well, Mr. Speaker, that we wish he would dust off now because there must be an inch or two of dust accumulated on the reports now. He has been Minister now for fourteen or fifteen months. So it is time for him to dust off those reports and get on and about dealing with them.

Now maybe he does not want to deal with them, but if he does not he should at least be up front and say he is not going to. But not go leading people on as we are going to deal with it some other

time. Deal with it now. If you are not going to deal with the report, say it is going on the shelf permanently; throw it away, then people will not be expecting you to deal with those reports, because they do expect great things from the Minister. I do not know why.

An Hon. Member: Are you talking about the Minister of Social Services?

Mr. Matthews: Oh, not the Minister of Social Services, no. The Minister of Education. Not the Minister of Social Services, no, no, no, the Minister of Education. I am sorry. I am looking over the Minister of Social Services back on to the Minister of Education.

Then there is another point that when the Member for Port au Port was speaking across and he got interjections back from the Minister of Social Services, and he said about the 100 per cent turnover, and the Minister of Social Services - no, but there were people who had to be sort of given the boot because there appointments were so partisan, that they sort of were not qualified, and you had to sort of get them out and replace them - had to replace them -

An Hon. Member: Do you know the reasons why?

Mr. Matthews: I am sorry?

Mr. Efford: You know the reasons why.

Mr. Matthews: I only based it on what you said. You said a lot of them had to go because they were partisan appointments at the time, and they were not qualified. Now,

Mr. Speaker, that is what I heard the Minister say.

Mr. Efford: The Member knows. He knows (inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Well, of course, that prompted me to think very quickly about appointments that have occurred in the Province over the last number of months to certain prominent positions, particularly in the Department of Social Services, that on the surface looked very, very partisan, Mr. Speaker. They looked very, very partisan.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Who is that?

An Hon. Member: Mr. Tulk.

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Tulk, well I was not going to mention any names, but since the Minister of Social Services brought it up, Mr. Beaton Tulk was appointed an ADM in Social Services.

Mr. Efford: He is doing an excellent job.

Mr. Matthews: Well maybe he is. I hope he is doing an excellent job. I hope he is doing an excellent job, most importantly for the people whom he is suppose to be doing the job for. I hope that is correct. And as well I would hope that he was doing a good job because of himself. Because like all of us, I guess, if we arrive in a position or a job you want to be comfortable and feel within yourself.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible). Not all of you.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, all of us. All of us on this side, that you

want to be comfortable with what you are doing, that you make a contribution. Personally, I would not want to be appointed to a position at any time in my life that I did not feel comfortable with, that I could do a job in. Because it must be a terrible feeling to end up in a position for whatever reason, and feel within yourself that you are inadequate or you are unqualified to do the job that you are being appointed to do.

So I hope for those two reasons that he is doing a good job, most importantly for the people he is suppose to be servicing and providing a service for.

Mr. Tobin: Social workers do not think he is doing a good job.

Mr. Matthews: Well I do not know, I have not talked to social workers about that. But as well as for himself, because for anyone who has put in a period of time in public life in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and it is not an easy life, and for that particular gentlemen, he put his total life in Opposition which was not all pleasant, some rough times. I hope he does feel comfortable there and I hope he does go about doing the job that he was appointed to do in the Province.

There are a couple of other things, Mr. Speaker, the Employment Programs that have been alluded to once again by my colleague for Port au Port. The Employment Programs are important to me, I guess, not only being the MHA representing one District in this Province but being a former Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, and having been involved in the Private Sector Employment Program, which I

sincerely believe was a huge success. And I will continue to believe that forever because that program worked extremely well.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Matthews: It employed about 3000 people with an expenditure from Government of \$7.5 million with an equivalent \$7.5 million from the Private Sector. And there was something like thirty per cent of those jobs turned into long term jobs. We would hope that it had been higher than that, but that was not too bad. For \$7.5 million the Provincial Government of the day was able to create 2800 to 3000 jobs and the big disappointment -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Mr. Matthews: And the big disappointment in the Employment Generation Program brought forward by this Government was the amount of money - \$2.9 million was really totally inadequate.

And I know Members Opposite, if they were honest with me, they would know that out and about their own areas there have been numerous applications that have gone into the Department that are still listed as pending. I do not know if any of them have been outrightly rejected, a few I would think, but most of them are still pending. And they are pending because there was not enough money to fund the program, and they are hoping now for a bit of slippage to approve a few more.

So that was a disappointment as

well, and the Minister, by her own admission, says that there were 400 jobs, I believe she said, created. And there could have been a lot more done with a few more million dollars from Government, there could have been a lot more done in that particular area. It would have been effective as well and the way to reduce or to stabilize the unemployment rate of the Province which has increased significantly in the last year. Eleven of the last twelve months we have seen the unemployment rate in the Province rise up to 18.6, I believe it was, for last month.

The payroll tax, Mr. Speaker. If there was ever a reason for not only Members on this side, but for the people out and about the Province, but specifically for the business community to develop nonconfidence or a lack of confidence in the Government, and in particular in the Minister of Finance and his Budget, it was because of the payroll tax.

The Minister himself did not understand the tax when he introduced it to the Legislature. He still does not fully understand it. He is really still not sure who pays it and who does not. He is not sure if his projected figures of \$15 million this year, I believe it is, and I think it is \$25 million next year, are firm figures. And it will be very interesting to see what happens to the Ministers projection on the payroll tax over the year, and as well on the Minister's projections on other figures as we have learned over the last few days with the increase in interest rates, with the dollar that has taken a dip, and I think within the last twenty-four hours or so a little dip back upwards, that it

would be interesting to see what the Minister's Budget is really going to - the real Budget- what it would be like at the end of the fiscal year, because all of this instability in the country is going to cause substantial financial pressure and strain on every Government of Canada - every Government within Canada, every Provincial Government and the Federal Government.

And it is going to be a big factor in the efforts that every Government is taking, Mr. Speaker, in trying to reduce the deficit. Here we have things happening with the dollar, with interest rates, that is going to have a very serious impact upon every Government's efforts to reduce their deficits and it is very, very important that we do that.

So, this constitutional instability in the country is going to impact on every financial outlook or every financial projection that has been made by anyone within the country, and particularly upon this Province.

The Meech Lake, Mr. Speaker: there are some interesting things that I would like to say here. We have heard the Premier make reference to people and accuse people of fearmongering. The President of Treasury Board occasionally shouts out across the House that you are fearmongering and you are using scare tactics. Members down in this corner have used it too over the last number of days. But I just want to say this to Members Opposite: the first person in Newfoundland and Labrador and the first person in Canada that talked about Newfoundlanders losing their dignity, the first person who talked about Newfoundlanders losing their self respect, the

first person who talked about Newfoundlanders remaining poor, maybe being better off by joining the United States of America, the first person who has spoken those words has been the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador. The first person, and the only person who I have heard make those remarks is the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador. And when I hear comments from Members Opposite about fearmongering and scare tactics, I would like to remind them, that what the Premier has done to swing public opinion his way on the Meech Lake Accord in this Province, is that in essence he has frightened Newfoundlanders and Labradorians into believing that the Meech Lake Accord, as it now exists, is going to be economically devastating for this Province.

Now that is what the Premier has done. That is what has happened, Mr. Speaker, in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Minister of Finance that is exactly what he said and -

An Hon. Member: It is not exactly what he said.

Mr. Matthews: No, he has said that we will lose our dignity. There will be lack of self-respect. That we will be poorer, that the regional disparity gap will widen in this country. As a Province we will be destined to economic devastation because of the Meech Lake Accord. Now the Premier has used all of those words in the Meech Debate, and what he has done is instilled in the minds of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that the Meech Lake Accord, as it exists, that that is what it is going to cause Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

That is what it will do to you and your people for generations to come. Now those are scare tactics. That is frightening people, even if they do not understand the Meech Lake Accord, to think your way, and for public opinion to swing behind you, that is what the Premier has done.

When someone else gets up in the Legislature and says, 'Well, how about my father's pension? How about MCP? How about unemployment insurance benefits?' Members opposite accuse us of scare tactics and fearmongering. But whether you look upon it as scare tactics or fearmongering or whatever, Mr. Speaker, you have to face the realities that if this country breaks up, those things as we now know them will not exist or will not be the same. There may be some other arrangement. But MCP as we know it will obviously change, old age security will change, because if the country breaks up, Canada as we know it will not be Canada. If Quebec leaves, Canada will not be as we know it.

See, that is what you do not know. We may have a western country that will break away. We may have the Atlantic Provinces balkanized into countries or some -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Speaker, all we are raising for concern is that in this debate, just as the Premier has said, economic disparity will increase, the gap will widen, you are going to lose your self-respect, you are going to lose your dignity if Meech Lake as we know it passes. Having said all of that - second class as the Minister of Finance says - just as you raise those concerns in the

minds of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians you have to raise on the other side of the argument, the question: what happens to your social programs as you know them today? Will they be as good as they are today? Maybe they will be better. Maybe there will be none.

I would just like to say this, Mr. Speaker, before I finish. There is a great concern and a great attachment by Canadians to their social programs. That is why so many of them go down in the States for X number of months a year but then they come back home. It is fine to get caught up in partisan debates and to try and sway public opinion this way or that way, but the reality of it is, Mr. Speaker, that if Quebec leaves the country, which is a strong possibility let me say to the Minister of Finance, and I would say he would be happy. He is the only one in the Legislature who will be happy if that happens. That Canada, as we know it will not be the same, so there will have to be some reorganization in the country.

Mr. Noel: Will Canada be the same if Meech passes?

Mr. Matthews: Sorry?

Mr. Noel: Will Canada be the same if we pass Meech?

Mr. Matthews: It could, because we know it now, yes, it could, but we could talk about change after. We could talk about Senate reform after, couldn't we? I mean there is Senate reform in Meech now. There is Senate reform proposed in some degree. You see, what we are talking is degree of Senate reform, isn't it? It is degree of Senate reform, isn't it, we are talking about -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Matthews: The Premier is at the extreme of Senate reform.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Matthews: There is mention of Senate reform in Meech Lake as we know it now, isn't there?

Mr. Noel: They will talk about it.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, they will talk about it.

Mr. Noel: They have been saying that as long as we have been a country.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, that's right, but do you want to remain being a country, that is the question you have to answer?

Mr. Tobin: Do you want to take away people's pensions.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible)!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please! Order, please!
Order, please! Order, please!

The Chair has recognized the hon. Member for Grand Bank to speak in this debate, so I would ask the other Members to refrain from interjecting and interrupting the hon. Member.

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't mind their interjections, Mr. Speaker, but I mean, if someone feels so strongly about this issue, then I say to the Member for Pleasantville, he is very articulate in speaking about Meech Lake and Senate

reform, then get up after I sit down and let us hear it! The more we talk about it the better the chance we will have of finding a compromise, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: He is not allowed (inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Yes, it is being done now, oh yes, publicly saying I am willing to compromise, but behind doors, being just as concrete as ever. That's what is happening. That's what is happening, one big show. The most inflexible person in Canada today on the Meech Lake issue, is the Premier of this Province. The most inflexible person on the Meech Lake debate and on the issue. Now, Mr. Speaker -

Mr. Tobin: Let him call a referendum and he won't win it.

Mr. Noel: Bourassa is very flexible, isn't he?

Ms Duff: Well he was.

Mr. Matthews: He was, he was, he was, he was. I am not suggesting he was flexible enough. I am not suggesting that. I am just speaking out of concern today, as one Member of this Legislature, and one Newfoundlander and Labradorian and as one Canadian, that's all, and I just want to raise the concerns. I mean it is the topic out and about the Province today, and on this weekend people said to me, because of the comment, by the way, on Friday from the Member for Green Bay about his pensions. I had people say to me this weekend: what will happen to me? I am getting a veterans allowance. They are sincere about asking the question, they don't understand Mr. Speaker, and they look to

people like me to say: well, what do you think of it Bill? Right? So they are concerned about it, they are concerned about it.

I said it is a possibility, if this country breaks up. I pray the country doesn't break up. If the country breaks up, it may be. The other thing is, Mr. Speaker, let me just say this, that there is more concern out and about Newfoundland and Labrador today, over the last week to ten days, there has been a significant concern, there is developing a significant shift in the way Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are thinking about Meech Lake, and I would suggest that it is because of concern, personal concerns, like older people about the Province, who have asked the question, I am sure they have asked the same to you people as they have asked to me and others on this side.

There is a legitimate concern out there, and my biggest wish today, Mr. Speaker, standing here as one Member of this Legislature, is that this thing falls into place within the next - we don't have many days left, but that it falls into place over the next few days or the next week or two weeks, and we do get a compromise across this country, and this country stays together as we know it for the most part, and by the most part I mean that all the Provinces of Canada remain a part of Canada. I hope that compromise can be found, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: A mini-Messiah over there.

Mr. Matthews: Now the Member for Exploits says that is what we are working at.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Yes, I hope that is what they are working at. I hope they are.

Mr. Simms: Plus they were taped on to Clyde's suitcase when he was carrying it for him last week.

An Hon. Member: Running around with his brief case.

Mr. Matthews: Well let me just say this on that question that if the three of them are going to fall in line someone has to fall in line first.

Mr. Simms: Right on.

Mr. Noel: McKenna has done that.

Mr. Matthews: Unless they all get in a room and say now boys, let us all fall in line together so nobody loses face, or nobody looks like they are giving in, and that is maybe what is going on in this very serious issue in this country. I am not giving in because Filmon will not give in, or I am not doing this because of McKenna.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Matthews: You see! I mean it is time for leadership.

An Hon. Member: Saner heads.

Mr. Matthews: I mean if the Premier of this Province thinks that it is right and that he can live in this Province and the Government can live with some compromise of Meech Lake, then why does he not go forward and say that? Is he worried about being first of the dissenting three to move forward and say, yes?

Mr. Simms: Oh, yes. He is worried about that.

Mr. Matthews: I mean if that is what is holding it up, Mr. Speaker, I am telling you something then there is no doubt about what will happen to this country over the next number of months.

An Hon. Member: Mark it down.

An Hon. Member: Ego (inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: If that is what the problem is - I do not think that is what it is.

An Hon. Member: He calls that ego.

Mr. Matthews: I hope the Premier is not up in his office sucking his thumb and saying I am not going forward before Filmon and McKenna, because I believe McKenna is going to go forward.

An Hon. Member: He is gone.

Ms Verge: He is nearly there.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, he is almost over the finished line now. His toe was there. You have to give him a little nudge to put him over.

Mr. Noel: Finished is an appropriate term.

Mr. Matthews: Pardon?

Mr. Noel: Finished is an appropriate term.

Mr. Matthews: It depends on what way you see it. When you are in a race, if you cross the finish line you win. So by finishing it you win. Do you understand that? When Ben Johnson crossed the line in Seoul, wherever it was, he supposedly won the race.

An Hon. Member: That was done by (inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: It was only something like steroids that fooled it up.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) the first shall be last.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Matthews: Well just let me say, Mr. Speaker, I have had to say what I felt about this very important issue because I am concerned about it. I do not believe in scare tactics or fearmongering.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Matthews: What is the Old Chicken Coop over there cackling about again now?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: I do not. I do not.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: That question has to be asked, and it is being asked of me.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Matthews: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing I did today, I guess I feel better, because I said what I said, which always makes me feel better anyway, is call some interjection from the other side. There has been some interesting comments from the other side, and my only wish now is that those Members who have been doing that interjecting would get up now and let us hear their concerns about this.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: That is very difficult for some people to learn anymore because it is like someone said to me one time -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Speaker, I will conclude on this remark, 'still the wonder grew how one small head could carry all he knew.'

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Winsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a few brief remarks on the amendment to the Budget. But before I get into my remarks I do not know if the title of Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier gives you illusions of grandeur of what your position is or not. Because his response then, his interjection across the House was we are working on it, just as if he is sitting down with the Premier on a daily basis - on a daily basis we are working on it. I asked him about teacher pensions and he said, oh, I will take care of that. I do not know if that title of Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier gives you illusions of grandeur or not. But I want to spend a few minutes of my remarks -

An Hon. Member: He is on his way out. The boys will get rid of you, buddy!

Mr. Winsor: - addressing the serious crisis that we have in the fishery again. Yesterday in the

House and last Thursday I asked the Minister of Fisheries what he had done about the terrible storm damage that resulted on the northeast coast? The Minister said, 'Mr. Speaker, the officials from my Department were instructed to visit the area and do an assessment of the damages. I have not received a report yet, but I will undertake to have it ready in time for Question Period tomorrow in the House.' Now that is what the Minister of Fisheries said yesterday. He said 'That he would have a report ready for Question Period in the House today.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, Question Period took place some two hours ago.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: If the hon. Member had taken the trouble and the interest to ask me a question during Question Period I would have had an answer for him.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: No point of order.

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, the Member had lots of chance to respond in answers to questions already asked and the Minister never chose to get up. So let me

tell the Minister -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Questions yesterday - you were questioned on it yesterday. You took notice yesterday. I will undertake to have it ready.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has become very defensive.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Yesterday I promised the House, and the Member, that I would be able to answer his questions on the gear loss today. I was here waiting for his question -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Carter: - and he chose not to get up; he would prefer to listen to his colleagues berate the Premier about Meech Lake than to get up and ask a question concerning his constituents.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader to the point of order.

Mr. Simms: Yes, to the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I mean, that is a rather weak response from the

Minister of Fisheries. In Hansard yesterday he indicated that he would get the information, and I believe the Member asked him for the information prior to that.

An Hon. Member: Thursday.

Mr. Simms: But to settle it all, why don't we give the Minister a couple of minutes leave and let him give us the information now. If he has information for the people of the Province, this is the place for it and we are quite prepared to let him do it. But he could have also used the procedure and the rules under Answers to Question. That is all he had to do. Instead of that, Mr. Speaker, he wanted an opportunity in Question Period so he could get a bit of coverage, or involve himself in some kind of partisan debate, that is all. There is no point of order.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Mr. Carter: To that point of order, the facts speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: The hon. Member, Mr. Speaker, had an opportunity, a thirty minute Question Period, during which time, if he had the interest he should have had -

An Hon. Member: He asked you twice.

Mr. Carter: Well, he knew, by the way, today would be the day when I would have the information.

Mr. Simms: You told him last Thursday you would have it.

Mr. Carter: I told him yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: And last Thursday.

Mr. Carter: Yes, that I would have it today. Now, he did not have the interest to get up during Question Period. Today we had a thirty minute Question Period, he chose to sit on his seat.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Carter: He did not have sufficient interest in his constituents to get up and ask the question, and now he is wondering why I did not give the answer. The obvious answer, Mr. Speaker, is why didn't he ask the question?

An Hon. Member: You don't have the answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Mr. Tobin: You don't have the answer. You don't have it!

Mr. Carter: I have the answer.

An Hon. Member: But you are not going to tell anybody.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Mr. Carter: Ask me the question tomorrow and you will get it.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Carter: If you have the interest tomorrow, ask me.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Mr. Carter: If you have the interest tomorrow, ask me the question and I will give you the answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The Chair has not ruled on the point of order raised by the hon. Minister of Fisheries yet. There is no point of order.

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

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: I wonder if the House would be willing to give the Minister of Fisheries leave to table it?

Some Hon. Members: No leave.

Mr. Speaker: No leave.

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

Mr. Tobin: Let the record show that the Government refused to give leave.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I asked the Minister. The Minister has had ample opportunity. I do not know if the Minister is looking for time in the House to score some political points or not, but I am not interested in doing that. I am much more concerned about the welfare of the people of the northeast coast who have been devastated by the failure of the Minister -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: You haven't got any interest. Inflate your ego, that is all you are trying to do.

Mr. Carter: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, the onnus is on the Minister of Fisheries to supply the answers. He was asked on Thursday and again yesterday, and he indicated that he would have it ready for tomorrow. I am not sure of the extent of it. I talked to the Chairmen of the Fisheries Committees in four different communities in my District last night and none of them had seen any officials from the Minister's Department. I am not casting aspersions on the Minister's officials either, but the Minister has not been in close contact with the people of the northeast coast.

Mr. Carter: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: Sit down, boy. Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries, on a point of order.

Mr. Carter: The hon. Member has no basis -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Mr. Carter: The hon. Member has no basis to make that statement. Let me remind him, let me read for him yesterday's Hansard.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Carter: In reply to his question I said, 'Mr. Speaker, the officials from my Department were instructed to visit the area and to do an assessment of the damages. I have not received a report yet, but I will undertake to have it ready in time for Question Period tomorrow' - now that is today - 'in time for this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House -

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The Chair has not recognized the hon. Member.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: The hon. Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, continues to try to put forth a weak-kneed response to the question asked by the Member. Instead of playing silly little games and trying to get his name in the media, why does he not do the honourable thing and get up and table the information? Why does he not have the courage to do that instead of playing little games?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries, to the point of order.

Mr. Carter: Why does the hon. Member not have the decency to do

the honourable thing and get up in the House and admit that he did not have the interest to ask me the question? If he is not prepared to ask me the question, then surely he should not expect me to get up and give the answer.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

There is no point of order, there is a difference of opinion on a matter between the two hon. Members.

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the intent of the Minister of Fisheries is to waste the time of the House so that his lack or failure to respond to the problem will not be addressed. That is the reason the Minister would not give the information to the House. The Minister knows he hasn't done anything to help the people.

But let me tell the Minister, because I am not sure if the Minister is aware of the seriousness of the situation. I know of some fishermen who had sixty nets in the water, and yesterday they managed to get twelve nets out of a total of sixty. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is twelve nets -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Winsor: That is the second time. I asked the Minister the same kind of question about a loan to the Fogo Island Co-op. He said, 'Why don't you get up and ask me in Question Period?' - so he can try to score political points with the people of the Province. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am

not interested in that. If the Minister wants to get up, I will give him leave to get up and table his response. But I am not concerned about that.

What I am concerned about is what the Minister is going to do and when he is going to do it. When is the Minister going to announce - because the time is going. Two lovely days this week the fishermen have not been able to fish because they did not have gear. Now is the Minister going to tomorrow, or is he going to have to wait until the House closes so we will not be able to attack his program. Because that is normally the kind of response -

Mr. Simms: Or wait until somebody asks (inaudible) question.

Mr. Winsor: No. Even if you ask a question he will say I will have that answer for the Member tomorrow. That is the kind of arrogance that we are getting from these people. But I want to get on into some things the Minister could have put in his Budget.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would he mind if I asked him a question?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Winsor: The Minister has taken up enough of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Fisheries asked me if he could ask a question. The Member for Fogo did not yield the floor, so the Minister cannot ask the question.

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, I gave the Minister leave to respond a while ago. The Minister did not respond. So the Minister will have to take his place and wait until I am finished, then he can get up.

Mr. Speaker, one of the platforms of this Administration, in their plan to get elected, was that they were going to have some kind of a catch failure insurance program. That was one of the things that was going to happen in the fishery. This the second year now that this Administration has been in place.

Mr. Carter: (Inaudible) seventeen years?

Mr. Winsor: Why didn't I do it in seventeen years, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Tobin: You were the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, for part of the time that Minister was Minister of Fisheries, and for the remainder of the years I was a student at university and in the classroom teaching. I do not know how the Minister expects that I put a catch failure insurance program in place, when I was in university or a student in school. You were the Minister of Fisheries. You were the Minister of Fisheries, not me.

The audacity of the Minister to suggest that I was responsible for what happened when he was the Minister of Fisheries. Shame on you!

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Administration failed to put a catch failure insurance program in. Their response to every crisis we have had in the fishery

is to blame it on the Federal Government. The Minister now has an opportunity to do something for the fishermen of this Province, and what does he do? He tries to hide away behind the procedures of the House and not give the answers, another attempt to cover up the inability of this Administration to come to grips with the crisis in the fishery.

Mr. Carter: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Matthews: This is an abuse.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Fisheries on a point of order.

Mr. Carter: (Inaudible) keep this up and mislead the House, not deliberately maybe, but mislead the House, then I will have to keep rising on points of order. Because what he is saying is not correct. I gave my word yesterday that today I would provide the information he sought with respect to the storm damage.

Mr. Winsor: Why didn't you keep it?

Mr. Carter: Today's thirty minute Question Period came and went and the hon. Member did not rise in his seat to ask a question.

Mr. Winsor: The Premier monopolized the time of Question Period.

Mr. Carter: Now, that is not my fault. If he is smart he will just drop the whole issue right now, and I am quite willing to do it as well. But if he keeps referring to it, then I am going

to have to keep rising on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, that is the third time the Minister got up to respond to the same thing, but I want to go on to something else that is of concern to the people in this Province. That, of course, is the threat to the commercial salmon fishery that presently exists in this Province. There is a genuine concern in the fishing community that their way of life, in fact their livelihood, is being threatened by regulation from DFO, and before the Minister gets a chance to shout across the House that it is a Federal Government responsibility, I will acknowledge that salmon management is a federal responsibility. What this Province is looking for, though, what the people, the fishermen are looking for, is some leadership from the Minister of Fisheries to articulate their concerns, and they are very much concerned that this Minister of Fisheries is not providing that kind of leadership.

With just days before the opening, we don't hear a word, not a murmur. We hear lots from the Fishermen's Union, we hear lots of concerns from SPAWN and the salmonoid council, but very little from the Minister of Fisheries, except in his usual blatant political way, to stand and say, I stand solidly behind the inshore fishery of Newfoundland. That is the sum token of what the Minister has done to make representation on behalf of these people.

Mr. Speaker, since time is running out, I want to get on to an item of concern as a critic for recreation in this Province to the Minister. For two or three weeks we have been asking the Minister to table the findings of his people, whatever he has done, on the community recreation programs. Some \$330,000 was announced. In the paper we have seen, I think, the community of Arnold's Cove was awarded \$20,000, thanks to my colleague from Bonavista South, who wrote a little story for The Evening Telegram. I think it might have been \$20,000 that was awarded in his District. There was an entire section of news I think the Member might have written, and I think there was \$20,000 approved for his area.

I know of another \$10,000 and another \$6,000, so that is a total of only \$56,000 out of the \$330,000 that we have been able to account for. We have waited and waited for the Minister to make the announcement. It now appears the Minister is not going to make the announcement, that this program is one he wants to keep under wraps. There seems to be some reason why the Minister does not want to table it.

An Hon. Member: It is partisan.

Mr. Winsor: It could be partisan. I won't even suggest that yet, but it could be that it is too partisan. After all, out of the \$56,000, with \$40,000 to Liberal Districts, I don't know if that is partisan.

I want to make a few remarks to the Minister on the Regional Facilities Program he announced some time ago. The Minister had indicated that he would soon be in

a position to announce which communities would be awarded these facilities. He said perhaps by the end of May or early June. I wonder is he, perhaps, again waiting to have the House closed?

Let me tell the Minister how committed the people in Fogo Island are to having a stadium. Having already raised \$130,000 -

An Hon. Member: How much?

Mr. Winsor: They have raised \$130,000.

- last week, at the annual meeting of the co-op -

Mr. Efford: How come you wear a red tie?

Mr. Winsor: It suits the jacket, I think.

Last week, at the annual meeting of the co-op, with 300 or 400 people in the building, the Stadium Committee came to the co-op and asked the members if they would, for the next summer, give seven dollars a month to the stadium fund per member. It was unanimously agreed to. So, this year, at the end of the summer, these people will have another \$60,000 or \$70,000 raised. So, at the end of this year, they will have raised their total portion of the \$1.5 million that is available to them. But they are not satisfied with that. Their project was for \$1.9 million, and they are going to go out and raise the extra \$200,000 or \$300,000 needed, besides your 20 per cent, so they can have recreational facilities on Fogo Island.

So I would urge the Minister to have a serious look at that application, and make an

announcement shortly, so the people of Fogo Island can get on with raising the money for their much needed recreational facility.

While the Minister of Education is here, I have to have a word with him on his School/Hospital Program. I want to read for him a letter, a little bit in today's paper from the Pastoral Care Committee of the Grand Falls and District Health Care Board. I won't go through it all, but here is what they say to the Minister of Education: "We are saddened and very disappointed to hear that our Government is using such a depriving tactic for the purpose of strengthening the financial state of our Province. Surely, there must be a better way!

We ask you to please reconsider your decision to discontinue school services to children at the Central Newfoundland Regional Health Centre. Please allow us to continue to provide the educational opportunities which have been successfully provided in recent years."

It is obvious what happened to the Minister of Education. I don't think he genuinely wanted to cut out that program, it came out of the old 'Kitchen'. I think that is where it came from. The old slasher said, 'Phil, no, you have to cut out that program; there are only four or five students and I am not much concerned about these four or five people.'

Ms Verge: There are hundreds of students.

Mr. Winsor: There are hundreds of students, so it works out -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) students.

Mr. Winsor: Oh, yes, in the course of a year. Isn't one day important in the education of a child?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: You can't defend it.

Ms Verge: I am surprised you are even trying to defend it.

Mr. Winsor: Today's telegram suggests, too, that the Minister might be having a little more of a problem.

Mr. Matthews: Oh? What is that?

Mr. Winsor: The Minister, in his address to the school board superintendents -

An Hon. Member: Some speech (inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Well, that is not what the paper says, that it was some speech. "Debate over elementary education apparent in minister's address". It says, "He said the system must include instruction in such global and national concerns as environmental sciences, AIDS", and so on; that is what the Minister said, and Mr. Siscoe responds: "teachers find the constant demands for expanded curriculum with limited resources..." This is from the Minister who gets on his feet and boasts about all the money he is putting into education, and now we find that the -

Dr. Warren: (Inaudible) speaker.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister wants to get up and take part in this Budget debate, then he is quite entitled to. They have sat there for days and days, and all we get are a few

interjections across the House, and the Minister of Fisheries, today, trying to cover up his inadequacies in the program he has not had the intestinal fortitude to announce. That is all we get from these people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just a few more comments on education.

Dr. Kitchen: Be careful now.

Mr. Simms: No, you be careful.

Mr. Tobin: You just got a threat from the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Winsor: The Minister of Finance?

Mr. Simms: What did he say this time?

An Hon. Member: He told him to (inaudible).

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, the rural inequalities in education continue to grow worse. I recognize that declining enrollments are a factor in the inequities that exist in the educational system. There is no question that that is a problem, that education in this Province suffers because of declining enrollments, but the Minister of Education is the only person in this Province who is in a position to do something about it.

Dr. Warren: I will.

Mr. Winsor: I will. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how long we are going to have to wait.

Some Hon. Members: Not seventeen years. Not seventeen years.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, the same man who came on hands and knees

begging the Government, the Government of the day, to allow him to head up the Task Force on Educational Financing, the same man who had a report written and then tried to sneak out from the report because of the calling of the election and say, Somebody else wrote the recommendations. I only did the work, the findings, and everything else. The recommendations were all done by somebody else. That is the excuse he uses to get out, to squirm out from under the report that same Minister has written.

Mr. Noel: Does that (inaudible) some type of psychological mind-set?

Mr. Winsor: Now, Mr. Speaker, what is he called? The expert on constitutional matters, the Senator from Pleasantville, he seems to be awfully anxious to take part in the debate. Now, I will allow the Member for Pleasantville some time to get up and tell us the distribution lines for the ten seats which are proposed for the Province, and he can also, at that time, tell us which seat he is going to run in, if he so desires. If the Member wants to do that, we will give him time. I will give him my valuable time to give us the breakdown of the boundaries of the ten seats the Province will have under the Premier's new constitutional amendment formula for the Province, the Triple "E" Senate.

Just a quick word to the Minister of Finance and the President of Treasury Board on the negotiations which are going on in the public service, particularly the one I happened to get a little bit of information from on occasion, the collective bargaining going on between the teachers. The Member

for Exploits hates to hear this being mentioned, because he knows what teachers in the Province are saying about them, and I suspect he is a little bit embarrassed about meeting teachers now. But the Minister of Finance, no doubt, gave explicit instructions to the people at Treasury Board that teachers' pensions are to go as they were formerly. I think the Member for Exploits and the Minister of Labour, over the next few days, will have a considerable amount to explain to the teachers of this Province as they get on with their collective bargaining process.

It being near five o'clock, I will take my place.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question on the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Yes. Yes.

On motion, the amendment was defeated.

Ms Verge: (Inaudible) barely had a majority.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, we have heard in this debate quite a number of points raised on both sides of the House, many of which we will be taking into consideration. We thank everybody for participating in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to close the debate.

Mr. Simms: You move the motion,

Herb, that the Speaker leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Dr. Kitchen: I move it, yes.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is that I do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

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

Committee of the Whole

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

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

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

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

Mr. L. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole on Supply have considered the matters to them referred, have directed me to report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again, presently.

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

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, I have received a message from His Honour The Lieutenant-Governor.

An Hon. Member: Did he ask you to apologize for something?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Kitchen: Pretty good!

Mr. Speaker: To the hon. the Minister of Finance.

"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending the 31st day of March 1991 by way of further supply and in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution Act, 1867, I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly."

The hon. the Government House Leader.

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

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider the message of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Supply

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

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

On motion, the total contained in the Estimates was carried.

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

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

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

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole on Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report that they have passed the amount of \$2,772,337,300 contained in the Estimates of Supply, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again, presently.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the Committee of the Whole on Supply with respect to the Estimates of 1990-91 be referred to a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means, and that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

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

Committee of The Whole on Supply

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Resolution

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991, the sum of one billion seven hundred and eighty-eight million eight hundred and twenty three thousand dollars (\$1,788,823,000).

On motion, resolution carried.

On motion, Clauses 1 through 3, carried.

On motion, preamble carried.

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

On motion, title carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried.

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

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

Mr. L. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole on Supply have considered the matters to them referred and report having passed a certain resolution and recommend that a Bill be introduced to give effect to same.

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

On motion, resolution read a first and second time.

On motion, A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For the Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Ninety-One And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service, read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper (Bill No. 50).

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

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, the order of business tomorrow is Private Member's Day, the resolution having to do with tourism, by the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

The Bills I want to proceed with next are Bill Nos. 27, 7, 30, 26, and 31.

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

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

Mr. Simms: I just want to ask the Government House Leader, the order is which he gave the Bills, is that the order in which he intends to proceed, as well?

Mr. Baker: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: So it is 27, 7, 26 30 -

Mr. Baker: No, 30, 26, 31.

Mr. Simms: Let us get it straight now. 27 is first, 7, 30. Thank

you.

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