



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 62

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush*

Tuesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

23 October 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

Before proceeding with our routine business on behalf of hon. Members we would like to extend a warm welcome today to sixty-three Level 2 students from Holy Trinity School, Torbay, accompanied by three teachers Shirley Thorne, Betty Gosse, and Paul McLeod.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

#### Statements by Ministers

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

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, I read this statement on behalf of the President of Treasury Board who is ill, but who wishes to have this statement read in the House today.

Mr. Speaker, today I wish to inform Members of the House of Assembly of some of the measures the Provincial Government intends to implement for the remainder of this fiscal year to address the serious deterioration in the Province's financial position

Hon. Members will recall that the Wells Administration is committed to eliminating unnecessary spending and achieving a more efficient Administration. Shortly after assuming office in May, 1989 we reduced the size of the Provincial Cabinet and the number of Government departments. This resulted further in a reduction in the number of deputy ministers, assistant deputy ministers, and other support staff. We have not wavered in this effort to eliminate extravagance and waste. This is reflected in the freeze we

placed on the purchase of all new automobiles this year and in reduced departments' operating budgets.

Despite these efforts, and as you know already, the Province's budgeted surplus of \$10.2 million on current account has been eroded to the point that we are now forecasting a possible current account deficit in the range of \$120 million by the end of this fiscal year.

To address this serious problem, a Special Committee of Cabinet has been put in place under the chairmanship of the hon. the Premier. This Committee has met over the past number of weeks to review measures that can be implemented this fiscal year to control the growth in the Government's expenditures.

At this time I would like to take the opportunity to indicate to hon. Members that all Government operations have been reviewed with the intent of identifying some immediate savings that could be realized.

The Committee has been successful so far in identifying savings in the amount of \$12 million.

The Committee has identified a number of areas to freeze funding because expansions in program initiatives will not be proceeding as planned in the Budget. In other cases certain services will be reduced from those originally planned last Spring. Furthermore some departments have had to fund expanded activities without a corresponding increase in their overall budgets. As a result departments will have to reallocate funding. Overall, expected savings will be in the

order of \$7 million.

The area where Government has most control over expenditures is with departmental operations. Each Minister is committed to eliminating unnecessary spending in his or her department. As an example of this restraint, all out-of-Province travel by public employees must be approved by Ministers. This applies also to any significant travel within the Province.

All departments have been given a salary budget for 1990-91. They have been directed to live within these amounts. In some instances there have been lay-offs because departments would have exceeded their salary budgets. Also, overtime costs will be trimmed.

Another area of Government expenditure which will be controlled is the expenditure on Government vehicles. This is a matter on which we addressed this Honourable House last May. Since then we have exerted more effort to control this area of expenditure. In a recent directive to departments we have indicated that no funding will be available to departments next year for light vehicles unless we are convinced that the vehicles themselves are required to deliver effectively services to the public. Each department and agency will be reporting to Treasury Board by the end of November on the action they will be taking to reduce expenditures on light vehicles.

Mr. Speaker, I am expecting that departments will realize savings in the amount of \$5 million for the remainder of this year in their operations. Through this action we can expect that overtime

costs will be reduced, that as positions become vacant in Government departments many will remain vacant, that travel will be curtailed and that unnecessary purchases will be eliminated. I have the support of all my Cabinet colleagues in ensuring that Government delivers on this initiative.

The importance of taking early action to address the deterioration in the Province's financial position cannot be overstated. The prospects for next year are not encouraging.

Mr. Speaker, departments and agencies are now in the process of preparing their budgets for 1991-92. They have been directed to undertake their budget planning on the basis that there is no new funding for 1991-92, that is, their budgets will be "frozen" at this year's level. This will place a heavy burden on all activities funded through the public purse.

As the Honourable Premier stated to the press on September 19, 1990: "All departments, government-funded agencies, hospitals, school boards, municipalities, the university and colleges will be expected to play their part. All will be requested to implement measures to streamline operations and increase efficiency." The directions I have announced today should indicate clearly to these agencies and to the general public that the process of expenditure restraint has begun. Ministers will be announcing shortly the details of the reductions in their respective departmental operations for the current fiscal year.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I must confess at the outset that we had a little bit of a misunderstanding with respect to the statement. It was delivered by the Minister of Finance's assistant, and, of course, it was placed in the - (BREAK IN TAPE), So I have just heard what the Minister has had to say. I have not really had a chance to go through it in detail, but I have tried to listen and to make a few notes as we go through.

Now, my first comment would be what a difference a few months makes, Mr. Speaker. What a difference. This is so far beyond what the Minister of Finance had to say publicly in this House, behind the clapping and cheering of the members on that side of the House back in March, that you would never believe it was the same Minister of Finance. It is hard to understand, Mr. Speaker. I cannot believe it.

Now, essentially there is nothing in the statement of specifics, very little specifics. All it does, I think, is add more fuel to the speculation that is out there, particularly in the health care field and the education field. There are no specifics here. The things he talks about in terms of restraint are all restraint matters that have been put in place in the past on occasion, from time to time, where you ask people to curtail their overtime expenditures, or you ask departments to cut down on travel. There is nothing new in any of this. In all this big statement he says they found \$5 million. But when the difference

is \$130 million from what he projected, he still has a very, very long way to go, Mr. Speaker.

There are a couple of interesting items here I found, as a matter of fact. One is his sentence on page two where he talks about the area where Government has most control over expenditures is with departmental operations. The next sentence says, 'each Minister is committed to eliminating unnecessary spending in their departments.' Why would there be unnecessary spending in the departments in the first place? It does not make any sense.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: The Premier is (inaudible) austerity.

Mr. Simms: Yes. I remind the Premier that this is his Budget this year, and he cannot blame it on us. This is your Budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only other thing I want to comment on at this stage is the comment about cars and vehicles. Number one, he talks about a freeze on the purchase of all new automobiles this year. Further on in the statement he talks about cutting back on operation expenses with vehicles and so on. Since the Minister has cut back on the purchase of all new automobiles, has he looked at the possibility of cutting back on leasing automobiles?

For example, the brand new cars leased by the Economic Recovery Commission, has that been curtailed, as well? Because it is not mentioned in the statement? The Economic Recovery Commission, I understand, have leased a number of large new cars, and, of course,

they have furnished their office space with luxury office furnishings. The Economic Recovery Commission has the equivalent of seven new assistant deputy ministers. So, if you want to look at an area in which to save a few dollars, have a look at the Economic Recovery Commission which, up until now in any event, has been a dismal failure.

I would also suggest to the Minister, in conclusion, that on the issue of asking public servants to curtail their out-of-province travel, when you find serious situations such as we face today, it might not be unwise for the Premier to have a look at perhaps curtailing out-of-province travel by Ministers as well, even though we understand the necessity from time to time. But the public are supposed to understand the importance of this serious situation, and maybe the Premier should put a bit of a freeze on travel by Ministers, particularly out-of-province travel by Ministers, for the period of the next few months, to the end of the fiscal year. You might save a few bucks there. I suspect by the smiles on the Minister's faces that maybe they are expecting that to come anyway. I hope it does, because it is a suggestion that, I think, might be well worth while looking into.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, there is not much in the statement; there were no specifics, there are a lot of generalities. What we are interested in knowing is what kind of plans there are for the health care sector, for the education sector, and all these other areas about which we have heard all kinds of rumors over the last two or three weeks, where we are about to face a serious catastrophe.

The next eighteen to twenty-four months in this Province are going to be very, very difficult times, and unless this Government shows proper fiscal management, responsible fiscal management, and most of all honest fiscal management, we are going to be in for a very, very difficult time, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

#### Oral Questions

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

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we have seen over the last several days that the Government, in an attempt to cover its fiscal mismanagement and incompetence, is now proceeding to institute some of the most severe cutbacks we have seen in this Province in a long, long time, cutbacks which will negatively impact on the sick, the elderly, the youth of our Province, because it is going to set the education system back at least twenty years according to educators in this Province.

We have seen over the last couple of days announced cutbacks at the Pentecostal Senior Citizens' Home in Clarke's Beach, at the Stephenville Crossing senior citizen home; last night we heard about cutbacks, all affecting the most vulnerable in our society, Mr. Speaker.

I want to ask the Premier, is the Premier going to allow the sick and elderly citizens of this Province to be put out on the street? Where is the compassion? Where is the fairness and balance

and compassion in the policy the Premier and the Government is pursuing?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I will answer the question in the context of the Pentecostal Senior Citizens' Home. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition raised the question a couple of days ago in the House, and referred to this fact, that the senior citizens home in Clarke's Beach was cut back by the Government to save money, so I undertook to have it checked. I have checked, and here is what I have found. A recent review indicated that there was no order whatsoever by the Department of Health, since May 5th, 1989, when this party formed the Government, to require a cutback in that home in Clarke's Beach. But I did not stop there. I went back beyond that and I found that on May 2nd, 1988 - I will not read the letter because it will be too long, but I will table it if hon. members want it - on May 2nd, 1988, there is a letter to Pastor Earle by the then Director of Services to senior citizens, referring to the meeting of April 19th, 1988 and the situation there was that there was overcrowding. 'Given this situation, your home is hereby requested to reduce its resident population to eighty-seven persons.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, other than that there has never been any direction to the Pentecostal home to cut back. So this is just one more of the kind of machinated and fabricated suggestions that the Opposition have been putting forward recently to try and divert attention away from the real dedication of this Government to cut out waste and keep the

Government providing the maximum possible level of services with the least possible interference with public services in the Province.

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

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is one thing to suggest reducing occupancy for safety reasons, but, Mr. Speaker, the Pentecostal Assemblies have advised us that they were recently told to cut back from 100 to seventy-five, a cutback of twenty-five people at the home in Clarke's Beach.

Now, I also asked the Premier about the cutback at Stephenville Crossing and he did not respond to that. But I want to ask the Premier this: The Premier and the Government are now planning cutbacks in Health, Education and Social Services. How does the Premier justify that when the Economic Recovery Commission, for example, is spending millions of dollars, when it is leasing vehicles, when it is appointing new people all over the Province, buying new furniture? How can the Premier justify to eighty year old citizens that they have to go out on the street and the Government cannot look out for them?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition does not understand that, then that provides me with the full explanation of why they made such mess of our economy in the seventeen years for which they had the responsibility. It explains it without further assessment.

Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge

of any suggested reduction in the senior citizens home in Stephenville Crossing.

Mr. Tobin: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: If the Member for Burin - Placentia West wants to answer the question, I will yield. But if the question is asked of me and they expect an answer, I would like to have the opportunity to provide it. But it is impossible for you, Mr. Speaker, or anybody else who is interested to hear it with the constant babble of the Member for Burin - Placentia West, chimed in by the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) lecture (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I remind hon. members that when the speaker rises, there is to be absolute silence. And I remind hon. members that every member is entitled to be heard in silence. We ask hon. members to adhere to that courtesy of the House.

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the question. In the time since members opposite raised the question about leasing of vehicles by the ERC, a member on this side very astutely went out and made a call. I am happy to tell you that we have been advised by the Chairman that the ERC has neither purchased nor leased any vehicles.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: So they have no regard for facts or validity. It

is the true Machiavellian approach. Say anything that slings a bit of mud.

An Hon. Member: Are they using somebody (inaudible)?

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Order please!

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, a minute is all they have had to do a quick check, and this is the note I have just gotten.

Now I will get the full and absolute details, and perhaps before this House adjourns today I will be able to reconfirm exactly what the situation is. But I just pass on that quick bit of information.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the Economic Recovery Commission, we had originally provided that Commission to help diversify our economy and give our people an opportunity to find work within this Province in other than the traditional resource-based industries. We had estimated approximately a \$3 million expenditure per year. In the first year they expended just over \$1 million. So far this year, Mr. Speaker, in this current fiscal year, they have spent just over \$1.1 million or \$1.2 million, I have forgotten, but I will get the details. So these allegations of vast quantities of money being spent by them are just totally and completely unfounded.

Mr. Speaker, their purpose, as everybody knows, is to ensure that we create the kind of opportunity here that will allow for the development of employment opportunities and the development and expansion of our economy. That is the real value and the

real purpose, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, while the Premier is hanging on technicalities, I hope when he says he is going to check out the information that he checks out Enterprise Newfoundland, or New Corp, whatever it is called, all under the umbrella of the Economic Recovery Commission. We do not want the technical answers, Mr. Speaker, we want the true answers.

Now Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from what the Premier is saying here today that the Premier is a nineteenth-century right-wing conservative. That what this Premier is, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear hear!

Mr. Simms: That is exactly what he is.

Mr. Rideout: Exactly what he is. When is the Premier going to admit to the sick and the elderly and the students of this province that he misled them in 1989? When is the Premier going to admit that he deceived the people of this Province, that he is not a liberal, that he is a left-wing lunatic, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: A right-wing lunatic!

Premier Wells: Make up your mind. Right or left, which question is it I have to answer?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

I remind hon. members again that when the Speaker rises, there should be silence. I also want to remind hon. members again that this is a small House and when the noise level reaches the level it reached a moment ago, then nobody can be heard. I did recognize the hon. the Premier, so I will now recognize the hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the comment from the hon. the Member for Grand Bank, I am having checked - and I pretty well have the detail now - the extent of the travel, and I will provide that as soon as I have it in good shape, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in response to the totally unfounded allegations of the Leader of the Opposition as to when I was going to admit that I had deceived, I have never, ever deceived anybody in my life.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Premier Wells: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, and the Members opposite do not like that fact. They do not like the fact that the people of this Province and perhaps even the people of the country have great respect for the integrity of this Government, and the honesty and the frankness of the Government. That really bothers the hon. Members opposite, so I can not do much about that.

But, Mr. Speaker, what I can say to the senior citizens of this Province and to the people requiring health care and so on, is that we lived up to our commitment. Last year, Mr. Speaker, we caused an increase of, I forget whether it was \$75 million or \$80 million, in the health care budget.



An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) away.

Premier Wells: We are not taking anything away.

Mr. Rideout: You are. When is a freeze not a cut?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Again I want to point out that Oral Question period is not a period for debate, it is a period for providing information. I would ask the Premier to please carry on and answer as quickly as he can.

Premier Wells: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will wind up very quickly. The simple fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we have demonstrated sensitivity to the concerns. We want this Province to be in a position to provide that service into the future. We are not prepared to be irresponsible, as the former government would be in the circumstances, and we intend to provide the service that is needed in this Province within the limits of our capability, of the capability not of the government, but the capability of the taxpayers of this Province, some of whom are the senior citizens about whom the hon. member is worried.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The Chair wants to comment on a couple of words that were used to make sure they are used in the right context. I want to point out to hon. members that 'deception' and 'deceived' are unparliamentary when used in a certain sense. When they are used in the political sense, the Chair has a tendency to let them go.

But to accuse a person of deception is, indeed, unparliamentary, but I took in the sense of the political sense.

The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. I am sure she will beware that a student assistants strike is presently in progress right across Newfoundland and Labrador. Is the minister aware that the government has violated, the government has broken the Memorandum of Understanding that was reached back in September between the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees and Government? And would the minister please explain why that agreement has been broken and why these people are forced back on the picket line again?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: Mr. Speaker, thank you for recognizing me. First of all, that question would, I think, more suitably be directed to the President of Treasury Board. My simple statement would be that as the Minister of Labour, my conciliators are standing by and will do everything they can to resolve the issue. Thank you.

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

Mr. Doyle: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Is the minister aware that one of the conditions under which the student assistants returned to work, and which was contained in that Memorandum of Understanding,

was that there would be no reduction in the hours of work, there would be no reduction in the number of people who were to be recalled. We now find that 2,200 hours less have been worked by the student assistants, and 200 of them have not been recalled.

Will the government be honouring that agreement, that Memorandum of Understanding, that tentative agreement that was made between NAPE and Government? Will the Government be honouring that agreement, and stop trying to balance the books on the backs of the developmentally delayed of this Province?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the lack of understanding my critic has certainly backs up my feelings about the lack of understanding of labour when they were in power. It is not my role as Minister of Employment and Labour to be responding to these questions, it is the role of the President of Treasury Board. I do not make myself familiar with those particular details.

An Hon. Member: What a disgrace!

An Hon. Member: What do you make yourself familiar with?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Ms Cowan: I make myself familiar with trying to see that the process works, which I do not suppose you have any understanding of whatsoever.

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

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, maybe I will ask the Minister of Labour a question that she can respond to. I am sure she is aware of the fact that the Memorandum of Understanding was violated because her department undoubtedly was part and parcel of that memorandum in reaching that tentative agreement. Can the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations tell us, and tell the labour movement all across Newfoundland and Labrador, what the affect on labour relations will be if the Government on one day can reach an agreement and then on the next day, when it does not suit them, tear up that agreement? Can she tell us what affect that will have on labour relations in this Province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: Thank you.

The point the gentleman is making is only one point of view, a point of view that is coming from another side to a collective agreement and that he is capitalizing on. It is not a generally held point of view.

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Since the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations does not understand the situation, despite the fact she is a former President of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, she should certainly understand it on that basis, let me ask a question of the Minister of Education. The Minister

committed to parents and teachers on several occasions, publicly this past year, that there would be no reduction whatsoever in the Student Assistance Program. How can the Minister now justify the fact that there is a reduction, and what is he going to do about it?

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

Dr. Warren: I am really pleased, Mr. Speaker, to answer that question, I have been waiting for it. In fact I had a leak that the Member was going to ask me that question. This Government has lived up, I am delighted to say, to its commitment to provide the same level of service this year as last year. In fact we found a little more than the \$500,000 which we needed. I am delighted to tell the people of this Province that we have done that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. Warren: I am not speaking for the President of Treasury Board but it is my understanding, and I have been briefed on the current dispute, it is my understanding that the problems have occurred with the implementation of the agreement. Some boards are meeting fully the spirit of the agreement, and I am informed in many cases, I just got a note in fact that in one case the board is going to take action if the student assistants do not go back to work, because the board has met fully the spirit of the agreement. In many other cases they are working on it and we hope this situation will be resolved very shortly.

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me tell the Minister that a couple of boards are living within the spirit of the agreement simply because they have made it quite clear that they are going to call back the student assistants and give them the same number of hours they had last year, as the Minister said they would get, and when the money runs out they will lay them all off at the one time instead of doing it in bits and pieces. The other boards are working on the reduced rate because the Minister has not delivered on the funding he promised.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Hearn: Let me ask the Minister: despite the fact that we pointed out earlier in the year there was not money enough in the Budget to cover the program in its entirety, has the Minister now given more funding to school boards so that they can bring back the number of student assistants for the same number of hours they had last year?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister.

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, Government has fully met its commitment to provide the same level of service, the same number of hours this year, and in fact to provide for the increase. The problem comes with the implementation, board by board. That is being worked on and my hope, in the interest of the students and the student assistants, is that the problem will be resolved very shortly.

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

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, the Minister yesterday, in answering questions based upon educational funding said that he had to make decisions to meet the fiscal requirements of Government. Let me ask the Minister then, if he wants to generalize, when is he going to start making some decisions which will meet the requirements of the students, Mr. Speaker?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, in the last few days - he asked me a very general question - I have had an opportunity to have my department put together the accomplishments of this Government in education over the last sixteen months. And I am prepared very shortly - I am getting a final draft ready - to spend twenty minutes or perhaps I will need two or three twenty minute periods, to outline what this Government has done for education in this Province over the last sixteen months, and I will do that, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. Will the Minister confirm that he has approved or will approve the use of a chemical herbicide on the cut over forest land in the King's Point area, in order to eliminate deciduous growth?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Mr. Flight: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the hon. member for his question, and I would say to him that in 1984 the previous Administration approved an experimental program using a herbicide to control vegetation in softwood stands.

And, Mr. Speaker, for the next five years that was carried on on an experimental basis administered by the previous administration. Last year, early in 1989, it became operational. I might point out, as the previous Minister of Forestry would know, that the experimental program was being monitored and an environmental impact study done and the Department of Environment approved the program for the purpose of vegetation control. It became operational and now the two paper companies apply in any given year to the department for approval to do that program, as does the Department of Forestry.

And, yes, Mr. Speaker, there is, as a result of that experimental program, initiated by the previous administration, -

Mr. Simms: Now you will blame that on the previous administration.

Mr. Flight: - a herbicide program for the purpose of vegetation control in silviculturally treated stands.

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

Mr. Parsons: Mr. Speaker, the Minister at least has a different slant on things. One time he is blaming the Feds, now he is blaming the crowd over here. You

are the Minister. Will the Minister tell the House what chemical is being used; what are the known environmental effects of the chemical; whether studies have been done to determine the affect of the chemical on wildlife in the Newfoundland and Labrador forests?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Mr. Flight: Mr. Speaker, obviously it is a very complex question. I will commit myself to provide to the hon. Member the answers to what again is, as I say, very technical information. I will tell him that the herbicide that we are using has two names really, Vision or Roundup. I might say to the hon. Member that the Department of Environment has determined, through departmental environmental studies, that it has no adverse effect on the environment, that it does suppress hardwood growth in silviculturally treated areas where we are trying to grow softwoods to guarantee a similar supply for our lumber mills and for the paper mills. But with regard to the very technical questions, I will provide the hon. member with those detailed answers.

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

Mr. Parsons: Will the Minister tell the House how this chemical will be applied? Does he intend that it be controlled from the ground, similar to the treatment which has been used by the electrical companies on their transmission lines? Is this the method he is going to use? Is it an aerial spray or is it a ground spray?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Mr. Flight: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to respond, Mr. Speaker, the tenor of the question would imply, how is the Minister going to apply it? The fact is, it has been applied for the past four years. Did the hon. member ever ask his Minister of Forestry or his Minister of Environment how they intended to apply that particular treatment? We are applying it the same way now, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Flight: I inherited the program, Mr. Speaker, and we are using the same method of application as was used and approved by the previous Ministers of Forestry and Agriculture and Environment.

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe what I am hearing. But you were the people who said you would not use a chemical spray.

Mr. Simms: That is right.

Mr. Parsons: You are now using a chemical spray. You were up in your place every day of the week saying that chemical sprays should not be used.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman is on a supplementary.

Mr. Parsons: Let me ask the

Minister another question. Given the high unemployment rate in Newfoundland, has the Minister considered hiring workers to simply cut out the unwanted growth, thereby creating jobs and avoiding any risk whatsoever to our environment?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Mr. Flight: The thought is worth considering, Mr. Speaker. I would have to inform the hon. member that to serve the purpose he is talking about, I probably would not have to hire people to cut out the unwanted brush, I would probably have to hire people to weed it out. Because, you see, that herbicide program is only used to get the softwood growth up to a point where it does not have any competition, and after that the hardwoods grow, and the maples and the blueberry bushes and everything else, so it is not a case of cutting it out. And with regard to the previous question, the hon. member would be interested to know that the way we are spraying, using the herbicide, i, in most cases, by helicopter, as was done prior to my inheriting the program.

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

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, Mr. Speaker, on the continuing saga of the mismanagement and mishandling of a contract on the Ossokmanuan Bridge in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, during the last set of questions I asked on this

particular item, the Minister made some statements I would like to check today. First of all, we found out in the last set of questions that between the first tender call and the second tender call there were items removed from the second tender call before it went out. I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation what were the specific items that were removed, the two items I am aware of at least, and why was the contract changed to remove these two items?

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

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, I will get an answer for the Member for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Question Period has expired.

An Hon. Member: No. no.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) another minute, isn't there? Two forty-eight, according to the table.

Mr. Speaker: No. I took down 2:14 when the Question Period began.

Some Hon. Members: 2:18.

Mr. Speaker: 2:18 Well, okay. Sorry.

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Premier will remember that he responded to a question of mine with a letter of August 24, 1990 in which he made some statements on the amount of money we saved by recalling this tender. I would ask the

Premier, was he aware when he wrote me this letter that there were items removed from the first contract before the second tender was called?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, no, I don't have any awareness or recollection that I was aware of that. When the letter was written to me, as most people holding the office that I do would do, I consulted the Department concerned and got the information and passed it on. To the best of my knowledge, everything contained in the letter is totally accurate and reliable.

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

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question back to the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. The Minister knew when the Premier was writing me a letter that all the information required relating to this particular contract should have been known by the Premier. Would the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation inform this hon. House why he tried to mislead the Premier by not giving him the full information as to what this second contract would be, Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, that would be the last thing I would try to do, mislead the Premier, let me assure you. I will get the answer to the -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gilbert: If there are any changes, I will get the answer tomorrow. If there were minor changes, I will get the answer and I will give it to the Member tomorrow.

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

Mr. R. Aylward: Mr. Speaker, maybe the Member would not intentionally try to mislead the Premier, and I suppose he would not intentionally try to mislead this House, but in answering questions last week, when I suggested that the changes in the contract would be worth some \$250,000, the hon. Minister said his estimates were that the changes would be worth some \$20,000.

Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of a page from a tender that was submitted with the first set of tenders, the information the Minister had when the Premier wrote his letter to me. Mr. Speaker, would the Minister confirm that the actual value of the two items removed was in the vicinity of \$152,000?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Gilbert: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not confirm that. I did find out as a result of a question which the member asked last week that there were minor changes in the contract. I do not know what they were. I told him I will give him the details of what the minor changes were tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Kilbride on a final

supplementary.

Mr. R. Aylward: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier table in this House a copy of the first and second sets of tenders received on this contract so that Members of this House of Assembly can have a look at them to see which statements of the Minister of Transportation are truthful and which statements are not truthful?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I am confident that everything the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation says to this House is truthful. Whether he is at any point in time mistaken in his belief or not may be another question. I see no reason why those tenders cannot be tabled. I will make an inquiry as to whether there is any legal reason or any other good and valid reason why they should not. But I have no quarrel with -

Mr. Hearn: (Inaudible) public tenders.

Premier Wells: Yes. Look, anything that involves the expenditure of public funds should be subject to scrutiny on the floor of this House, including the inordinate expense to which the taxpayers will be put by the improper request of the members opposite to the Ombudsman to carry out a court application. We will tender that too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. Aylward: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member for Kilbride on a point of order.

Mr. R. Aylward: I am sure the Premier did not realize what he was doing, Mr. Speaker, but he has indirectly called the Ombudsman a liar. Because the Ombudsman has stated publicly that the investigation that he would do on this matter would not cost one cent.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

There is no point of order. I did not gather that the Premier had said anything to that effect.

Question Period has expired.

#### Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: A few days ago, some member opposite suggested that if I curtailed my personal travel as Premier I could save a good deal of money, and I undertook to table in this House the expenses I incurred as Premier. And today some other hon. member raised the question of my travel expenses, and I told him that I was in the process of getting the travel expenses. So that they would be meaningful, I have also included the travel expenses of former Premier Peckford for the last three years, and I am happy to table it, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

#### Petitions



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

Mr. Hodder: I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of twenty residents of various districts throughout the Province, most of them being in the St. John's area, some in the Burin - Placentia West area, some in Humber East, but most of them in the St. John's Centre area of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the petition to the House of Assembly asks that the Government change its policy with respect to maintenance and child support received by a social assistance recipient, which now deducts family support payments dollar for dollar from social assistance. They state this change in policy adversely affects some of the poorest people in the Province, namely, single mothers and children. And they state this change in policy negates the benefits of the Support Enforcement Program for the people who need it most. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the third or fourth time that a petition of this sort has come to the House of Assembly. I think it is very, very important that this issue continue to be put forward in this House of Assembly, because it seems to me incomprehensible that the government has taken this step, and it is incomprehensible that they have not changed their minds and reversed their policy on this.

Mr. Speaker, on a couple of occasions I have spoken on this particular issue, but the message does not seem to be getting through from the Opposition to the Government just what they have done. Mr. Speaker, I would like to go through it again for the

sake of members opposite, especially for the sake of the minister responsible, who is not here today - the Premier is - for the sake of single mothers, and for the sake of children who are suffering because of this particular program of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, let us say, for example, that you have two families on social assistance. Of course, that is something neither family would be proud of, but it is a fact that nevertheless is a reality in many homes in this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, if in one family there are two parents, under the present regulations in the Social Services Department, one or both of those parents can earn extra income in addition to their social assistance. Now the minister was quoted the other day in the media as saying that a family cannot receive income from two sources, if one of those sources is social assistance. Well, that is not true. There is earned income allowed to social assistance recipients without their social assistance being affected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you have the second of those families, and in the second family there is only one parent, usually the mother; father may be separated or divorced from the mother, or it is possible that the parents were never married at all, but there is at least one child in the family. Now, Mr. Speaker, under the Department's regulations that mother can also go out and earn some extra money without it affecting the social assistance, but the problem with that is: how can she afford to go out and earn some extra income if she is the only parent to look after the

child? How much money is she going to save if she is going to have to pay a babysitter, a cook, or whatever it is, to look after a child when she can only earn - and these are not situations which are in a utopia like in Toronto where there is day care. We are talking about Newfoundland, in the real world, particularly in rural Newfoundland where there is no day care or very little day care. Mr. Speaker, in a two parent family one parent can care for the children while the other can bring in some income, whether it is a little bit of fishing, or whether it is getting his own wood. He can actually earn from social services \$100, or 50 per cent up to \$200 he can keep as allowable income. That is in a two parent family. But what happens to the single mother, Mr. Speaker? She is not free to both care for the child and to work, and that is the person this Government has hit in this particular cutback. She is not free to go out and acquire the work skills she needs to get herself off social assistance because someone has to care for her child. Now this is what I would like hon. members to understand, where you have two parents, one of them can have earned income where there are children, but when you only have one child this is practically impossible in this Province. Mr. Speaker, when members get up and say they are bringing it up to make everything fair is just not so. What about the child's other parent?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

o o o

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Fortune Hermitage.

Mr. Langdon: I have a petitions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I called Orders of the Day and we will have to have leave of the House to revert to Petitions.

An Hon. Member: By leave.

Mr. Speaker: We have leave to go back to Petitions.

The hon. the Member for Fortune - Hermitage.

Mr. Langdon: I have a petition here from the residents of Gaultois asking that the present ferry service be preserved, but it is not on the proper letterhead and so on, so I guess I will have to have leave of the House before it could be presented.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have leave?

An Hon. Member: He has leave.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. Langdon: I am pleased to present this petition of 302 names to the hon. House today but I am saddened, like the residents of Gaultois, to realize that the present system they have will come to an end very shortly. The present ferry system they have came into being this past Summer because of a contract dispute with the previous owners there. The original ferry assigned to the Gaultois - Hermitage run had no vehicle capacity and the council, along with the Development Association, have argued from that particular time that the service

should be upgraded and that there should be provision for a roll-on, roll-off service provided to the community. The past Summer the residents of Gaultois saw first hand the advantages of having a roll-on, roll-off, service to the community. The Department of Transportation, along with the Department of Municipal Affairs upgraded the roads in Gaultois, which was the first time, I think, for fourteen years according to the Mayor, but the ferry did provide access for vehicles to come from Hermitage, the trucks, the graders, and what have you, to travel to the island to upgrade the road. Without the present ferry they have that would not have been possible. There is a need in Hermitage, and there is a need in Gaultois for a ramp to provide more effective roll-on service for the community. The residents are not asking for a facility that you would find in Port aux Basques or one that you would find in Argentia, but one suitable so that a tractor trailer when it leaves the ferry could back back by the plant and load its fish into the particular trailer and send it to market. This summer when I met with the people from Gaultois, the mayor and the representative from management, they were saying that with a ferry service similar to the Isle of Islay on the route they could save in excess of \$250,000 in transportation costs, which would no doubt help to make the fish plant there more viable. And I think this is what the whole process is about.

In conversation with a resident of Gaultois this morning, they were saying that we are not only against the ferry Agnes and Ann 11, but we are against the Kimberly Christine or any other

ferry that would go on that service, even if it was brand new, if it did not provide the service which would provide for a roll-on, roll-off service for a tractor trailer.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this past weekend when we met in Hermitage in a conference which all the people from the area attended, except for the people of Gaultois, who could not make it because it was too stormy that day for the ferry to come across from Gaultois to Hermitage. The Agnes and Ann, the boat that is going to be replacing this particular vessel, is about one-quarter of the size of the boat that is now there. And since we have very rugged, winter weather on the south coast, I really support the people of Gaultois in saying that this particular boat that is about to go into service cannot really adequately do the job.

Mr. Speaker, the fish plant in Gaultois, as we are all aware, is really in a very tenuous position and they are trying to keep the plant open. I would think that sometimes we play the chicken and egg game saying that if the plant is kept open then we will provide the necessary ramps and dock facilities and what have you. Probably if we provided that beforehand we might be able to attract some particular buyer for that plant in Gaultois and if that is not happening then probably we are looking at the demise of the town itself.

The wharf facilities in Gaultois this past summer has been improved considerably by a contract let by the Federal Department of Public Works, where many of the old buildings on the wharf have been torn down, and the area has been

filled in with rocks and gravel that was brought, by the way, on the ferry from Hermitage to Gaultois, and probably without that ferry service that particular job could not have been done so economically.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to rise today to speak to this petition, to support the people in Gaultois in their request for upgraded ferry service. I raised this matter in the Legislature some time last week after the people of Gaultois made some representation to me about the concerns they had about the Agnes and Ann, a fifty-three or a fifty-five year old vessel that the Department of Works, Services and Transportation was going to put on the Gaultois-Hermitage run. There were two major concerns that the residents had about that particular vessel, one was the age of the vessel, and the question of safety, and the other as the Member for Fortune - Hermitage has alluded to, being the desire to have a roll-on, roll-off capacity, mainly for the reason of giving their fish plant and their town a chance to survive.

Now the people of Gaultois are not asking too much, Mr. Speaker, from either level of government in their quest, their desire to keep their town alive. They are asking for a redfish quota from the Federal Government and an adequate vessel to service the people of

Gaultois, from the Provincial Government. They are not asking very much. That is all they are asking of the Provincial Government, Mr. Speaker, is to provide them with a roll-on roll-off vessel with that capacity.

Now I happened to visit Gaultois a number of months ago with members of the Fisheries Committee here to talk to the people of Gaultois and to look at their particular fish plant operation. I was thoroughly impressed, Mr. Speaker, with what I saw, with the industrious people of Gaultois, how hard they work, and how determined they are to keep working at their fish plant and to keep their town alive. And if any other members of this Legislature were to go there I am sure they would be just as impressed as I was.

And after I came back from Gaultois I put out a press release saying just that, that I was very impressed. That if it was any way possible for them to keep their town alive they were going to do it. But they need help from both levels of Government. They need a redfish quota from the Federal Government and they need an upgraded ferry service from the Provincial Government.

And I would like to say very sincerely to the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation that he should give their request very serious consideration.. Because as the Member for Fortune - Hermitage has also alluded to, there was a study done which shows that a roll-on roll-off capacity or capability on a vessel would save about \$200,000 at the fish plant operation. And that will make the difference whether an operator looks at going into Gaultois to operate that fish

plant or not. We all know the fishing industry is very tight these days, and in a lot of our fish plants, their operations are marginal. But \$200,000 is a lot of money. And if that service was put in place I think it would make the difference between Gaultois attracting a new operator for the fish plant or not getting one.

So I would sincerely ask the Minister to give that very serious consideration. The people of Gaultois deserve it. They deserve it for two reasons. One is for the safety of the people who have to travel between Gaultois and Hermitage, and the other for what it means to the industry, the town's only industry. Their only means of staying alive is the continued operation of their fish plant.

So Mr. Speaker I want to join with all members on this side in supporting the petition put forward by the Member for Fortune - Hermitage. And in concluding I want to say to him that if Gaultois was in my district, with the very serious problem that they have, I would not have waited over a week to get up and bring this forward to this Legislature. I would have pressured the Minister, the Premier and the Government to come up with an adequate ferry service for the town of Gaultois, because their very existence - and they do not want to live anywhere else, Mr. Speaker. They want to stay in Gaultois working at their fish plant. And I just want to say to the Minister, give that very serious consideration because with the way things are going in this province if they cannot stay in Gaultois and you take them somewhere else, what are they going to do when they get there?

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

Mr. Gilbert: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have had a lot of correspondence with the people of Gaultois over the last few months concerning the ferry service. And as you are aware, the ferry service there is the last one in the Province that is not directly operated by the Province. We inherited it from the previous Government. They had provided the rental vessel down there which was on lease, and the contract was due to expire in January 1991, Mr. Speaker.

And what we have done is that we plan to extend that contract until the end of March while we do a study of the present ferry operation to see what was going to happen with the fish plant and its continued operation in Gaultois.

I have heard the Member for Grand Bank get up and make some allusions to the fact that the ferry was there. He was so concerned that the ferry was operating down there, he did not bother to check to see that the ferry was down in the harbour and was being checked out by the Federal Government for CSI.

He was so concerned it was there, and then he found out it was not there. He is concerned about the safety of the people of Gaultois. Let him be assured that I, as everybody else in this House, is concerned about the safety of the people in Gaultois.

We went to tender. Five tenders were received. The lowest one was the vessel 'Agnes and Anne', which is presently undergoing CSI. If it does not pass the safety inspection, I can assure this hon.

House that the ferry will not be going into service on the Gaultois run, there is no doubt about it. The member for the district stated that the 'Sound of Islay' gave good service. Certainly it did. It is the swing vessel in our fleet which fills in in all the services when we take vessels in for refit.

The reason it was in Gaultois this summer was that the original contractor's boat developed trouble and he could not fulfill his contract, so we had to take the contract over ourselves and we put in the 'Sound of Islay' while we were going to tender. Now, the tender as I said, is in. The low tender is the 'Agnes and Anne'. If the CSI inspection proves that it is right, we will carry on with the service to Gaultois until we get a chance to appraise the situation.

Now I would like to read into the record a letter which I wrote to the Mayor of Gaultois, then I will table it in the House. It is to Mr. Roy Ingram:

'Dear Mr. Ingram: Thank you for your letter of September 25th, 1990 concerning concerns about the private operation of the Gaultois/Hermitage ferry service.

'You are correct in stating that all provincial services except the Gaultois/Hermitage one are now directly operated by the Government. The services were gradually taken over during the 1980s, with the most recent being the Bell Island/Portugal Cove service, which was taken over last year.

'In line with this policy of direct Government operation, similar consideration will be

given to the operation of your service. However, I am unable to commit a specific date. Until such time that a decision is made to directly operate the service, we plan to provide a third party operator.

'The tenders which recently closed are to provide an operation to replace Delpoint Enterprises, whose agreement has been terminated. The successful tenderer for the provision of ferry service until March 31st, 1991 is Midnight Marine, using the motor vessel 'Agnes and Anne'. This will allow time for the Department to consider the longer term needs of the Gaultois/Hermitage ferry service.

'In light of decisions to be made with respect to the fishery, as committed in previous correspondence, my Department will make a decision on a passenger only versus a passenger/vehicle ferry over the next few months. I understand our relief vessel, the motor vessel 'Sound of Islay', has operated quite satisfactorily in her service since termination of the motor vessel 'Kimberly Christine'.

'With refits scheduled for the fall throughout the fleet, we have a requirement of the 'Sound of Islay' and are unable to leave it in your service.

'We are confident that the shorter term operation of the motor vessel 'Agnes and Anne' will provide acceptable service to your community.

'In the meantime, we will keep you appraised of development with respect to the longer term plans of the Gaultois/Hermitage ferry service.'

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Minister's time is up.

Mr. Gilbert: I will table this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Burin Placentia West on a point of order.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, we in the House gave leave to the Member for Fortune - Hermitage to present a petition because it was not in the appropriate headings, and we gave leave very sincerely. I think all Members of the House did.

I went to the table and got a copy of the petition which was presented, but nowhere can I find the signature of the hon. the Member for Fortune - Hermitage on this petition. I do not know if he is aware that in order -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Well, Mr. Speaker, Section 90 of our Standing Orders clearly states, "A petition to the House shall be presented by a member in his place who shall be answerable that it does not contain impertinent or improper matter; and every member offering a petition to the House shall sign it with his own hand."

Mr. Speaker, I bring that to the attention of Your Honour. I am not sure whether the hon. member did not know he had to sign it, whether or not he does not support the petition, or lacks sincerity on behalf of his constituents. But I bring that to Your Honour's attention.

Mr. Speaker: Maybe the hon. the Member for Fortune - Hermitage can explain the situation.

The hon. the Member for Fortune - Hermitage.

Mr. Tobin: I think he should be forced to sign it.

Mr. Langdon: I said at the beginning that I wholeheartedly endorse the petition; but I did not know I had to sign it. I can sign it, if it has to be. I did not know.

An Hon. Member: Bring it over, and I will sign it for you.

Mr. Speaker: The point of order is well taken. All members ought to understand this, certainly. All members know that they have to sign a petition. I have asked the hon. member if he would now want to sign the petition, if the House will accept that. The Chair had no notion that it was not signed. Is that satisfactory to hon. members, that he will now sign the petition?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

#### Orders of the Day

Mr. Furey: Motion 1, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It is moved and seconded that I do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on said Bill.

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

Committee of the Whole

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a few words again today on this Loan Bill. You might recall, I am sure you will recall, because you were listening attentively as you always do, Your Honour. Members opposite perhaps did not hear a thing I said yesterday afternoon, but you will recall, Mr. Chairman, that yesterday I was making reference to the fact that I had been away for a couple of weeks and that when I left there seemed to be some light at the end of the tunnel, some positive things happening; Hibernia was being announced, job opportunities possibly coming off, all that kind of thing. So I went away on my vacation, my well-earned vacation, and when I came back, as I was saying, lo and behold there was nothing but a disaster to face this past weekend, and I could not believe it.

And I made reference to some of the issues that had been talked about in the public media these days, leading off with the deficit, the considerable change in my old friend's, the Minister of Finance, position in March to his position in October. In six months there was a sizable difference in his approach to explaining the budgetary position of the Province. I remember vividly last March, when the Minister of Finance was all smiles and all grins, and the boys and the girls were over there and they were pounding their desks in support of the Minister of Finance

who announced in March, there will be a \$10 million surplus. Oh, he was so excited. He was really excited, and so were his colleagues. Then, when I came back the weekend, I read in one of the old papers I was reading about the \$120 million deficit that had turned into, and that was unbelievable.

That was bad enough news, but then I went on to read some of the old newspapers of the last couple of weeks while I was away, back editions, and I saw where they were talking about dealing with this \$120 million deficit. As if that news itself was not shocking enough, from a \$10 million surplus to a \$120 million deficit, now they were talking about how they were going to deal with it.

Well, how are they going to deal with it? They are going to close everything down. That was the first option - close hospital beds, lay off teachers, take students out of the classrooms, all kinds of things like happening.

Mr. Winsor: The most disadvantaged students in the Province they are putting out (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: And the developmentally delayed students were into another hassle with respect to the teacher assistants strike. The Marine Institute Instructors are out, and there are nearly 800 or 1000 students left without -

Mr. Hodder: I will bet you thought they were talking about the wrong province.

Mr. Simms: To tell you the truth, I did not know what was happening. I could not believe my



eyes when I was reading all those papers.

Mr. Winsor: Do you know what the Minister of Labour told Rotary out in her district?

Mr. Simms: I do not know what the Minister of Labour told Rotary out in her district, but I am sure you will let me know. I understand the Minister of Labour spoke recently to Rotary out in her constituency. Now this is, I confess, secondhand.

Ms Cowan: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: No, secondhand. I did not hear it, but I heard it from my colleague, the Member for Fogo, who said that the Minister of Labour in her speech to Rotary proudly announced to the people in attendance that the state of labour relations in this Province is at an all-time high. Now, I understand that is what she said. Now, she says that is wrong, I guess. Is that what she is saying, that she did not say that?

Ms Cowan: I am not saying anything.

Mr. Simms: Oh yes you were. A moment ago you were saying something, but now you are not saying anything. A very wise decision.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, if that is what the Minister of Labour is going around saying to Rotary groups and other groups in this Province today, then make no wonder we are in the deep trouble we are in. If the Minister of Labour cannot see what is happening in this Province with respect to labour relations, we are in deep, deep trouble, deep, deep difficulty. Because I am

sure she would know what everybody is saying, one half of the side she deals with as the Minister of Labour, because she is not supposed to take the Government's side either. She has certainly heard all the many leaders of the other side, the union side, when they said publicly that the state of labour relations in the Province are at an all-time low. That is what they are saying. Now, that is kind of contrary.

The President of NAPE has said it, the President of the Federation of Labour, Mr. Parsons, has recently said that labour relations have never been worse in this Province. They thought they had it bad under the Peckford Administration they said, but they had not seen anything until they saw this Administration. I think it is time for the Minister of Labour to perhaps open her eyes and maybe become a bit more tuned to what is happening in the Province with respect to labour relations, because I can assure you the state of labour relations in this Province is not at the highest level it has even been.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Oh, I see. She is saying the private sector now.

As I was saying, I noticed again that strikes were underway with the teacher assistants and with the Marine Institute. I also tried to find something in the newspaper coverage about the progress of the Economic Recovery Commission, the great progress it was making. I had to look at every page. I looked at the front, I looked at the back, I looked in between, I turned the papers upside down, I did everything to try and find

something about the Economic Recovery Commission and the positive progress it has made, but I did not find it.

Mr. A. Snow: Did you see Chuck's new video?

Mr. Simms: Oh, Mr. Chairman! I do not know if we should raise this now. We should raise that at a more appropriate time.

I was trying to find out what the Premier's answer was back in the first session or so of the House. Do you remember when there were questions in the Legislature to Ministers about advertising? And do you remember about using pictures in the paper? We often did it, but that is not our point. The point is you opposed it: 'It is wrong. You should not be doing that.' We asked the Premier and the Premier said, no way. The Ministers have been told no advertising with their pictures and names and all that stuff, so imagine my luck as an Opposition member, sitting down with twenty-one back newspapers from when I was away on my holidays, flipping through them and seeing just about every mug except the Minister of Fisheries'; he doesn't need to place ads, because he gets pretty good press coverage. But a lot of other Ministers - I do not know about the Minister of Transportation. I am not sure. I see a picture of the Minister of Energy there all the time. I do not know if it is press or ads. I cannot tell. It is hard to say.

An Hon. Member: What about the television ad?

Mr. Simms: The Minister of Environment, oh yes, his Environmental Cleanup Program. Hon. Jimmy Kelland, Minister.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Oh yes it is all there. And I turned on the radio station from Grand Falls and live from Grand Falls there are ads "Don't start any forest fires", Honourable Graham Flight, Minister. So I thought there was no more advertising of the Ministers names and all that stuff. That's what the Premier said but those are piddly little things. We are researching it, we will find out. But those are minor things. Then I see a great bit of advertising on behalf of the Minister of Development and Tourism, a tremendous advertising program underway.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: Do not interrupt my line of thought. I was talking about the Minister of Development and Tourism, his great advertising, his latest advertising initiative includes a nice television, a nicely produced television advertisement. Now I don't know who produced the ad. I have no idea who produced the ad. There are a number of competent advertising firms in the Province. There are some who have not been around all that long like Appa and people like that. Maybe Appa produced them, I don't know. I have already asked who has produce it. Who produced it?

An Hon. Member: CBC produced it.

Mr. Simms: CBC? Really? Did they charge you for it?

An Hon. Member: Was Rod Stewart in it?

Mr. Simms: And did they charge you for the advertising -

An Hon. Member: Who was there with Rod?

Mr. Simms: - or was that a miniscule amount?

So television ads produced by CBC and carried on CBC television would not cost very much at all.

An Hon. Member: Not too much. I forget how much.

Mr. Simms: Would it be in the thousands of dollars?

Mr. Furey: I do not know.

Mr. Simms: Oh, I see. Would it be fair to say it is probably in the thousands?

Mr. Furey: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Oh that may well have been but you were not going to do any advertising, accordingly to the Premier. See this is the point.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Oh, we have already read it. In any event whether it is one percent of what the former Administration spent or not, its all irrelevant now, because you are facing a very serious financial situation and if you spent \$10,000 on television ads or \$20,000 on television ads you have to ask yourself is this the priority or should we give this \$20,000 to one of the hospitals, or one of the nursing homes, or whatever?

An Hon. Member: Shame on (inaudible)..

Mr. Simms: That is the point, and that's the reason I raised it Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Whose brother?

Some Hon. Members: Your brother.

Mr. Simms: My colleague here from Menihek is a great help, keeps giving me all kinds of notes. That's not my brother in the gallery. I would not be surprised to see him here though. This is my birthday and he usually shows up.

Some Hon. Members: They gave your brother an award today.

Mr. Simms: Yes I understand the Minister of Tourism gave my brother an award. In fact I spoke to him on the phone this morning about it.

Mr. Tobin: By the way, today is his birthday. He is fifty today.

Some Hon. Members: Happy Birthday?

Mr. Simms: Mr Chairman It will be a long time before I see fifty, a long, long time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was hoping the President of Treasury Board would be here today because I really wanted to address another issue, and I have sort of been talking a little bit to try to kill some time hoping that he might pop in through the door, but I must proceed and do it anyway. I am sure the acting Government House Leader will advise him of what I said just to make him aware of it. But I wanted to address this whole question once again of teachers pensions and the interference of the President of Treasury Board in many peoples view by the letter that the President of Treasury Board, the four page letter plus two added

pages, sent to every teacher in this Province. Now what happened with these letters Mr. Speaker, aside from the charge of interference that we have made as critics and as an opposition, aside from our alleging interference, I raised it yesterday in the House of Assembly you may recall, and the President of Treasury Board responded to my questions about the pension issue.

The President of Treasury Board, when I asked him the question, responded by saying: Oh Don't worry about it. Everything is being worked out with the teachers on the pension plan, not to worry. Don't worry a thing about it. When one of my other colleagues said he was interfering in the collective bargaining process by sending out these letters to all teachers in the Province, he said no, everything in the Province is going smoothly with the NTA. Everything is going quite nicely. So low and behold this morning when I opened up my mail from teachers in Grand Falls, I do not know how many, around twenty odd, from Grand Falls, Windsor, Exploits probably, the Exploits valley branch, I had a bunch of these letters sent back to me. Now on top of the letters a number of them have made various comments. So, I read -

An Hon. Member: Table them.

Mr. Simms: I will table them, sure, I have no objection at all. But the comments do not exactly jive with the comments of the President of Treasury Board when he said yesterday: Oh no, teachers are happy with what I am doing in negotiations.

Let me read just one. There are three or four here that I am going

to read actually but there is one really good one. This one here reads: Dear Mr. Baker, I do not appreciate a ploy from Government to try and create unrest within and between the NTA and its members. To add to this I do not appreciate the Government wasting taxpayers money on the cost of mailing out such unnecessary propoganda. A blatant misuse of Government funds. That one is not signed. It is signed, 'Dissatisfied and discontented voter'. I will table it. The next one is signed, I do not mind tabling it. It is signed by Gloria Raynes. I do not know what Gloria Raynes politics are. I have no idea, not an inkling. I have been talking to the NTA branch people out there and that is where this came from: Dear Mr. Baker, I am also extremely disappointed in you and our Government for the stand they have taken against the teachers of this Province. I consider the cost of material printing and postage unnecessary for getting the letter to these teachers in this Province, a gross wastage of our money. In fact the whole idea of this letter makes me very angry.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible):

Mr. Simms: Just a second now. I have a couple more. I will get to that if you give me a chance.

You will see as I go through that the comments are not quite the same.

Mr. Tobin: Oh, now you are attacking the NTA.

Mr. Simms: I see, so the former presidents of the NTA who are sitting now bum to bum and cheek to cheek and are behind all of the things that this Government is

doing to the teachers of this Province are now saying that those were the tactics that they used. They sent a letter out to all teachers and said reply. Here is the reply for you. Is that what you used to do? Is that what you are saying?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: I see, so you are not necessarily saying that is what you did.

Okay, Mr. Chairman, these are legitimate hand written responses. 'This gives a wrong impression,' another letter says sent back by teachers. 'Teachers are aware that we have to make changes to our pension plan and we are willing to negotiate, but it makes it so difficult when the Government is so arrogant and inflexible.' Now, that is not exactly what the President of Treasury Board was saying here yesterday in response to questions in the House that I asked him about the NTA pension plans.

Here is the cutest one of all. There is a bunch of others with more tax dollars wasted and notes like that, but this one that is addressed to Mr. Baker says, 'what a pile of garbage from a former NDPer.' So, whoever wrote it must be an NDPer themselves. 'What a pile of garbage from a former NDPer.' Shocking, shocking. Now, the former NDPer being the President of Treasury Board, of course, as members opposite would know.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: I know he is pretty left winged. I will tell you, he must have some job sitting around the Cabinet table sitting next to

the Minister of Health. If you are talking left wing versus right wing, by the Lord heavens I will tell you, you are further right than the Premier and that is saying something. It used to be Attila the Hun and now it is the Premier who is further right, and you are further right than him, the Minister of Health. He sits over there, Mr. Chairman, when you talk about health care cuts in this Province, the Minister of Health sits there with a big grin on his face and he is whispering under his breath saying, 'they are not cutting deep enough as far as I am concerned.' That is the Minister of Health. Grossly right wing.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Decker: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, (inaudible) and I have to defend myself. What the hon. Member is not saying is that since this session of the House opened the Minister of Health has not received one single question about health matters. There is not even a health critic over there since Ms Duff left, Mr. Chairman, and I think it is a little bit hypocritical for members to talk about that when they do not even ask the Minister of Health a question on health matters.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Well, Mr. Chairman, as always there is no point of order. The hon. Minister of Health gets up and makes a fool of himself, but he certainly does not

raise a valid point of order. But I can say to him since I had the floor I can answer his allegations raised in his silly and spurious point of order. I can tell him first of all that there is a health critic over here.

Some Hon. Members: Who is it?

Mr. Decker: An \$834 million dollar budget and there is not even a health critic.

An Hon. Member: Yes there is.

An Hon. Member: There is a health critic!

Some Hon. Members: Who is it?

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, I said there is a health critic over here. And then all -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Simms: - the trained seals got up and automatically -

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Simms: - clapped their hands all together. Just relax, relax. We have lots of time. This loan bill is not going to pass this week, let me tell you that. So take your time.

An Hon. Member: Or next week, or the week after.

Mr. Simms: Now the health critic, who was appointed, I do not know, a week or so ago -

An Hon. Member: About a week and a half ago.

Mr. Simms: - a week and a half ago, is the member for Humber East.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: She is the acting health critic. That has already been announced, that is old news.

Mr. Decker: Why did you not notify the Minister of Health?

Mr. Simms: Could not find you.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simms: Listen, you are too busy out taking the linens off the hospital beds of the Province and closing them down, boy, that is what you are up to.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Anyway, boys, enough of this for me.

Mr. Chairman: Order please!

Mr. Simms: To address the other allegation made in his spurious point of order, Mr. Chairman: First of all there is a health critic, as he is now aware. Secondly, he should be aware that there have been numerous questions on health care matters raised since the House opened - only last Tuesday, by the way. The House opened for three days last week and this is the second day this week. It is not like it has been opened for months. This makes it sound like it has been opened here for months. There have been several serious questions asked about the health care situation in this Province. And they were asked to the leader of the Government for obvious reasons. The leader of the Government is ultimately responsible for his Government and all the decisions of the Government, and that is why the questions went to the leader of the Government.

I should mention also of course,

the other reason, we do not particularly like to ask questions of the Minister of Health.

Mr. Decker: No you do not.

Mr. Simms: For two reasons. One, is that he is reluctant to give you any answers with any detail or anything in it anyway. And secondly, he is probably the most arrogant Minister on that side of the House. So I say to the Minister he can bark and bawl, if he wants to get questions from the Opposition in the House so that he can then play up to the press gallery or the people in the gallery, and try to get a bit of press, if he wants it that way, then he had better change his attitude and answer questions in the House properly when he is asked and not be so arrogant when he stands on his feet. That is the reason he does not get questions. And he will find out.

You ask the Minister of Fisheries questions - my colleague from Grand Bank frequently does - and the Minister of Fisheries answers questions in a credible fashion. There is no doubt about it. I think he does, of course he does. And I do not believe the Minister of Fisheries shows arrogance at all. He gets up. Now we are not often satisfied lots of times with the answers that we get from him, the content. And sometimes we catch him and he does not have all the information at his fingertips. But that is normal. But I have yet to see the Minister of Fisheries act in an arrogant fashion when he answers questions.

I do not see the arrogance from the Minister of Energy. Quite frankly I do not see it from the President of Treasury Board, not arrogance. He is coy but he is

not arrogant. And I do not see it from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, he is not arrogant. And I certainly do not see it from my friend the Minister of Forestry. There is not one tinge of arrogance -

An Hon. Member: He does not know enough to be arrogant.

Mr. Simms: - in the Minister of Forestries' -

An Hon. Member: What about Transportation's?

Mr. Simms: - personality or character. So, there are some, and those are the ones that get questions. Now I would not describe what the Minister of Finance has in his character as arrogance, and that is not the reason we ask him questions. It is for another reason, which I will not elaborate on at this point in time, but it is not because of arrogance, I can say to him. We ask the Minister of Labour questions from time to time, and I must say, she does not display arrogance. Arrogance is not the word. I would not describe the Minister of Development as being arrogant, but he certainly loves to play to the cameras, the media and the galleries. He is the best actor in the Cabinet -

An Hon. Member: Yes, and they say if you can fake that you can do anything.

Mr. Simms: - but the most arrogant Minister is the Minister of Health, and that is why he does not get questions. Health questions go to the Premier, the leader of the Government, and that is the way it will stay, Mr. Chairman.

An Hon. Member: How about The Minister of Social Services?

Mr. Simms: The Minister of Social Services? No, he is not arrogant. No, no.

An Hon. Member: He might be slow, but he is not arrogant.

Mr. Simms: The Minister of Environment has a tinge of arrogance about him, has an air of arrogance.

An Hon. Member: He is slow.

An Hon. Member: What about the Member for Humber East, is she arrogant?

Mr. Simms: The Member for Humber East? She is not in the Cabinet.

An Hon. Member: No I know but let's talk about her for a change, is she arrogant?

Mr. Simms: When you get up to speak you can talk about the Member for Humber East. I am talking about this Government at the moment.

So Mr. Speaker, I hope my friend, the Minister of Development, will pass on to his colleague and his seat mate, the President of Treasury Board, some of the comments that have come back from some of the teachers. And I got these this morning in the mail, and that is a fact. I was not communicating with anybody. The - what is the group out there called - the Political Action Arm, or Political Action Committee or something, of the Exploits Valley NTA Branch had called my office last week to make me aware of what was happening, and then today in the mail I got these.

I did not know if they wanted me to present them in the House as petitions, or what they wanted, so we called them and they just said: no, you can do what you want. You can raise it in the House, mention it to the President of Treasury Board, so that is what I am doing. And I can table them or whatever, it does not matter. Or I will give them to the President of Treasury Board personally maybe - or maybe I will save them for tomorrow and bring it up again, that is quite possible too.

Now Mr. Chairman, when I appeared on open line this morning on the Q Radio Network -

Some Hon. Members: Your buddy was there.

Mr. Simms: No, my buddy was not there. He is not allowed to be there apparently because he is out campaigning for re-election. In fact the hostess last week was Anne Bell.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, this week Brendan McCarthy, who is an employee of the radio station, is the host.

Some Hon. Members: Another tory friend.

Mr. Simms: Brendan McCarthy is? Friend? In what way? You mean a political friend. You are saying Brendan McCarthy is a Tory, the Member for St. John's South?

Mr. Murphy: I never said anything.

Mr. Simms: Oh, I did not think you said it. Yes, or I did not think you would admit you said it.

Anyway, when I was on open line this morning for an hour or so,



just to take a few calls, on the way to the office - actually there were not that many calls. But anyway, a lot of the calls I got, quite frankly, were about politicians, I say to Members opposite, not so much about issues. I was anxious and armed with all kinds of information about health care cuts and education cuts, and all the rest of that stuff.

But the most interesting thing I found was what the people had on their minds - except for those that did call, there were a few calls about the economic situation - were people who talked about politics and politicians, and the level of cynicism that exists - not only in Newfoundland, it exists everywhere in the country - with politics and politicians. And I believe it is a very valid point, and one that all of us have a responsibility to respond to in the best way that we can. And it is not always easy. Some politicians like to be jovial, right? And by being jovial or showing a sense of humour, sometimes people take that all incorrectly. And they call you something that you shouldn't be called.

So, there are people in Canada, certainly people in Newfoundland that I have spoken to over the last number of years in particular, that say politicians cannot be trusted. And inevitably they will say, now we are not talking about you, or something like that, and they will go on to name a bunch and all this kind of thing. But the problem I had with that is that I do not personally believe that to be true or accurate. Now, I am a politician, so you would probably expect me to say it, but if I thought it to be

true, I am also a politician who would say it, if I thought it were true. I do not believe it to be true, and that is the kind of commentary that we had on that open line program this morning, which surprised me to some extent, quite frankly. I did not expect that kind of a call or those kinds of calls from a Newfoundland audience at this stage of the game.

But the other call I got, and I want to raise this with the Minister of Health, since the Minister of Health has exhibited an anxiousness here today to speak about health matters.

I want to raise a matter now that which was raised with me, the first call I had this morning on the Open Line program, and for fifteen minutes the moderator kept me talking about it. And I said, you know, I am not the Minister of Health. I cannot answer all these questions. I do not have all of the information at my fingertips, but at the earliest opportunity in the House of Assembly I will invite the Minister of Health to stand in his place - we have a Loan Bill debate and you can get up and talk about anything - and tell us the government's position with respect to the move by Dr. Henry Morgentaler.

The Minister of Health, who rose on a point of order five minutes ago and lambasted us for not giving him a chance to get on his feet, now has that chance and I hope when I take my seat momentarily, he will stand and perhaps address this whole abortion issue: What the Provincial Government's stand and position is on this now, because it has now become an even trickier kind of situation, I suppose; and whether the Provincial Government

would be prepared to provide financing funding for clinics of the sort that Dr. Morgentaler might open. He has made that request in the past, refused by the previous administration, but I am sure that is what is going to be coming, something of that nature. And what the Government's position is and how the government is answering the questions of those people who want to know: Will he be able to perform what he performs here in Newfoundland, or is the Provincial Government here going to try to do something to stop him? What exactly will be the Provincial Government's position? We all know the issue itself is extremely divisive - we all know that - from personal points of view, but beyond that there is a government issue at hand here now I guess, and the government acts on behalf of the people.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I look forward to the Minister of Health elaborating a little.

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

Mr. Decker: Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech made by the Opposition House Leader. I am glad the brought up the question of abortion. I spent the last twenty-four hours answering questions from the media on this very question, and I know the media must be wondering why it is the Opposition did not see fit to bring up the questions today in Question Period as to our position

on abortion. But I will get to that later on.

Before I get to that I want to put the whole matter of health care into perspective for the benefit of the people of the nation who have the opportunity, through the medium of radio to listen to me today. Since we have introduced radio to the people of this great land, they can listen to this speech I am going to make. I better write down on my notes 'abortion', so that when I am finished on the first part, I can always come back to that, Mr. Chairman.

Now let me put the whole matter of health care into some kind of perspective. Mr. Chairman, for seventeen years the previous administration allowed the health care system of this Province to almost totally disintegrate. As I said once or twice before in this House, for seventeen years there was hardly anything done; for five years in certain parts of the Province not a window was fixed, not a roof was tarred, not a blade of felt was put on, the whole system was allowed to disintegrate. So as soon as this Government came to office, a little more than a short year ago, we had to try to address the terrible beating which the previous administration had perpetrated on the health care system.

Since we have been in government we have brought in two Budgets. In the first Budget, Mr. Chairman, we put special emphasis on health and education, two areas we are going to spend money on. As a result, I was allowed to get up and make very pleasing announcements to the people of this Province, expanding on the

health care system. That is what I did in the first Budget.

In the second Budget, which came down last spring, Mr. Chairman, again we announced an increase of somewhere between \$75 million and \$80 million that we were going to put into the health care system of this Province. For eighteen months, or however many months we have been in power, the Minister of Health has been a veritable Santa Claus, going throughout every corner and every nook and every part of this Province dispensing goods to the health care system, and it has, indeed, been a wonderful experience.

On the Coast of Labrador, the clinics in Nain and Hopedale and Davis Inlet. The previous administration had negotiated with the Federal Government some funding whereby they could put clinics in coastal Labrador. When we began to go through the budget, I had stupidly, sillily - I don't know how stupid I was or how foolish I was, Mr. Chairman, but I accepted the figures the previous administration had prepared. I accepted them, and I thought we could build these three clinics because of the negotiations by the previous administration. And it shows the attitude of the previous administration to coastal Labrador, because the money they had negotiated with the Federal Government would not build three decent outhouses on coastal Labrador. That was the attitude, the contempt in which they held the people of the coastal Labrador. I stupidly, and I could kick myself every time I realize how foolish I was, accepted their figures, only to discover that they had not even negotiated enough money to build one clinic in coastal Labrador. I said we

are not going to put up with this nonsense, we are going to build clinics and they are going to be clinics that are worthy of the people of coastal Labrador. So we went back to the Federal Government; negotiations are about to clue up, and I am pleased to say, Mr. Chairman, that when next year comes around, we will be able to put clinics on that coast, not the silliness of the previous administration, which would not put up three or four stages, let alone clinics that are worthy of the people of Labrador.

Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of thing I have been doing for the last eighteen months. It has been fun giving out hospital beds. We opened beds which have never been open before in the history of the world, Mr. Chairman. That is what we have been doing in the hospital system. Now, the good thing about that year and a half of being a veritable Santa Claus is that we have broadened the base of the health care system: we have opened beds that have never before been open, we have opened beds that used to be closed, we have opened operating rooms, and we have dealt with the bottle necks the previous administration had allowed to develop in cardiac surgery. Mind you, there is still a problem there. I am aware of it, but it is not one tenth as bad as it used to be when the previous administration was there. So we have broadened the base.

An Hon. Member: Is that right?

Mr. Decker: That is right.

An Hon. Member: I didn't know.

Now, Mr. Chairman, totally out of the blue came this made-in-Canada recession, a recession over which

this Administration has no control. Mr. Chairman, the Tory Minister of Finance in Ottawa has only in the last forty-eight hours admitted that we are in a recession. Now, if the Tory Minister of Finance was too stupid to realize, until forty-eight hours ago that we are in a recession, what kind of hypocrisy comes from the other side of this floor when they suggest that we should have known about it eighteen months ago? It is totally absolute stupidity, and I would suspect they are only trying to make political points on this whole matter. They are not even concerned with the facts. That was obvious the minute the Leader of the Opposition got up and blamed the Premier for closing twenty-five per cent of the beds out in the Clarke's Beach Nursing Home. That, Mr. Chairman, was checked out and there was not an iota of truth in it.

The previous administration, in 1988, before we came to power, had tried to scale down that nursing home out there in Clarke's Beach, so I have to say that the Leader of the Opposition was not concerned about the truth, he was concerned about making political points. What the Opposition needs is a lesson from someone on this side of the House, someone who has been in Opposition for a few years, like myself or the hon. John Efford, or someone over here who knows what it is like to be in opposition.

The Opposition need lessons from us to teach them that when they make accusations in this House, accusations which are going to go out over the airwaves, they should have their facts straight, they should have concrete under their feet, are the words we used to use.

When we were in Opposition, when we were investigating an issue, and there were lots of them, Mr. Chairman, when we were investigating certain things the Government was doing, we used the phrase, now let us make sure we have concrete under our feet, let us make sure of our facts.

Since this House opened, Mr. Chairman, in the last few days, I have heard accusations coming from every seat over there, and hardly any of them have any basis whatsoever. They are just getting up, their mouth is totally out of gear, their brain does not know what their mouth is doing, they are just spouting off a lot of nonsense and there is no basis for it. And it is not fair to the people of this Province, because I believe there is a place for an Opposition. I believe an Opposition is an integral part of the Government of the Parliamentary System, and they have a duty. Don't think they are over there just for their own fun, just so they can get up and make a few silly speeches. They have the duty to scrutinize Government policy, and they are not taking the time to do the research. This Administration has given them thousands of dollars to hire researchers so that they can get out and research the questions, yet, Mr. Chairman, they get up and they mouth off a lot of nonsense for which there is no basis whatsoever, and it is an injustice they are doing to the people of this Province.

This House has been open five or six days and the Minister of Health has not received a single, solitary question about health care, the Minister of Health has not been advised if there is a health critic, not since Mrs.

Duff, who was the health critic, resigned some time ago.

I wish she was back here, Mr. Chairman, because she did do her homework. She knew what she was talking about. I believe it is a great detriment to the Opposition, that they have lost that lady. Because she knew her work. She was doing an excellent job on health; she was researching her questions. And I can tell you that when Shannie Duff got up and asked a question on health, I knew there was concrete under her feet, I knew she had not allowed her mouth to go without doing her research, I knew she had done her work. But that is not happening right now.

What is happening over there now? I do not even know if they have a health critic. The Opposition House Leader did not know it. When I rose on a point of order a little while ago and asked who was the health critic, the Opposition House Leader did not know who it was. He quickly got together with some people, and they said the Member for Humber East.

Now I am very doubtful if the Member for Humber East knows whether or not she is the health critic. I would like to be able to put the question to her before Opposition members get time to tell her, now for goodness sake, Lynn, say you are the health critic if someone to asks you. Mr. Chairman, that shows the esteem they have for health.

I am getting off on a tangent, Mr. Chairman. While I am on that tangent, I wonder could we have a draft Shannie movement? We need a draft Shannie movement to bring her back to this House so that the people of the Province will know

there is a health critic who is concerned for the 834 million of their dollars which is being spent. I think we would be doing a great justice to the Province if we were to instigate a draft Shannie movement to bring her back, because the Opposition need her.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Decker: Now, Mr. Chairman, I am back off my tangent. After we put all these millions of dollars into the health care system, we found ourselves in a made-in-Canada, made-by-a-Tory-Government, by a Tory Minister of Finance - we found ourselves in the middle of this recession. And what did this Government do? The Hon. Leader of the Opposition talks about an arrogant Minister. The Minister of Health is the most approachable Minister this Province has had since the Smallwood Administration was in power, since my predecessor, Ed Roberts, Mr. Chairman.

The Last Liberal Minister before this minister was Ed Roberts, a very open, very approachable man. Since then, we have had a litany of arrogance, we have row after row of arrogance. Finally, we have a Minister who is approachable. So when we found ourselves in this made-in-Canada, made-by-the-Tories, made-by-Mr.-Wilson, recession, we realized that we were going to have to make some minor adjustments to the health care system.

Without taking any thought, I ran straight to the stakeholders in the system, the Newfoundland the Newfoundland Hospital and Nursing Home Association, the Newfoundland

Medical Association, the ARNM. I ran out to those people and I said to them, we are about to have some difficult times and unfortunately, I said, you are going to be on the front line, you are going to receive some criticism. But, I said, I want to protect you from taking a front line criticism, because although we did not cause this recession, although we did not make this recession, we are in power and if there is any criticism, if there is any blame, we are prepared to take it. That is the position of this Government.

Now the Government did not go out and say you must do this or you must do that, but in the spirit of consultation, back and forth talking - the hon. Member for Grand Bank, I wish he had been at the meeting with me when I took this news, the Corner Brook meeting.

An Hon. Member: I know about the meeting.

Mr. Decker: Well, if the member knows about it, he knows that it was my happiest, most pleasant two hours since I have been Minister of Health. It was a back and forth discussion. Suggestions were flying from the floor. The people were there, Mr. Chairman, and they realized that this was not of this government's making, this was something that we had forced upon us and their position was this: it is going to be tough, Mr. Minister, but together we can do it, in a spirit of consultation. That is what is happening.

Now, if the hon. Opposition House Leader wants to call that arrogance, then maybe he has a totally different dictionary from the one I use. Because that is

not arrogance, consultation, discussions back and forth.

Mr. Chairman, the Newfoundland Hospital and Nursing Home Association has been told that I am available twenty-four hours a day, and if there were twenty-five hours in a day I would be available twenty-five hours a day. The secretaries in the Department of Health have been told that if a call comes in, even right in the middle of this speech - even right in the middle of this speech if you see me run, Mr. Chairman, it could be because there is a message for me from the Newfoundland Hospital and Nursing Home Association, or from some nurse out in the system, or from some doctor out in the system, because they know I am totally on top of the situation, totally involved. We are working together, Mr. Chairman, to try to get us through this tough time in a spirit of consultation and co-operation.

The good thing about it all is this that in this brief one and a half years we have been here, we were able to raise the base of the hospital system. We were ready to open beds never before opened. We were able to open operating rooms never before opened. We were able to do all of that, Mr. Chairman, and that cushions the blow just a little bit so it will not be as difficult as we thought it was going to be. Surely goodness if we had not gotten in power and the previous trend had continued, and be ye well assured that this same recession would be upon us, I shudder to think what would have happened, I shudder to think what would have happened had that administration still been in power. They would have been closing out every single

institution in this Province. They would not have had the leeway to rationalize, because they would have had the whole system turned down and, Mr. Chairman, I shudder to think what would have happened.

Now I trust that clarifies it in some detail, and if hon. members want a little more detail on any specific point I made, I will make myself available to them just as I have made myself available to the stakeholders in the health system.

Mr. Matthews: Why do you not make yourself available to Grand Bank and St. Lawrence?

Mr. Decker: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member talks about Grand Bank and St. Lawrence. This is the silliest thing I ever heard, and I am surprised he gives me an opportunity to say it. In this House the hon. Member from Grand Bank got up and criticized the Department of Health and me for the way we were treating Grand Bank and St. Lawrence - that was one particular morning in Question Period - and within twelve hours, due to the great modern invention called a helicopter, I was able to leave St. John's and I was down in St. Lawrence, right down in Grand Bank within hours. Now, Mr. Chairman, was I afraid to confront? Was I afraid to explain? Was I afraid to consult? Was I afraid to listen to the Mayor of St. Lawrence? No, Mr. Chairman, I was down there and I talked to the people down there and they understood what I am doing. And what happened in last year's Budget? We put aside a considerable sum of money, I believe it was \$700,000, I am not sure. A consultant has been engaged, we are looking at -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: It may not be \$700,000. It might be \$1 million, but I can tell the hon. member this -

Mr. Matthews: No, it might be \$20,000.

Mr. Decker: Oh, no, no, it is enough money - the hon. member does not know what he is getting - for us to look to design an expansion to the St. Lawrence clinic, an expansion, Mr. Chairman. An expansion to the St. Lawrence clinic whereby it will become a nursing home to take in some chronic care people. I believe it is forty beds we are going to put in that facility when we finally do it. It is unbelievable, Mr. Chairman. I went down and I walked through it and I saw what they were doing to health care and I was utterly disgusted. I saw senior citizens put in three and four rooms, some people suffering from that dreaded disease of Alzheimer's, totally unknowing where they were, in the next bed a perfectly well, a perfectly sane senior citizen, and it was difficult to know which one suffered from Alzheimer's. This is what they had allowed to happen to health care. I went down and I said this will not be tolerated for one single Liberal day. It has to be stopped.

Mr. Hewlett: Alleluia!

Mr. Decker: I went back to my colleagues in Cabinet, and I said it is despicable. It is absolutely despicable what the previous Administration have done with St. Lawrence. We have to bring them into the twentieth century, and they said, great we will do it. We are glad to help you Minister, if you want to do something for St. Lawrence. And,

Mr. Chairman, if it had been the previous Administration, do you know what they would have said, the previous would have said: they are not the same political stripe, they do not belong to the same politics, but that did not mean the least thing in the world to this Administration.

Mr. Hewlett: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: Because we are not spending our health dollars based on politics, on political stripes. We are spending it based on our overall philosophy of fairness and balance. We treat our people equally, Mr. Chairman.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Decker: That is the proudest plank in our platform. We treat everybody fairly and with balance. And that is why we saw a need in St. Lawrence, Mr. Chairman. And I met with the Mayor of St. Lawrence. I do not know his politics. I do not want to know his politics, Mr. Chairman, that does not matter. But we discussed the need for that chronic care facility, and I found the money in last year's Budget. And if there is either dollar left, Mr. Chairman, after all of the other needs have been met, the important needs, if there is a dollar left we will certainly be considering what we are going to do with St. Lawrence and the hon. member can go and tell the people that. If there is any money around we are going to do what we can for the people of St. Lawrence and I am not worried, Mr. Chairman, about their politics. That is the kind of government we have today.

Now I never timed myself. I do not know how much time I have left.

An Hon. Member: Your time is up.

Mr. Decker: But the Opposition House Leader asked me about abortion.

An Hon. Member: Who did?

Mr. Decker: The Opposition House Leader.

I was genuinely surprised today when that question did not come up in the House during Question Period. I mean it is a major topical issue. The Member for Grand Bank does not even seem to realize what the issue is all about. He is asking what it is about? It is about abortion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been a policy within the Department of Health which we did not see any reason to change. The policy was that this Government will not allow certain surgical procedures to be carried on outside an established hospital. So that has been the policy. It is a good policy. The previous Administration went by it, and the one before it went by it, and we see no reason to change it. Generally speaking surgery, whether it be abortion or whether it be any other surgery, generally speaking, it should be done in an accredited institution so that the Government can make sure that all the controls are followed, that the safety of the patient is taken into consideration, and the best way we feel to enforce that particular policy is to make sure that all surgical procedures are carried out within hospitals that are owned and operated by the Province.

Now there are a few exception to that. There are a few minor exceptions, for example,



vasectomies are carried out in doctors' offices. Now some people argue the principle has been broken, so what is the difference. You carry out a vasectomy so therefore you carry out abortion and then you carry out a heart operation or you carry out the removal of a gall bladder, where do you draw the line? The previous Administration and us have accepted the policy that abortions and surgical procedures, as a general rule, will be carried out in hospitals.

Now, Mr. Chairman, over the last little while we have seen a court case in Nova Scotia, which states that the Nova Scotian law, which tried to insist that there be no free standing abortion clinics in Nova Scotia, that law has been overturned by the courts. As a result of that law being overturned by the courts, we are going to have to review our policy within Newfoundland and Labrador.

It is no good for us to have a policy if it cannot legally be enforced, so at this very moment, or in the last few hours since we heard about the Nova Scotian court ruling, we have been reviewing our policy about abortion, and we might have no choice in the matter, if our policy is contrary to the Human Rights Act or whatever.

We are not above the Canadian law, we have to abide by the Canadian law just as Nova Scotians do, just as Ontarians or Quebecers or any one else do, we are not above the law, so if our policy is illegal, then we are certainly going to have to review our policy, and that is the answer I would have given - if they had a health critic who would have asked that question today - that is the

answer I would have given. If they had a critic, or if Mrs. Duff was there, I am sure she would have asked me the question yesterday, and let us hope that after we get the Draft Shannie Movement, she will come back, but that is the situation.

Nothing, nothing mysterious, we are not trying to hide anything, we are very open, very up front. We have a policy which we thought was good, as it applied to all surgical procedures, not just abortion, all surgical procedures.

We have learned today that it is possible, that when it comes to one surgical procedure, namely abortion, our policy might not be legal, therefore, we have to review it and to do that, we have been talking to the other Provinces to see the implications for them, wide consultation again, that consultation wide open.

We are listening to various women's groups, Newfoundland Medical Association again, very wide open Government, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition must envy, must envy me this wide open, this brand new attitude, which is at work in the Department of Health today, where we do not try to ram things down people's throats, we try to consult, we talk back and forth and it is fun, it is fun being Minister of Health in this kind of a Government.

Some Hon. Members: Fun?

Mr. Simms: Now, there is a quote for you.

Mr. Decker: Yes, it is fun being Minister of Health.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) it is fun

closing hospital beds, closing hospitals, (inaudible) have fun.

Mr. Decker: It is obvious that the Opposition House Leader refused to listen to the first part of my speech, when I explained to him the consultation that was going on.

Mr. Simms: I did not refuse, I heard it.

Mr. Decker: Well, you would not be asking such a silly question about saying fun. I said it is fun dealing with those people who understand the situation that we are in which was caused by the made-in-Canada recession, made by the Tory friends in Ottawa and it is a delight, it is a delight to deal with the good people in the health care system. Another word for fun is delight. It is a delight to work with the people in the health care system to try to address this situation in this hard time which has been perpetrated upon us by the Tory Government in Ottawa, who made this made-in-Canada recession.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to monopolize all this time because the Members of the Opposition have an obligation to the people of this Province, to give us the hard hitting questions about health, get out and scrutinize what we are doing in education, get out and scrutinize what the Minister of Finance is doing, that is why you are over there, but they have not been doing a very good job of it Mr. Chairman. If I were to give them a mark, I would give them an F minus, if that were possible. Thank you very much.

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

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to have a few words on this piece of legislation, however, Mr. Chairman, if you allow me, before I do, I thought probably it would be appropriate, Sir, to ask you through the Speaker, if the House would convey its condolences to our Assistant Clerk to the House, Miss Murphy, on the passing of her mother, and I thought probably it would be appropriate that Mr. Speaker would pass along the condolences on behalf of all Members of the House.

Second, Mr. Chairman, through you again, through the Speaker, today a particular lady in the Province is eighty-nine years young, and that, Mr. Chairman, is the wife of the first Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador, Premier Joey Smallwood. His wife Clara is eighty-nine years young today, so I thought it would be appropriate that the House would extend congratulations to her reaching that ripe age of eighty-nine years.

Some Hon. Members: Hear hear!

Mr. Warren: And Mr. Chairman, I am just going to say that it is very interesting to note that the House Leader for the Opposition has a birthday today but he is only almost half the age of Mrs. Smallwood.

Some Hon. Members: Hear hear!

Mr. Warren: Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I would like to get back to discussing health care. And listening to the Minister of Health for the last fifteen or twenty minutes I am not surprised at all that this side here have been asking questions concerning health to the Premier. Because, Mr. Chairman, I think everyone in

this Province knows that what the Premier says is gospel. And the Premier is the person who makes the decisions for all Departments.

And that is why, Mr. Chairman, there are so many questions being asked of the Premier and noting the way the Minister of Health spoke today you would not get a truthful answer from him anyhow.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, let me just give you an example why you would not get a truthful answer from the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health said that there was not enough money in the coastal Labrador agreement which was negotiated with the former government and the Federal Government to build two - and I think he used the word - outhouses on the coast of Labrador.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there was in excess of \$2 million allotted. Now let me explain what happened, and I am surprised that the Minister of Health would not tell the exact events of what has occurred since he became Minister of Health. The first thing that the Minister of Health did was ask to get plans and specifications for the nursing clinics in Hopedale - Davis Inlet. That is the first thing he did.

Now when the Minister of Health received the specifications and the plans, here is what happened to a lot of the money, Mr. Chairman. The plans were for a nursing clinic in Hopedale with a population of less than 500 people. They produced plans and specifications for a nursing clinic in Hopedale to accommodate 3,500 people. For an isolated community -

An Hon. Member: Who did that?

Mr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell my hon. colleague, this was done by officials that the Minister had hired to do up plans and specifications for a nursing clinic in Hopedale. Not only that, what is so ironic about the whole thing, people must remember that Hopedale is on a large rock. And the nursing clinic is bigger than the community of Hopedale.

In fact, there is no place in Hopedale to put the size of the clinic that his Department wants to create. But the Minister would not tell the truth here, see? So now, here is a blunder, here is a waste of taxpayer's money by this Department, and the Minister said there was not enough money.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: No, there is not enough money, Mr. Chairman. Let me say to my hon. colleague, what the people in Hopedale want is a similar nursing clinic as is in Makkovik, Postville and Rigolet. That is what they are asking for, nothing better but nothing less. And Mr. Chairman, enough money was allotted to build a clinic in Hopedale and Davis Inlet.

Now Mr. Chairman, in Makkovik there are 380 people and a clinic that is big enough to accommodate up to 650. And I tell you this much, Mr. Chairman, it will not be in your day or my day when we will see more than 600 people in the community of Hopedale.

So that is the truth of the matter, what you did not tell here, Mr. Minister. And I am surprised that you thought you were going to get away with it.

But, Mr. Chairman, let me tell my hon. colleague that he made, I think, very nasty remarks about the other Ministers of Health, in this House. Mr. Chairman, I do not know about that hon. colleague, but I considered the late Dr. Twomey one of the most competent Health Ministers in this Province. And I am surprised that the Minister of Health would make such nasty remarks about former Ministers of the Crown. And the same with the late Wallace House. I am surprised that the Minister would stoop so low in condemning other Ministers of Health.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Yes, Mr. Chairman. He would not tie up the late Dr. Twomey's shoes. He would not lace up his shoes, Mr. Chairman.

Another comment the Minister of Health made was that he got a standing ovation. Mr. Chairman, I remember quite clearly he got a standing ovation. I think it was in Corner Brook, but I believe it came as a result of a comment he had made, saying that this will be a one-term Government. I think that was the comment he made, that this will be a one-term Government, for which he got a standing ovation.

You can understand, Mr. Chairman, why the Minister of Health is upset that he is not being asked any questions. Anyhow, I am going to give him twenty-four hours notice that if he is in the House tomorrow, I will be only too glad and too happy to ask the Minister a question. If the Minister is here tomorrow, I will be ready. And knowing what he was saying today about the nursing clinics on the Labrador coast, I am sure I can develop a question around some

of his comments on the nursing clinics on the Labrador coast. So I think tomorrow, if the Minister is in his seat, and if I get the okay from my caucus members, I will probably ask the Minister a question or two. I am sure there wouldn't be too much difficulty coming up with one.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible)  
kidnap him now.

Mr. Warren: That is right. I understand that the Minister may be kidnapped. If the Minister of Health is ever arrested in some of those mock arrests, where you raise so much money to get him out, I will tell you this much, he will not raise a cent. He will never get out, because no one will pay a cent to get him out.

Mr. R. Aylward: They will have to build an apartment for him and keep him there.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I would now like to go from Health to Education. The big comments around town these days are something to the effect that some of the teachers are saying that we have had our 'Phil' of Warren. How true, Mr. Chairman. With what is happening with our education system in this Province is in the last eighteen months, we can see that they do have their 'Phil' of Warren.

Mr. Chairman, I noticed today the Minister of Finance read a Ministerial Statement on behalf of the Treasury Board. I think probably it would be an appropriate time, and I am glad my colleague from Eagle River is here, because I am sure, knowing how concerned my friend from Eagle River is about events that take place in that great land that God

gave Cain, we want to make sure that we get our share. Maybe the Minister responsible for recreation in our Province can listen to this comment that was made in the Ministerial Statement today by the Minister of Finance. The Minister said, "Departments and agencies are now in the process of preparing their budgets. They have been directed to undertake their budget planning on the basis that there is no new funding for 1991-92, that is, their budgets will be "frozen" at this year's level."

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me ask the Minister responsible for recreation a very straightforward question that my colleague would like to answer to, plus practically every individual person living in Labrador would like to have the answer to, and that is, has the Minister's department been asked to freeze at this year's level? And remember the Labrador Winter Games. We have had three so far. And the year before, because the games take place in March, before next year's Budget, so, therefore, in the next Budget coming up there have to be commitments made for the Labrador Winter Games. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want the Minister to come clean with the people of Labrador once and for all. Will there be the 1992 Labrador Winter Games? The Minister has to answer that, because unless the Minister takes money from some other part of his Budget, then we may as well say good-bye to the Labrador Winter Games. Because you have to plan next year for the games the following year, because they take place before the fiscal year.

I say to the Minister, here is something he did not realize. And I will also tell the Minister that

\$300,000 is the minimum that has to be committed for the Labrador Winter Games. In fact, Mr. Chairman, as soon as I saw this this afternoon I was not long getting ready to issue my release and ask through the media for the Minister of Municipal Affairs, responsible for sports, to come clean with the people of Labrador and tell them if there will be 1992 Labrador Winter Games. He has the obligation to tell the people whether or not there will be Winter Games. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that my colleague, the Member for Eagle River, is going to be very upset with the Minister.

Mr. R. Aylward: He said he will not be upset. He does not care if it is gone.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, I just heard the comments from my friend. He said, no, he will not be upset if there are no Labrador Winter Games. I will tell my hon. colleague for Eagle River that the people in Charlottetown, which is so interesting, and the people in Port Hope Simpson, who went that close to winning the last Winter Games, and it is in his district, that in fact they are looking forward to 1992, and they were going to win because of the hard work and training they were going to put into it, and now my hon. colleague is not concerned about whether the games go ahead or not. He could not care less. My hon. colleague has to get on the radio in Labrador tomorrow and let the people know that he is going to go after this Government for the Labrador Winter Games. He has to do that. I have to tell him this, that if he does not do it, don't leave it to your colleague from Naskaupi, because he does not care. In fact, there was a lot of consideration given to the

Labrador Winter Games being held in Labrador West this year, so naturally my colleague from Naskaupi will want them held in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. He would probably rather not have it there at all than have it go to the Western part of Labrador.

An Hon. Member: Are you finished?

Mr. Warren: I am not near finished yet.

An Hon. Member: What did you have for dinner with McDougal?

Mr. Warren: She was too cheap to invite me out to dinner. Let me say one other thing, since we are talking about McDougal. Yesterday in the Senate the vote was fifty-three to forty-one. I am just wondering if my hon. colleague for Eagle River would give me some of the names of those forty-one who voted against this Bill C-21? I am willing to take my seat and let my colleague stand up and tell us who were some of the forty-one people who voted against Bill C-21. I wonder if it would be someone such as MacEachen?

Mr. Chairman, I just overheard him say, we are going to get rid of your seat. I heard that comment. I say to my colleague that we are in a serious debate, we are talking about the finances of this Province. I have already offered to resign my seat for the Premier to take me on. I have already made that offer but the Premier said, no. Furthermore, since we are talking about the finances of the Province, the Premier now has a good example. I understand the Liberal nominations are closing in St. John's East in the next few days. The Premier has never been elected in this Legislature, so why does the Premier not run in

St. John's East and see if he can get elected? This is a good opportunity for the Premier to prove if the people really -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) Ed Roberts got.

Mr. Warren: One former leader would not take it on, so maybe this is a good opportunity for the Premier of the Province to find out if the people really want him as a Premier, and the people in St. John's East will make the decision whether or not to elect him.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say to my hon. colleagues that the people in Torngat will vote for this individual as long as this individual is running in the district of Torngat Mountains. As long as this hon. gentleman runs in Torngat Mountains, I am sure the people of Torngat will give him a resounding victory.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, yes. I say to my colleague, if my hon. colleague is here - let us see, it is eighteen months now - in another ten years, if he is here until 2001, then he can rise in his seat and say, 'Well, this is my last term. I never could be in the House as long as the Member for Torngat Mountains.' Not only that, Mr. Chairman, I am sure he will never do half as much for his constituents. Mr. Chairman, I have done more for that gentleman's district in the last eighteen months - it is only this morning that I got a call from Charlottetown.

An Hon. Member: What!

Mr. Warren: Now, Charlottetown is

not in my district.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible)  
Charlottetown?

Mr. Warren: It is in my hon. colleague's district.

An Hon. Member: And they called you?

Mr. Warren: A person called me today. And, Mr. Chairman, the reason was that there was a press release issued by the hon. gentleman about the resolution he is bringing forward tomorrow.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Yes, there was a press release from my hon. colleague about the resolution he is presenting tomorrow.

Now, his resolution is that only the people on the Labrador Coast will catch the codfish.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Warren: Oh, yes, that is what his resolution is saying. He does not want the Newfoundland fishermen to go up on the Labrador Coast, which they have traditionally been doing for hundreds of years. His resolution now is calling for adjacency, which means the people of Labrador must have it.

An Hon. Member: Now!

Mr. Warren: Now, Mr. Chairman, here it is. I am going to listen to my hon. colleague tomorrow. I will be on the plane to Labrador, but I will hear what he is going to say.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Warren: I tell you what I will have to do, Mr. Chairman. I will have to cancel my reservation tomorrow. I am forced to stay here. I want to go to Labrador. The insurance company is opening up its offices up there, but I won't go tomorrow, I will stay here and vote on the resolution. Now, I am not saying which way I will vote on the resolution, but I assure you I will be in the House tomorrow and I will vote one way or the other on the resolution.

Mr. R. Aylward: And if you amend it you will have a seconder, won't you?

Mr. Warren: I say to my hon. colleague, if I bring in an amendment, I am going to make sure I have a seconder. That is one thing I will tell my hon. colleague. If I bring in an amendment tomorrow, I am going to make sure I have a seconder.

Mr. R. Aylward: Nobody over there supports it (inaudible).

Mr. Warren: That is right, not like some people who tried to pull a fast one last week.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I do not have to say who found out the errors in democracy in this House.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: My hon. colleague was not here last week but we got a fifteen or twenty minute lecture -

An Hon. Member: From who?

Mr. Warren: - from my hon. colleague from Eagle River - on how democracy works in Parliament.

An Hon. Member: You have got to be kidding.

Mr. Warren: How everything takes place in Parliament. What you are supposed to do when you are a Parliamentarian. And he said I have learned this through my political studies. And he gets up and he makes a resolution with no seconder.

An Hon. Member: They would not support him. There was nobody over there to second it for him.

Mr. Warren: No, I have just said that you may be discouraged if the Labrador Winter Games do not go ahead.

An Hon. Member: Well, you have 100 per cent more than I thought you got.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I have fifteen or twenty minutes yet.

An Hon. Member: You have another ten minutes I think.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, before I clue up --

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: I never thought a person would be so jealous that he never got a plaque, that he went and cried over it. I could never believe it. Mr. Chairman, if I can recall about the last Winter Games a particular Member from this Legislature went and asked for a meeting with the committee, and wanted to know why he could not have a plaque.

An Hon. Member: Oh, what a big baby. Big sook.

Mr. Warren: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why, but he went and

asked for a special meeting of the committee and wanted to know why he could not have a plaque. And Mr. Chairman, plaques are given in appreciation for something you are doing. And so, I do not understand why --

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: -- he wanted to ask for one. And in fact he said to the committee, I will even buy it if you will present it to me.

An Hon. Member: He wanted to be recognized for existing.

Mr. Warren: Anyhow, Mr. Chairman --

An Hon. Member: You do not give plaques for just existing, you have to do something.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! Order please!

Mr. Warren: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to go back to one other Department in Government that is really slashing it to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. And that is the Department of Social Services.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Warren: The Department of Social Services. And Mr. Chairman they will not hire on people who are out there begging to be hired on. I gave the Minister two examples last week why they should, and no way, Mr. Chairman, would the Minister have his officials give the people jobs, in fact, as I told you, and I am sure you checked it out, sir, and it is true, right? See, now, my hon. colleague, the Minister, is agreeing that what I said last week in this Legislature was the truth.



So, Mr. Chairman, you can see that the Minister of Social Services did not know what his social workers and his field staff were doing. And with that Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I have a funny feeling that we are going to be here for a long time until we can get the real answers from Government on why this Government is going to cut out the Labrador Winter Games, cancel the Labrador Winter Games. The word is out now, in fact it was in the Minister of Finance's statement today.

It says that budgets will be frozen for next year in every Department, and therefore there is only one way the Labrador Winter Games can go ahead, is they are going to have to take it out of another group. So I say to my hon. colleague from Naskaupi, that he has to make sure that the money comes forward for the Labrador Winter Games in 1992, and we have to have the money in next year's budget.

So I am hoping that my hon. colleague will do this - and I will be the first to stand up and give credit where credit is due. And, Mr. Chairman, it is nothing unusual for me to give my hon. colleague credit. And I will do it time and time again whenever it is demanded for me to do so.

So thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member for Grand Bank.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry -

Mr. Kelland: Mr. Chairman. We always rotate, don't we?

An Hon. Member: Fairness and balance, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kelland: We rotate back and forth, don't we? Be a gentleman, Bill.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Chairman: It is customary to go back and forth, but the hon. Member for Grand Bank was the first man on his feet.

Mr. Kelland: But Mr. Chairman, may I just make a brief point of order. I have no objection -

Mr. Chairman: Okay, the hon. Member for Naskaupi on a point of order.

Mr. Matthews: - to the hon. member speaking before me but do we not traditionally rotate.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: Point of order.

Mr. Matthews: A point of order, yes, and not a real hard point of order, Mr. Chairman. And I do not have any objection really to him speaking before me, if indeed he was up before me. When I rose you were looking in that direction, I believe, Mr. Chairman, and I do not mean that as any slight to the Chair, obviously. But normally we rotate back and forth, and as the previous speaker was, you know, making some reference to questions in Labrador, I thought it would be an opportune time, with the concurrence and courtesy of my colleague for Grand Bank, to say a few words. I have no intention of keeping it too long or anything like that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Matthews: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman (Barrett): The hon. the Member for Grand Bank on the point of order.

Mr. Matthews: I realize what the Minister is saying and referring to, but I have a commitment at five o'clock, that is why I wanted to have a few minutes just to talk about a couple of points. I have to leave in about five minutes, so that is as long as I would be. If the Minister will only speak for a couple of minutes then it would be all right, but I really have to leave.

Well maybe since I am up, Mr. Chairman, are you going to rule on the point of order?

Mr. Chairman: Well I was looking at both sides of the House and the hon. Member for Grand Bank rose in his place, and I have no other choice but to recognize the hon. Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will only be a couple of minutes then you can get up and go to it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) five o'clock. You can start again tomorrow.

Mr. Matthews: No, I am not going to stop until five o'clock. I want to do what I fully intended to do, Mr. Chairman, and I know what we usually do here, but I do have to leave. Now just a couple of comments that tied into remarks already made today in this debate, particularly by the Minister of Health, and now by my colleague for Torngat Mountains referring to the Labrador Games.

Now I will talk about the Labrador Games first. Because realizing

the predicament that the Government finds itself into today because of the fiscal mismanagement and incompetence of seeing a projected \$10 million surplus go to approximately \$120 million deficit, and realizing that some people may think that the Labrador Games, when you look at the seriousness of health and education in this Province, they may think that is sort of a frivolous expenditure. But being the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth back in 1985, and officially opening the 1986 Labrador Winter Games, I just want to -

Mr. Tobin: The Minister of Sports is not even listening.

Mr. Matthews: Oh, yes, he is listening. He is pretending not to listen. But he is listening.

Mr. Tobin: The Minister of Sports should listen.

Mr. Matthews: Having been involved in Newfoundland Games both summer and winter as a coach in Summer Games and as the Minister responsible at the time of the Winter Games in Corner Brook for the Province, being to Canada Summer Games in St. John, New Brunswick, representing the Province, that the most special feeling I had as the Minister responsible for Sport in Newfoundland and Labrador was participating in the official opening of the 1986 Labrador Winter Games, and I say that very sincerely.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: When I stood there as Minister and watched the people from all over, particularly coastal Labrador, walk in to that

official opening, I felt very special and -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Matthews: I compared it at the time to the feeling of Canada Games and Newfoundland Summer and Winter Games, but to see those people come there to that central point in Labrador for more than sport really, it is to interact with people from the small communities of Labrador and so on, and I just want to leave the Cabinet really with a message, is that just do not slough it off as being a \$300,000 or \$400,000 expenditure that does not mean very much, because it means a lot to the people of Labrador, and to not have it would be certainly a very negative step and I just hope that the Government can see fit to continue with the Labrador Winter Games.

On the health care issue the Minister of Health in his speech was talking about a number of issues, a number of institutions, and health care institutions and associations and everyone, and how he has consulted and how well he has done, how well things are going. And there is one thing that we have learned over the last few weeks is that the Minister of Health is telling us how well he is doing with his consultations and how happy every one in the Province is with him. We heard the Minister of Labour just a few days ago telling us how wonderful things were with labour relations in the Province. And it just makes me wonder really when they are going to get realistic about the happenings in this Province, because I understand and I know that the Minister of Health did get a big applause in Corner Brook and it is referred to already that

he actually got a standing ovation when he made reference that the Government would be a one term Government, that is how bad things are, so how can he say he is happy and yet go out and admit that it is going to be a one term Government and all the people there from the health care sector around the Province gave him a standing ovation. The Premier did not know this.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Yes, you said, look, we are going to be a one term Government and the place went on the rocks. The place went on the rocks by the way.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Health.

Mr. Decker: I am again being quoted out of context. Someone talked to me at that meeting about the politics of what we are doing and I made it quite clear, and I stand by what I said, that I am not half as interested about getting re-elected as I am in doing what is right for the people of this Province -

Mr. Tobin: Ah, that is not true.

Mr. Decker: - and if that means we are a one term Government, then so be it, Mr. Chairman. We do not have the luxury to play politics with people's lives and people's health care, so if the hon. Member is going to quote me, he had better put it in context.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Tobin: That is not what he said, that is not what he said.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. Minister is giving a point of explanation or clarification.

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the Minister getting up and giving an explanation, because I realize that the predicament in which he finds himself, how embarrassing it must be.

It must have been very embarrassing for him to have to say that where all those people were, and of course once he recognized that so many of them agreed with him, that it was even more embarrassing.

But I want to just pick the Minister up, once again, he is relating his trip to St. Lawrence and Grand Bank, but he did not tell all the story, he leaves out certain parts.

But he went down to St. Lawrence when the council delegation was here in St. John's, the mayor was not even in St. Lawrence to talk to him and as I said before -

Mr. Decker: I met with the mayor.

Mr. Matthews: Here.

Mr. Decker: No, in St. Lawrence.

Mr. Matthews: No, you did not. No one in St. Lawrence knew you were there. As I told you, you landed in the biggest spot of dust in St. Lawrence and kept the rotors on the helicopter going so no one would know who landed in St. Lawrence, that is what he did.

The people did not know who was

there, because the dust was flying and he ran in the hospital door and he ran out and they still did not know who was there. That is the truth of it, Mr. Chairman, and that is why I called him airwolf when I found out about it, because that is what he did. And then what did he do after in another speech in this House in relating the story, he said what he found. I have got copies of Hansard.

An Hon. Member: Your time is up, boy.

Mr. Matthews: Yes, I know. There is one thing I know, I know the time. I am a little better at telling the time than the Minister is at predicting the deficit, I can tell him that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Matthews: But in another debate here, in the night sitting, the Minister said that when he went to the Burin Peninsula, what he found was like something out of a Charles Dickens novel, a story book; that is what he said, this Minister, what he found was like something out of a Charles Dickens novel.

An Hon. Member: What did he mean by that?

Mr. Matthews: I do not know to what he is referring, but it was not either one of the places that I have been in many, many times, but that is what he tells me.

An Hon. Member: Scrooge, is one of them.

Mr. Matthews: Well, I knew he was a scrooge, but the Minister made a statement today on his feet and I know he made a mistake and I am sure as he reflects he realizes he

made a mistake, that he said last year in the Budget, they provided \$700,000 for St. Lawrence.

Now the only reference in the Budget that I could find is that, in talking about rationalization of health care services on the Burin Peninsula, that in the Budget speech it was very clearly outlined that Government was providing funds for the planning stages of a facility in St. Lawrence.

My recollection of the cost- I think it is somewhere, I believe now, somewhere like \$22,000. Now that is a big difference from \$700,000, and I want to say to the Minister, I just hope that in the upcoming Budget now that - perhaps he made a mistake, perhaps he has already made the decision that it is going in to the next Budget, some \$700,000 for St. Lawrence, if that is the case, we will all be happy, myself and all the people in St. Lawrence and the Burin peninsula will be happy that we will have a \$700,000 expenditure.

But I just want to correct the Minister on that because I am sure that he now realizes that there was no \$700,000 Budgeted in the Budget this year for St. Lawrence.

An Hon. Member: Unless that is to pay the staff who are there now.

Mr. Matthews: No, No, that is not the staff, but maybe that could be too. When the hospital was fully operational, with the inpatients services and everything else there, the Budget in St. Lawrence was somewhere around just about \$1.2 million a year, so maybe with the inpatients service phased out, maybe it could be \$600,000 or \$700,000.

Perhaps that is what the Minister is talking about, but it is certainly not to do with what the Minister is proposing and planning for St. Lawrence with the new type facility, which they call a health care centre, or something like that. I just want to correct the Minister on that, and maybe when he speaks again in the debate, Mr. Chairman, he can correct that and tell us exactly what - maybe the Minister can undertake to find out for us exactly what was spent in St. Lawrence this year, in the planning stages for that new facility. With that, Mr. Chairman, I will finish my remarks and get back at it a bit later on.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

Mr. Kelland: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not anticipate I will take a long time. I know the hon. the Member for Grand Bank would have been willing to give me his position, but the ruling of the Chair was otherwise so I accept that.

I just want to make a couple of comments with reference to the Labrador Winter Games because it has been raised by the Member for Torngat Mountains, and it was raised in the sense that it creates a certain fear in the minds of Labradorians that somehow or other Government, up to this point in time, has contemplated cancelling the 1992 Labrador Winter Games. I want to make it very clear that there has been no discussion, to my knowledge, with respect to the cancellation of the 1992 Labrador Winter Games. What the results of our Budget considerations may be I cannot predict in great detail, but there has been no discussion and no specific move on the part of

anybody in Government to deliberately and with premeditation, let us say, cancel the Labrador Winter Games. I find that when the Member for Torngat Mountains speaks in this manner he uses a form of scare tactics to upset the people in Labrador. I know a lot about the Labrador Winter Games, as much about the Labrador Winter Games I am sure as the Member for Torngat Mountains with respect to MHAs participation in them. I can tell you something historically, I suppose, that in 1983, the first Labrador Winter Games, I had the honour of being the host Mayor in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) the host minister.

Mr. Kelland: Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the Member from Grand Falls, or wherever he is from, be quite so I can continue my discussion.

In 1986, I was the host MHA, having won a resounding victory in the Naskaupi district in 1985. In 1989, the third Labrador Winter Games, I would have been one of the funding Ministers. However, the former, short-lived Premier called the election out of time, and if he had called it a little earlier, say in March or something, I would have been one of the funding Ministers. There is no question about that, because I think my majority in the district went up close to 70 per cent the last time, an increase over 61 per cent, but that notwithstanding.

Now, hopefully, if all goes well, I may be in a position to establish that record in 1992. But I can assure the hon. member that there has been no discussion

that I am aware of, in any way, shape, or form, with an intent to cancel the 1992 Labrador Winter Games. I find it a bit reprehensible that he would play on the emotions of the people he represents, and I represent, and my colleagues for Menihek and Eagle River represent, playing on their emotions, stirring up and using scare tactics to try in a vague and vain attempt to have them become upset with the current administration.

I only have a couple of minutes left on the clock, Mr. Chairman, to talk about it, but he made some reference to trophies and things like that. I know an awful lot about that with respect to the Winter Games, as well. Every member of the House of Assembly then representing Labrador seats, in the 1983 Winter Games, I understand, from their own pocket, out-of-pocket expenses as far as I know, provided a trophy for the most outstanding athlete in their particular district.

Mr. Tobin: You got that too, did you?

Mr. Kelland: Well, I certainly could have if you were my competitor.

In 1986, I then had the honour to serve Naskaupi district in the House of Assembly and I, along with my three colleagues, also purchased trophies, again, as far as I know out of our own pockets, for the outstanding athletes in each of our districts. At that time, the Member for Torngat Mountains, from what I was given to believe, approached the Committee in one form or another and suggested that he could get - maybe not an exact quotation - a real good deal on four trophies

somewhere down here in St. John's - he would get a real good price for all of us, and he would take care of the deal; he would arrange to pick up the trophies, we would pay him and so on. I said, no Committee, I am going to buy my trophy in Labrador, the area of the Province I represent, and that is what I did. On top of that, I also arranged to purchase five individual MVP team trophies for each of the five communities in my district.

Mr. Tobin: What does this have to do with the Loan Bill?

Mr. Kelland: I am just responding to what your colleague talked about a little while ago. In 1989, I was given to believe by certain Committee members that on the request - I cannot say order, I do not know that for sure - on the request of a member of the Legislature who represents a section of Labrador, the North Coast, I suppose Torngat Mountains, the suggestion was that as there may be an impending provincial election, potential Liberal candidates would not be given too much of a show, and the request was that the two Liberal members would be seated well back on the stage and would not be introduced with the formal introductions, and would not, by the way, as had been done in the previous Winter Games, in 1983 and 1986, would not be awarded a plaque for their contributions in trophies and time and otherwise. Do not present these two Liberals, however, jackets and trophies should go to the Government side members. I find that small, yes, small, but I thought I wanted to put that in context in view of the fact of what my colleague for Torngat Mountains had mentioned.

Just to simply respond my main point, Mr. Chairman, was to simply say I know of no discussions or negotiations that would cancel the 1992 Labrador Winter Games. That may or may not happen, as many other things may or may not happen. I know nothing of it.

And I want to take the Member for Torngat Mountains to task for using scare tactics and scaring the people of Labrador and frightening them and trying to turn them against what is the best administration in the Province the past seventeen years. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a few brief comments on what has been said. I am not sure that what the Minister has stated is true regarding the way the members were treated, but if that was the case, I can tell the Minister that I agree with him that that is not a very professional way for people to deal with things. Indeed, it is rather small if someone was involved in it. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that it is just as small as what the Minister of Transportation did. And probably the Premier should listen to this too, by the way. It is as small as what the Minister of Transportation did when he took the invitation for me to the christening of the ferry in Marystown and threw it away and said no Tories were going to be permitted.

Mr. Gilbert: I did the same thing (inaudible).

Some Hon. Members: Shame! Shame!

Mr. Tobin: That is what he did. It is just as small, Mr. Chairman, as what the Minister of Transportation did when the Marystown Shipyard sent in the list of people they wanted invited to the christening of the ferry. The Marystown Shipyard sent in a list of the people they wanted to invite to the christening of the ferry and the Minister of Transportation said, there is no way Tobin is going to be invited, because he is a P.C. I would think that was rather small, as well. I am sure members opposite would agree with that, too. I do not think, for example, that the President of Treasury Board would do it.

But never mind, Mr. Chairman, there were more votes in it by me not being invited than if I had been invited. Because once the people came to me and asked me why I was not invited and I told them, they said they could not believe it. If that is the fairness and balance the Premier promised, that is all right. But I do not think the Premier was aware of it, either. Imagine a Minister of the Crown to haul it out and say to his officials, 'Don't invite Tobin, he is a P.C.', when something was taking place in his district.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: To the christening of the ferry down in Marystown, and it is no secret. The Shipyard sent in my name to be invited, as well as the former members of the Board of Directors of the Shipyard, and they all appeared on the Ministers desk and the Minister instructed his officials not to invite Glenn Tobin because

he is P.C. I know that for a fact. And the members of the Marystown Shipyard took issue with it.

An Hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. Tobin: That is true. The members of the Marystown Shipyard took issue with it, and the workers of the Shipyard took issue with it. I am not so sure that one of them did not even mentioned it to my colleague who was present. But I do know that a Liberal, and I will use his name if he will give me permission, and I think he will, said a worker in the Marystown Shipyard came to my house to see me the next day and expressed his utter disappointment with the president of the Marystown Shipyard and the with the Minister of Transportation. Nor was the Minister of Development aware of it. I know that, too. But the Shipyard sent in my name with a list of about sixty people they wanted invited. One name was withdrawn from it, and that was mine, and it was said it was withdrawn because I was a P.C., and the Minister can tell you that if he likes.

Mr. Chairman, we will get into more of this as we get on. We will not practice that type of fairness and balance. Now that it is almost time, I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

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

Mr. Speaker: Do hon. Members agree to call it five o'clock?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member



for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

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

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

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

Mr. Warren: I give notice that after reviewing Hansard tomorrow, I will be bringing up a point of privilege.

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

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, I remind members that the resolution for debate tomorrow is the resolution by the Member for Eagle River.

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

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