



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 47

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas

Wednesday

1 June 1988

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I shall now comment upon the point of order raised by the hon. member for Fogo on May 25, 1988. The issue is whether a member may ask a minister a question relating to a statement made outside the House by the minister. The Government House Leader and the member for Fogo in their submissions both referred to Beauchesne page 132, No. 359, subsection 10, which states 'A question ought not to refer to a statement made outside the House by a Minister.'

As far as I have been able to determine from our records, this issue has never before been raised. Without conducting a complete and exhaustive study of every question asked by the hon. members to the government of the day over the past ten to twelve years, I feel sure questions have been asked of ministers respecting government policy as may be set forth in statements made by ministers outside this hon. House.

Upon checking the Journals of the House of Commons of April 14, 1975, the Speaker made the following comment in relation to the rule from Beauchesne as quoted above. The quote is: 'It seems to me it is a matter of form rather than one of substance, for, indeed, if a question otherwise conforms with the principles of Oral Question Period, it ought not to be disqualified simply because of its preamble, because in its preamble some reference is made to a minister or a statement made by a minister some place other than here. For the life of me, I cannot understand why, in the case of a valid question, a member

would want to tie it into a statement made outside of the House and therefore risk having it disqualified when, in fact, the simple device is to put the question directly without any reference to the statement.'

In conclusion, the rule as set out in Beauchesne seems clear. The way around the rule is also clear. A member wishing to ask such a question should simply take care to phrase the question without referring to the statement made outside the House.

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier,

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I rise on what I consider to be a matter of very great importance and it concerns the ongoing questions both inside and outside this House - Your Ruling is rather appropriate at this point in time - by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells) and other members of the Opposition, as it relates to the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Health, the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins).

I made a statement several days ago relative to this, that the hon. Deputy Premier, the Minister of Health, had disclosed all of his interests every year since he has been a minister; every single interest he has had he has disclosed, and he has followed the conflict of interest guidelines scrupulously, and I think that has not become the perception in the

media in the coverage of this.

I have since asked the Minister of Health to follow through on additional allegations, that his name did appear on a shareholder's list even though he had his shares put in trust and had nothing whatsoever to do with the company from the day he entered Cabinet up unto this present moment.

The minister, the Deputy Premier, has provided me and hand delivered to me last night a letter, which I have copied for all hon. members and for the press, in which he says the following: 'The Leader of the Opposition has alleged that my name appears on the Terra Nova Enterprises sharelist for 1982, 1983 and 1984 as registered in the Registry of Deeds. You have asked me to investigate this situation for you.

I established telephone contact with Mr. Donald Mercer, Q.C., trustee of my share interest, who was travelling in Nova Scotia at the time, who stated the opinion that this could only have been the result of clerical error' -- mistake - 'in his office. He suggested I contact the business manager of his office to see if it could be determined how the error arose.

I subsequently contacted the business manager who also stated it could only have been a clerical error, pointing out that at a certain time each year literally hundreds of these sharelists are prepared and submitted to the Registry as required by law, that accordingly they were prepared by clerical staff alone (often junior staff by reason of the minor importance attached to the document) and submitted for a lawyer's signature, essentially

without scrutiny. He further stated that, regrettably, errors often creep into this process. He undertook to procure copies of the submitted sharelists, for any further information they may contain.

Subsequently, I examined copies of the sharelists (the first time I had ever seen them) for the period 1978 to 1986 inclusive, which are attached. Scrutiny shows that, indeed, a number contain several errors, as follows:

The 1978 sharelist is essentially without error (although submitted at a later date than strictly in accordance with the law, September 11, 1979) and correctly lists my name as Dr. John Collins, Treasurer, and John Collins owning one share;

The 1979 list contains several errors, the first page is incorrectly dated as 1978 with correction in ink, the second remains incorrectly dated as 1978, the sharelist contains the name "John R. Collins" (my initial is John F.) owning "nil" shares, but it correctly leaves my name off the Directors' listing and shows Mr. Donald A. Mercer as trustee of one share;

The 1980 list incorrectly shows P. Christine Mercer as a Director (I have been assured by the office manager and Mr. Mercer that this lady has never had any connection with the company but is a Director with an unconnected company), but is otherwise correct in that my name neither appears as a Director nor as a shareholder (Mr. Mercer continues to be shown as trustee of one share);

The 1981 list shows no errors;

The 1982 list shows "Collins, J."

as a Director (which all report was an error in listing), whilst continuing to show Mr. Mercer as trustee of one share;

Both the 1983 list and the 1984 list were registered on the same date, April 19, 1985 (i.e. the 1983 list was registered one year late), and lists "John C. Collins" as a Director, whereas my full name is John F. Collins (again, the staff at the law firm state that these were listings in error);

The 1985 list, whilst not showing my name as a Director, is incorrect in that it lists Collins, J. as owning one share whilst not listing Mr. Mercer as possessing a share in trust, which continued to be the actual case (this sharelist was also registered one year late, May 13, 1987);

The 1986 list is correct in that it does not list my name as a Director but again lists Mr. Mercer as holding one share in trust.

It is regrettable that these clerical errors, of a number of varieties, have occurred and provided the Leader of the Opposition the opportunity to cause some confusion. The fact remains that I personally had no part in preparing the sharelists in question and that the law firm concerned readily state that errors were made in them as outlined above.

I would also like to make the point at this time that the Leader of the Opposition, in a most devious way, has now taken the line of suggesting that it is somehow improper for a Minister to be a minority shareholder in a company doing business with

Government, on the basis that the Conflict of Interest for Ministers is breached in that event. As you are well aware, the Guidelines contained no such provision, and the Leader of the Opposition is clearly endeavoring to cause further confusion by means of innuendo and stating an untruth as to the nature of the Guidelines.' The Deputy Premier is not breaking any guidelines. He followed completely the guidelines.

'I trust he will not be allowed to perpetrate these falsehoods without exposure and reprimand.'

Mr. Speaker, I table this, and all I need to say is that the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Health, the Member for St. John's South, has scrupulously carried out his activities in accordance with all the laws and regulations governing this Province; he has had no dealings with the company from the time he put his shares in trust.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

Say you are sorry.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Apologize.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, if those undisciplined people would remain quiet, they will hear the full truth. They can say what they

like after, but I would just like the opportunity to be heard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Somebody should preach to you, you need it. You have demonstrated to me long enough.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

There has been dire need for years.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, when you have maintained order, I would like to speak.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to address the matters raised in this, primarily because of the suggestion that I have been doing something improper. I want to address that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You can address it all you like.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:

You are taking our salary under the table, that is (inaudible).

MR. PEACH:

We do you not disclose your interests? That is a problem.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour or any member of this House wants to get the Hansard of the day I raised this question, and read it, they will see clearly what I said. What I did say, Mr. Speaker, very clearly was that, as I looked at that sharelist and it showed the hon. member as a shareholder in 1985, I was completely confident that was an error and that errors were fairly common in sharelists like that. That is there in Hansard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

I also drew attention to the fact that the hon. member was listed as a director for three straight years in a row, and I simply asked the Premier to determine what was the cause of this, and he has done that. The hon. minister has made his statement. Now, that is totally irrelevant. It has nothing to do with the guidelines, that just addressed the question of the Premier's statement that the hon. minister had nothing to do with the management of the company.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Let us deal with the guidelines and the conflict of interest. The guidelines speak very clearly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, would you please maintain order. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The guidelines state very clearly that 'while holding office and for one year after ceasing to hold office, a minister, his spouse or minor children, or a body or organization in which any of them has a financial interest, shall not, without first obtaining the approval of the Premier' in each case, shall not, without first obtaining the approval of the Premier - 'be eligible to receive any of the following benefits from the Province or an agency: A contract for the supply of goods or services.' That, the Premier has told this House, was not done. He had a general letter from the minister when the hon. minister first became a minister and there was no letter for any one of these leases. The conflict of interest rules have been clearly breached, and, on top of that, Mr. Speaker, the information provided indicates clearly that at least another \$96,000 a year is paid -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. WELLS:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, I stood to speak in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Apologize! Apologize!

MR. WELLS:
Look what we have now. I cannot even make the point of order, because those animals do not have enough discipline to behave themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. WELLS:
I am addressing Your Honour on a point of order and I insist on my right to finish it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. WELLS:
I insist on my right to address Your Honour on a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:
A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council has risen on a point of privilege.

MR. WELLS:

That does not take precedence over a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

You are good at income tax, but you are no good in the House.

MR. DAWE:

Guess again!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could give the hon. member an opportunity to cool down a little bit before he blows a gasket over there.

My point of privilege is a very simple one, but a very important one. First of all, he is wrong when he says a point of privilege does not override a point of order. It certainly does.

MR. WELLS:

A proper one does.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, it certainly does.

MR. WELLS:

Yes, a proper one.

MR. SIMMS:

Does the hon. the Leader of the Opposition think he is the only one

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

I know he loves to play God and

judge and everything else, but he is certainly not playing Speaker. It is up to the Speaker to determine.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the leader of the Opposition in his fit of rage a moment ago, clearly referred to the members of this hon. House as animals. Now, I, for one, resent it and I am certain other members in this House resent it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We all do.

MR. SIMMS:

I do not think members opposite would like to be referred to as animals, even if they were. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is a slur upon the integrity of members of this House. And if he cannot control his temper, then the best thing he can do is leave the Chamber.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

But certainly he should be asked, at the very least, Mr. Speaker - and if you look at Beauchesne, 105, you will see the reference there - to refrain from using those kinds of derogatory comments towards members of this House who have been duly elected by the people of this Province to sit in this House. He certainly should withdraw his use of that term at this particular point in time.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Exactly what I thought it was, a point of order under the guise of a point of privilege, and that does not take precedence over the point of order to which I was addressing Your Honour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No? No?

MR. WELLS:
That is exactly what it is.

Why do you not be a man and withdraw your stupid remarks?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council certainly has not established a prima facie case. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition did refer to hon. members as animals, and I would ask him to withdraw that term.

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, I have no reluctance at all to withdraw any unparliamentary language, and I do so. I simply ask Your Honour to keep those undisciplined members, who do not have the courtesy to allow a member on this side of the House to speak, quiet. That is what I was asking Your Honour to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
State your point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I understand the hon. member has withdrawn the term.

MR. WELLS:
Thank you.

Now, I would like to address Your Honour on the point of order in

respect of which I was interrupted by the President of the Council on an improper point of privilege. I would like to state my point of order, Your Honour.

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

MR. WELLS:
My point of order is this: The hon. the Premier stood in this House and made a statement, half of which dealt with facts, the other half of which cast aspersions against me personally and suggested that I was, by devious means -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Did not say it.

MR. WELLS:
The word is used. It is printed there, 'in some devious way tried to make improper statements in this House', and I stand to address it, as is my right by anybody with a sense of fairness and balance whatsoever. Mr. Speaker, the hon. members have shouted in exactly the same way as the hon. members are shouting now, to such extent that I have not been able to address and respond to the issue. I just get started on it and Your Honour rules my time is up. With respect, Your Honour, that makes a mockery of this place. As a democratic institution, with respect, Your Honour, that kind of procedure on the part of hon. members that prevents a member from this side of the House from speaking until their time is expired, makes a mockery of the democratic institution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier, to the point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The Leader of the Opposition had his time under the rules to respond to the statement I made. As we do every day, a minister or the Premier gets up and makes a statement and a member opposite, representing the Opposition, has half the time to respond to that statement. That is what happened in this case. The Leader of the Opposition, once again, does not understand the rules of the House; he has been away too long and will be away again very shortly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

I would like to point out to hon. members that there is no particular rule about half time or quarter time, it is a kind of general idea we have. In this particular case, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition had exactly the same amount of time as the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to give notice now that I will be bringing in a point of privilege after I have had the opportunity of

studying Hansard of today and certain other relative matters. This is my first opportunity to do so in present circumstances. As Your Honour knows, I have never been asked a question by the Opposition on this matter, ever though my name has been dragged into certain matters. So I give notice of a point of privilege. At the earliest opportunity, when I have had an opportunity to study the Hansard and similar matters, I will be rising on a point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The matter has been noted.

At this stage I would like to welcome to the gallery Sir Allar Urwick, the British High Commissioner to Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, in a statement I made to this House on April 18, 1988, I indicated that my department would be conducting a comprehensive study of our lobster fishery with a view to determining new means to increase the potential development of this very important industry. I am very pleased to announce today that my department has now contracted a consultant to review developments within this industry.

The lobster fishery provides

approximately \$12 to \$15 million to our inshore fishery annually. To many of our inshore fishermen, the lobster fishery is vital to the overall performance of their fishing operation. Due to the importance of this fishery to our inshore sector, this government has made a firm commitment to review the operation of our lobster industry with a view to improving the overall performance of this fishery.

This study will review and evaluate fishermen and processor participation in the industry and analyze production, price setting and trade practices. I have also requested that the consultant provide an assessment of the impact and range of options concerning a number of issues which could have serious implications on the Newfoundland lobster fishery.

The major issues to be evaluated are the following:

Recent changes in United States regulations on minimum carapace size; the feasibility of large scale holding pounds in this Province; product development to reduce dependency on live lobsters, market development to decrease dependency, which is presently 90 per cent, on United States markets.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the contract for the lobster study has been awarded to Mr. Aiden Maloney of St. John's. Mr. Maloney, a former Minister of Fisheries of Newfoundland and Labrador and past President of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, is certainly an authority on all aspects of our fishery and I am confident that he will provide a valuable insight into the

development of our lobster industry. A maximum allocation of \$15,000 has been reserved for this study which shall be submitted to my office by October 31, 1988.

Mr. Maloney will consult with all sectors of the lobster fishery in this Province as well as representatives of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and any agencies having an impact on the international trading of lobsters. Officials of my department will be meeting with him during the duration of the agreement to discuss the progress of the study.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the lobster fishery is an extremely important aspect of our inshore fishery. It constitutes a significant portion of the income for many of our small boat fishermen. I am optimistic that this study will provide us with an increased awareness of the potential of this important industry, and will be beneficial to our fishermen for years to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, while I welcome the announcement that a study is going to take place, I cannot say I am too impressed with some of the guidelines set out in the minister's statement. For example, it is unfortunate that the minister had to wait until this year's lobster fishery was almost about to conclude before

taking some action to correct some of the problems within the lobster fishery which have been evident now for the past number of years.

I note with interest, Mr. Speaker, that one of the problems the Committee will address is the one having to do with the recent changes in the United States regulations on the minimum size of lobster.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note, as well, that just four days ago one of the recommendations in the report of the House Committee on Ways and Means, of the United States, and the Senate Committee on Finance headed by Senator Bentsen, had to do with the import of lobster into the United States, and I have it here.

One of the Finance Committee recommendations, Mr. Speaker, was that it would prohibit entry into the United States customs territory of any whole lobster or part of such lobster that is not consistent with the new regulations set down by the Lobster Fisheries Management Plan. This, by the way, is a Committee of Ways and Means having to do with free trade.

So it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the committee appointed today by the minister will have its hands full, because, obviously, as far as the United States is concerned, their minds are pretty well made up.

I welcome the appointment, Mr. Speaker, of Mr. Aiden Maloney as Chairman of that Committee. Mr. Maloney is a very well-known and highly respected

MR. TOBIN:
Time, Mr. Speaker?

MR. W. CARTER:
Who is the Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, again I welcome the announcement that Mr. Maloney is going to be the chairman of this committee. He is a very fine person.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that I express some regret that such a small budget has been provided, which, of course, raises a question as to just how serious the minister is in addressing these problems.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I am pleased to address the whole question of the marketing of lobsters. In my home, in Cape St. George, one of the ways we know the lobster season has started is to listen to the boats out in the bay, because that is the first activity there.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Go home.

MR. LONG:
Be quiet, boy.

I cannot actually say I am the last forgotten fisherman of the Bill of Cape St. George, but

actually the last person on the Bill of Cape St. George is not a fisherman to start with, so maybe that is appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the statement, we welcome Aiden Maloney, our old friend, being involved in this particular study. One of the points I think should be looked at is the point marked (D) in the minister's statement 'The market development to decrease dependence (presently 90 %) on the United States markets.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is in line with most of the advanced thinking in terms of the fishing industry. The free trade deal has indicated that we want to sell a whole bunch more processed fish to the United States. In fact, the United States is a very poor market for our fish, whether it is unprocessed, processed, lobsters or whatever it shall be. As the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) knows, if you look at the Japanese market, with only 100 million people but with a consumption approximately ten times the size of the United States, the market itself is perhaps four or five times as big and we have people who take seafood as a natural industry.

I am hoping that Mr. Maloney's study of the industry will put us in a position to relieve ourselves of this terrible dependency on the American market, which allows for massive swings in the price and does not give us the kind of return we should have. And, of course, some of the other aspects, the pounding and storing of lobsters, are very important if we are going to do a more orderly market. I welcome the statement. I look forward to seeing Mr.

Maloney's report, since I know, as I think everybody in this House does, that he is highly credible in the industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

It is now 2:30, Private Member's Day, so it is time for Oral Questions.

Oral Questions

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. Is he aware that the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, have made a proposal to Congress that they include in the U.S. legislation implementing the so called Free Trade Agreement, a provision that would require the President, in the case of application of any rules by Canada or any province of Canada to control the export of unprocessed fish or impose landing requirements on fish, to implement the provisions of GATT that would protect the United States within thirty days?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WELLS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Will the Premier express to the House his government's view of the impact that will have on The Fish Inspection Act and Regulations, and the conduct of fisheries in this Province, if that is implemented?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, a very hypothetical question. One has to see what happens in the United States and with Canada. We have signed a Free Trade deal and we think it is a good deal for Canada and for Newfoundland and we would hope the deal, as signed, will be implemented, and that is what both Canada and all of the provinces who support the Free Trade deal will be working on, and that there will not be any amendments or changes which are injurious to any part of Canada, including Newfoundland.

MR. WELLS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, would the Premier indicate to the House whether the government has done an assessment of the potential impact of that on the application of The Fish Inspection Act of this Province,

and the impact on the fishery if that arrangement is implemented with the United States having the powers recommended by these two committees?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have. It was this government which was insistent during the free trade negotiations to have that clause included. So obviously we were the primary ones, I guess, who were instrumental in getting that protection that we had all along. We have done various studies on it.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

That was a final supplementary. I recognize the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

My question goes to the Minister of Fisheries. Yesterday the Government House Leader refused to agree to a special debate in the House on the Rose Ting fish plant situation in St. Lawrence. In light of that, Mr. Speaker, and in light of the importance of that plant to the social and economic well-being of so many people on the South Coast, I wonder would the Minister of Fisheries give the House an update as to exactly where negotiations stand at this point in time in terms of getting that plant back to work?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all allow me to make a comment on the hon. gentleman's preamble. My understanding is that the political ploy by the Opposition to get an emergency debate yesterday was in fact after the Orders of the Day had been called. Secondly, we had gone through a full thirty minute question period during which I was present yesterday and I do not believe there was any question asked, although there certainly was an opportunity.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Not one.

MR. LONG:

We asked one.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Except for the other opposition party in the Legislature, there was no question asked on fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, let me say to the hon. gentleman and to the House that the Cabinet committee dealing with this particular matter of the plants in St. Lawrence, Lawn, Rose Blanche and Port aux Basques, have been very much on top of the situation on a daily basis over the last number of days. Since Mrs Ting has indicated publicly now to government that she intends to sell all of her plants, we have had communications with her. We have invited her to meet with the Cabinet committee as early as possible, over the next day or so. If she can arrange her schedule to do so we can certainly arrange ours. We want to arrive at a bottom line for the sale of all her assets, including the plant that was mentioned in the question from the hon. gentleman, and we will move as quickly as we can in co-operation with her. She

is the legal owner of those facilities, we are not. We do not have any guarantee, any mortgage, or any legal means available to us that would bring those facilities into our possession at the moment. We will move, with whatever haste is available to us and is necessary, to try to find interim operators as quickly as we can. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, we are not about to deliberately hoodwink any of the individuals dependent on operations in those communities that it will be easy, but we intend to use every means available to us to ensure that it happens as quickly as humanly possible.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I will not comment on the minister's preamble to his answer, because it is not worthy of comment to attribute political motives on this side for enquiring into a matter that is so important to such a large number of people.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister: Given the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the negotiations, to which he referred, will undoubtedly take a long time to conclude, has the minister given thought to maybe leasing that plant and arranging with an operator to move in there immediately to get the plant operating to provide jobs and to buy the fish from the fishermen?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, the hon. gentleman knows, and the record will show, that despite the maneuvers of the Opposition yesterday there were, in fact, no questions on this important matter in this Legislature during Question Period yesterday. Now, let that be established first, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Except for the NDP.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Yes, by the other opposition party. I keep forgetting that they are here, Mr. Speaker, they are so small and so insignificant. The Socialist hordes are disappearing from the face of the Newfoundland landscape.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, secondly - let me get to the hon. gentleman's question - we are prepared to discuss any and all alternatives with Mrs. Ting. In fact, we have had discussions with her already on the very basis that the hon. gentleman has mentioned. We are prepared to explore with her, in an expeditious manner, that alternative, other alternatives, or whatever might be out there as alternatives, with a view to arriving at an accommodation as soon as it is humanly possible to arrive at such accommodation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the minister's answer would indicate, and clearly shows who is playing politics with this question. He seems to be more concerned about -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely shameful that 1,500 people in this Province whose livelihood is being threatened -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about having negotiations with Mrs. Ting. My question: IF there is an unwillingness on her part to enter into a lease now at this point in time, will the minister entertain the proposition that maybe an expropriation for use be entered into? In other words, expropriate the plant for use on an interim basis and then to negotiate its purchase later on.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say that the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The very fact that the Opposition have tried on three occasions today to cover up their political incompetence of yesterday goes to point out what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said clearly in this House, I have said clearly to representatives of all the four towns involved, not just

St. Lawrence and Lawn, because yesterday I had a meeting with a group from Port aux Basques and Rose Blanche as well, that we will explore expeditiously every option open to us. Every option means every option, not just one or two, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin). It is ironic that the minister had a statement today on child care in this Province in light of what took place in the House of Commons yesterday when day care was put on hold. And I would like to ask the minister, in respect to the statement he brought in and the statement in **The Evening Telegram** today concerning day care being put on hold, can the minister tell us if he has already, as he indicated several weeks ago, had a deal signed for the Province, or is Newfoundland still in the same position it was several months ago on day care?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said that we indicated several weeks ago that we had in place in this Province an agreement with the federal government as it relates

to day care. That has never been said. We did say that we were negotiating a National Day Care Strategy Programme with the federal government, Mr. Speaker, and we are still at that. We are still part of the negotiations on the National Day Care Strategy with the federal government as it relates to day care.

The hon. gentleman asked, Mr. Speaker, is everything the same in the Province as it used to be. No, Mr. Speaker. Employment has increased by 2.8 per cent, for a gain of 10,000 jobs on a monthly average base. Unemployment has dropped 1.4 per cent in 1987, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:
- the largest drop of any province in Canada. Things have changed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
In light of the fact that we have some 15,000 children in this Province still awaiting day care - we are the worst off of any province in Canada. Can the minister tell us when an agreement will be signed? the federal government have now done a complete reassessment of the day care and they do not even know what time the agreements will be signed with the Province? Does the minister know something that he is not telling? Is he

expecting to sign within the next short while?

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, in reference to what the hon. gentleman is saying as it relates to day care, this Province has been experiencing much growth, Mr. Speaker. Right now there are ninety licenced facilities across the Province for a total of 2,251 child care spaces. Mr. Speaker, that is very significant. That is a new programme that was brought in under the Peckford Administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:
That is the type of growth and prosperity that we have seen in this Province since the Peckford Administration took power, and we will continue to grow and expand. And I can further say to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague, the Government House Leader and the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, will be meeting next week with his federal counterpart and day care will be discussed.

MR. EFFORD:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
I ask the Minister of Social Services very clearly, Mr. Speaker, are the minister and the

federal government taking the same attitude towards the working people of this Province as did the former Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) when he said that all women should stay at home? Is that the reason we have not got an agreement signed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. gentleman that this is a government that has shown tremendous progress as it relates to the status of women in this Province. This is the government, Mr. Speaker, that has improved the situation in this Province. This is a government that believes that day care, Mr. Speaker, is an essential part of social programmes in this Province, and a government that has initiated and brought into this Province major social programmes.

We are on the right track, Mr. Speaker, and as it relates to the statements by the hon. gentleman, he is the same man who stood in this House the other day and said that social workers attending conferences should have to eat Kraft Dinners when the rest of the professions in this Province can go out and have whatever they like. But he wants to downplay the significance of the Department of Social Services and treat the whole shebang, Mr. Speaker, professional social workers and everyone else, like dirt and trash, something like the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, tried to do to the character of the member for St. John's South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the new Minister Responsible for the Status of Women (Mr. Simms). Yesterday evening the 16th Annual Meeting of Planned Parenthood in this Province was held. In the fine report they produced they indicated that they have dealt with over 5,600 women at their clinic, in terms of pregnancy tests, having women seen by doctors there, and counseling.

My question to the minister is this: What is the government's attitude towards planned parenthood, and what kind of support is it willing to put in place in order to support this organization?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, that question would require a very lengthy answer, as the hon. member should be aware. But let me say this, having only been the minister for a two week period, I guess, now - less than two weeks; my two week anniversary will be tomorrow.

I have, in less than a week and a half, meet the staff of the Women Policies Office, all of them. We have discussed a number of issues, one of which is the one the hon. member refers to.

More recently, just a couple of

days ago, I had a meeting with the President of the Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women, along with a number of other members of the council, and this issue, among others, was addressed. I can only say to the hon. member that we will, as a government, continue to be as aggressive in dealing this particular issue as we have been in dealing with many, many other issues of importance to women, such major social policy initiatives as equal pay for work of equal value, which was brought in by this government; as the pension plan for part-time workers brought in by this government, such as the establishment of the Women's Policy Office brought in by this government, such as the establishment of the Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women brought in by this government. So we will continue to work in a positive way to respond to issues that affect women, Mr. Speaker. I am quite prepared and willing to listen to any representations from anybody, including the representation, I would suspect, just made by the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is this: Since recent studies have shown that teenage pregnancies is one of the major reasons for women dropping out of school, and since Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan are the only other two provinces in Canada besides ourselves that do not provide direct funding to Planned

Parenthood, would the minister rise in his place and commit his government to providing direct financial support to the Planned Parenthood people who up to this point have been operating totally on volunteer subscriptions?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member now is entering into an area of great sensitivity, a much broader question than he has put in his few words here today. The government has made its position clear and made its position known on the broader issue, which is the one he is trying to get at, I am certain. I would only suggest to the hon. member to take the time to read the statement issued by the Minister of Health with respect to our overall position and then he will clearly understand where we are coming from.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I apologize if this sounds a bit repetitive, but in the answer there I am not quite sure whether the minister meant that you are considering it and you will give the money to it later on, or whether it is no.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

Could the minister clarify his answer there? Does this

government intending to support an organization which helped over 5,600 women last year in an area that is clearly a chronic problem area in our Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help it if the hon. member does not understand what my answer was. All I can do is repeat my answer.

The government's position on the issue is very well known, very clear, and I can only recommend his reading the statement put out by the Minister of Health some time ago, which makes our position quite clear.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to direct a question to the Premier. Your Honour will know that over the past few weeks there have been quite a few questions on the Sprung project. In a lot of cases information was given, and in a lot of cases important information was withheld. Of late the Premier has adopted the position that he will not answer any more questions, but I believe he has an obligation, and, therefore, I put my question, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask the Premier: What is the current status of the Sprung project? By that I mean, have cucumber sales increased or decreased over the past couple of

weeks? Are there currently any out-of-the-Province sales of cucumbers, or are cucumbers still being "dumped" or otherwise disposed of, except through sale?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my prepared statement to the House some time ago, I would from time to time, or the government would from time to time, be making statements on the project but we would not be looking at the day-to-day operations of the project to give it an opportunity to succeed, as with other projects around the Province in which government has money. I do not know how many projects there are around the Province. I suppose there are twenty-five, thirty or more, this very moment, that receive money from the government, that are operating their businesses, that are marketing their products and so on. In the same way, I do not think we should discriminate against this project any more than the other projects in the Province. But, from time to time, as I indicated in my prepared statement to the House, we will be reporting to the House on this project.

MR. KELLAND:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupia.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier can skate all he likes on this but I would like to ask him specifically what is the current financial status of the company? Is it financially sound or will more government funding assistance be required to

get through this current fiscal year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, the operation is going super-duper, everything is on schedule and we look forward to a highly successful project here for the people of our Province.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. KELLAND:

The Premier represents 50 per cent owner of Newfoundland Enviroponics and therefore I pose my final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Why does the Premier continue to refuse to give information that should be in the hands of the 50 per cent owner, the people of this Province? Why does he continue to refuse?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, why does the Opposition refuse to ask questions about Baie Verte mines? Why do members of the Opposition refuse to ask questions about the Marystown Shipyard? Why do members of the Opposition refuse to ask questions about Hope Brook gold mines, in which we have millions and millions of dollars? Why are they only approaching one project rather than twenty or thirty, Mr. Speaker? There are \$99 million worth of guaranteed

loans out from the government. I guess it is well over \$100 million now because of ones we have done recently. All I say to the hon. member is that this is a business opportunity, it is a research and development project which is going to work for our Province. There are 200 Newfoundlanders out there working today, producing and marketing a very, very high quality product for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, for the people of Canada, and hopefully, for the people of the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Brett) in relation to the minister's department's capital works projects, which appear to be becoming more and more public every day without being presented to this House for commentary, debate, approval or whatever. I wonder if the minister can indicate what purpose is achieved by government members announcing these capital work projects outside of this House?

What new purpose, Mr. Speaker, has sprung up to require this irregular, incongruous and undemocratic way of announcing capital works projects?

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

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I think that or a similar question has been asked many times. I told the hon. member yesterday or the day before that every single member of this House will be notified if in fact there are any projects in his or her district. By Friday everybody on both sides of the House will be notified and then any member is free to go out and call a press conference, or stand on his head, if he wants to. What the member does once he gets the project is up to himself. So there is nothing unusual going on. Some members have been advised.

It is a fairly large programme. It takes time to write up all the MCs, to get everything in order, and it is impossible for the staff to get them all out in one day. They will all be out by Friday. I will be making a Ministerial Statement. I will table it in the House, and then the hon. member for Bonavista North, if in fact he has any projects, can go out and have a big press conference, get all the new media together, and tell them what a great government we have in the Province of Newfoundland because of all the money they are putting into water and sewer in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
The problem is, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be none left to be announced by the minister. They are all announced now. I ask the minister, Mr. Speaker: Will he

not come clean and admit that the only purpose achieved by members opposite announcing these capital works projects is a political one, and that this procedure is violating, subverting and destroying the democratic process as we know it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how the hon. member can come to that conclusion. I have already told him that every single member in this House who gets funding for capital works through the Department of Municipal Affairs will be notified by letter. It cannot be done all in one day, so it is being done over a period of time. The hon. member will have the same opportunity as everybody else, as I have already told him.

MR. LUSH:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister, because this could make a difference, if these projects now being announced by government members are going to be sponsored by Tory Party Funds or are they going to be sponsored by the taxpayers' monies of this Province? If they are going to be sponsored by the taxpayers' monies of this Province, why does the minister not do it the proper, the correct, the democratic way, and announce these projects in

this House?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I intend to do on Friday morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for a second. Could he tell us again if the policy of his department is to send a letter to the members before an announcement is made so that this protocol call can be followed, and we will know which monies we receive in our districts? I want to hear that again. Could he tell us, please?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not recall ever seeing that hon. member in my office since I went over there a number of months ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT:

He has never, ever been to my office to make representation on behalf of the people in the district of Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. BRETT:

And I would suggest, for that reason if no other, that hon. member should not be allowed to announce the projects even if he has any. Obviously he has no interest in the district. He has never been in my office. He has never made a request for any funds.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Democracy is alive and well, Mr. Speaker! Would the minister comment on a press release -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

We will find out in the next election who made good representation, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister comment and tell us the reason why the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doyle) and the Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier issued a press release in Stephenville today announcing \$300,000 in projects for Stephenville?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD:

Because the hon. member is not interested.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, order!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

You tell me if that is democracy, Sir! You tell me!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. BRETT:

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that opportunity might be available to that member some day ten, fifteen or twenty years down the road when they get a leader who is not bought and paid for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

I would like to address a question, Mr. Speaker, when the children on the other side quiet down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). I would like to ask the minister whether he has made any inquiries into the bombing the Elizabeth Park Subdivision in Paradise by the adjoining gravel pit operation? I would like to have the minister report to the House what the results of these inquiries have been?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, for some time prior to the blast that the hon. the member for Mount Scio is talking about, our department monitored very carefully what was happening. There was no cover-up or anything by the company, it was all out in the open. It has been monitored ever since 1986, I believe, Mr. Speaker, when they started doing this. It was monitored by the Department of Mines also, and by the Department of the Environment. There has been some variance between the actual information which has come out, and what the real information is.

The answer to the hon. member's question is, yes, we have looked into it thoroughly, and I can provide the hon. member with some information on it.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, would the minister inform the House, whether he is satisfied that adequate safety precautions are in place there? Is he satisfied that the Mines Inspection Branch of his Department is ensuring this operation is carried out in a proper and careful fashion, a fashion safe for the adjoining residents? Is the minister aware - I personally saw this - that on an earlier occasion about a year ago there was a piece of rock

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, embedded in the lawn of a house?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This is a supplementary question, but the hon. member is commenting on another issue.

MR. BARRY:

I asked the minister, Mr. Speaker, is he aware of this earlier incident, where there was a piece of rock embedded in a lawn of a house, which, if it had hit the house, would have demolished the house and wiped out everybody in that house? Is the minister aware of this?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that particular part of the story has been reported and it has been investigated. We were even told that the rock went down into the ground eight inches deep, or something like that. Now you can root into the ground and find some rocks eight inches down, or twelve inches or whatever.

We do not take these things lightly, Mr. Speaker. This very morning the Premier made a proclamation proclaiming the week of the 19th to the 25th of June Occupational Health and Safety Week. We are very, very conscious of occupational health and safety matters. We did monitor that. We looked at it. There was a buffer zone and there were people watching when the blast took place. Some rocks did pass overhead and land in the buffer zone, but up until this point in time - well, Mr. Speaker, I will

not say this point and time, but up until the latest reports that I have of the investigations into this, there was no indication the rocks went beyond the buffer zone, which was somewhere in between where the blast took place and where the houses are.

We are not taking it lightly, Mr. Speaker. I can assure the hon. member that and it has been looked it. There has been a meeting with the Metro Board, under whose jurisdiction that area comes, and our department has been represented there, the Mines Department has been represented there, and Environment, so it has been thoroughly examined.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:
Is the minister aware that residents in the area are disputing the claims of the Mines Inspection Branch of the minister's department, that no rocks went outside of the buffer zone? Is the minister aware of this point? Will he investigate this point? Because, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that that rock was not dug down. The people did not dig eight inches down into the lawn to find that rock. That rock landed, Mr. Speaker, and imbedded in the ground eight inches. I saw it and the minister should take it seriously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
It is going to be too late when

somebody is killed. I ask the minister to look at that very, very carefully.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is just time for a brief answer.

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many different ways I can tell the hon. member, that yes, all of the information and the claims that have come out about where rocks went are being investigated. I understand that there is complete co-operation by the company. They are concerned that the residents are being turned off by the blasts. But it is being looked at, Mr. Speaker, and a report will be made in due course.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Private Members' Day

MR. SPEAKER:
The debate was adjourned by the hon. the Minister of Northern Development and he is not here.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the motion and speak on the resolution that the Province deal with the arts community in a more comprehensive manner than it

has in the past.

I think there is no question the arts in this Province have been brought into focus over the last six months or so, and possibly over the last year, but certainly in the last six months we have seen a great focus on the arts community.

From the City perspective, we have seen the York Theatre Project where a study was commissioned and a report brought forward on the York Theatre. That commission, in fact, showed the York Theatre, the building since demolished by fire, could, in fact, be restored, rehabilitated and used as an arts centre. The fact that that commission did, in fact, report its findings in a positive way certainly indicates the viability of the arts community in St. John's, and, indeed, in the Province.

Since we have lost that alternative, as far as that particular building is concerned, we still have opportunities to take advantage of the recommendations contained in that study and see the recommendations carried out so the thrust of the commission's study is not lost and the initiative taken by many of the artists and consultants, a lot of whom were engaged in dialogue with the commission, a lot of the thrust of their comments and of their recommendations, are not lost in the future. We can, in fact, take advantage of their expertise by ensuring they are plugged into all the necessary departments of government so the appropriate officials are spoken with on the provincial level, as well as on the municipal level, and their suggestions are carried forward to government and dealt

with in a positive way.

Many of these individuals have concerns, of course, which go beyond the scope of simply providing a building, such as the York Theatre might have been. Whether it is a building such as that or a similar structure - I can give some examples in the City, such as the BIS building, the Star Theatre, two examples of two older buildings, in fact, that could be used for the arts - whether it is a structure historic in nature or is a brand new structure deemed necessary because of the demand from the arts community, is irrelevant in a way, as long as it is recognized premises have to be provided for the arts community to carry out their mandate on behalf of individuals artists, whether it be in the area of theatre or dance or the folk arts, or whatever the area of the arts community might be. Having premises available, and these premises supported by the provincial government and by municipal governments, such as St. John's, Stephenville, Corner Brook and other locations throughout the Province where we have an ongoing presence of theatre and folk arts, Mr. Speaker, it is important to realize the arts community needs a mandate far in advance of what has been put in place in the past.

It has to be assured the Province will work with the arts community to see funding is available, funding adequate to support both artists in the carrying out of their individual efforts because commissions have shown artists are suffering in all the areas of the arts and are having difficulty becoming established in their craft; funding as well for infrastructure and for rehabilitation of buildings for

use by the arts; and ongoing support of buildings already in place, such as our Arts and Culture Centres throughout the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the recent focus by the City with the York Theatre Project has probably brought about a situation which has seen a renewed focus on the need for not just a more broad provincial and municipal policy, but a need for the corporate community and the corporate sector throughout this Province to become involved with government more so than it has in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the catalyst and the important area of this focus has to be government. Government should bring back into proper focus the needs of the arts community and, by way of a commission or a committee, comprised of good representation from the arts community, government and municipalities, is therefore able to come up with better solutions, alternatives and recommendations whereby we can see all levels of government participate. It would encourage the corporate community which, in fact, has not really played the sort of role we would have liked to see in encouraging the arts, play a larger role in providing funding from the corporations to support the community at large, thereby, of course, supporting these corporations themselves because of the recognition they would receive, and supporting the employees who work for them and the community itself. We do not see enough of that in this Province.

We know on a national scale the arts are funded by way of grants and scholarships and so on, very

well nationally, and I say very well, certainly a lot better than we see in a lot of the provinces, particularly Newfoundland, where the corporate community nationally has recognized - I suppose because of the national scope of a lot of these corporations - has recognized the need to be a major participant in supporting all areas of the arts community.

It is unfortunate it has not permeated down to the provincial and municipal level where corporations of reasonable size could play a major part in support of the arts community, whether it be way of making provision for scholarships, outright grants to artists, in fact, supporting artists as individuals in some cases, or playing a major role in the rehabilitation of historic premises which could be used for the arts. They could be involved in many, many areas, but I believe government must take a leading role.

As it has done with the recent announcement of the stock purchase plan and funding agencies which can be tied into the stock purchase plan, the same sort of idea where the business community can be encouraged to get involved with the economy, can also be a part of the arts community and the arts thrust as well. As we all know, government itself cannot be the answer to all of the problems of any given sector of the Province, or any given part of our economy, but can certainly be a catalyst to see all initiatives which can be taken advantage of are approached. I would suggest the corporate sector in particular should be added to the list of groups which should be participating in a much broader way than they have in the past.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, in speaking to this very same subject at City Council, I made a suggestion City Council adopt a policy of having a permanent committee to address the problem of the Arts community and, in fact, act as a ongoing committee dealing with arts and culture, and this committee be comprised of representation from all areas of the arts community, as well as City officials and elected councillors. That position was accepted by the council and, in fact, the composition of the committee is about to be announced.

I would say that initiative taken by City Council and started, I suppose, by the York Theatre Project, be followed through in other communities throughout Newfoundland and be tied into the provincial Arts Council and hopefully, eventually, into a provincial arts foundation which could be set up to provide ongoing funding to all areas of the arts and could see the corporate sector tied into the foundation, as I suggested, so that funding, provincially, municipally and from the corporate sector could all be funnelled into a provincial foundation which could work in liaison with the various municipalities to see the arts community was properly funded on an ongoing basis and not have to come back to government, as it seems, consistently looking for help almost every year.

Mr. Speaker, the '88 Soiree celebrations have indeed shown we are distinct in many ways. As I mentioned in the Meech Lake debate, we are certainly a distinct society. We are distinct as well as far as our culture is concerned. I do not think anybody would argue that our arts

community is certainly distinct in relation to the rest of Canada.

Soiree '88 is showing already the participation of our arts community is going to be a major part of the success of Soiree '88 in St. John's and region and in the rest of the Province.

I would like to see more participation by our Newfoundland artists. In fact, I was disappointed, I would have to admit, with some of the Soiree celebrations which I hear were not well represented by Newfoundland artists and could have been. Some of the arts community has voiced objection to that and possibly rightly so.

However, it is an improvement over what we have seen develop. As recently as five years ago, I would suggest, any major celebration in this Province would probably not include as many Newfoundland artists as we are now seeing with Soiree '88.

So we have come a long way, but, Mr. Speaker, we have a long way to go, in spite of the recognition of the arts community, in spite of the activity in most areas of the Province, as far as the development of the arts is concerned, the activity with high school festivals, the plays which are being encouraged, and the expertise. Anybody who has witnessed any recent graduations and have seen the talent in our schools will attest to the future of the arts community.

So we have come a long way, but, Mr. Speaker, I think we have a long way to go. I think we have infrastructure in place, in a lot of cases historic infrastructure which can be put into use by the

arts community.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I think, most importantly, we have got to recognize we need to have a fresh look at the mandate the arts community has, the mandate this government has put in place, and I believe a commission of enquiry into the present status of the arts be initiated. It would be wise if this is done as soon as possible with representation from all areas of the arts community and we focus once again in a larger way in coming up with a more permanent solution, a longer term solution, Mr. Speaker, which would see the arts and cultural areas of our economy, because it does play a major role in our economy and in our social lives, that that mandate be renewed once again and a set of permanent recommendations for a long term solution be brought forward and, hopefully, would be acceptable to the arts community, Mr. Speaker, and we would continue with a partnership that has been working to some degree.

The partnership between the arts community, society in general, and this government, can be enhanced by firm recommendations which could be a foundation for a better long-term future for the arts.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have an opportunity to speak in this debate for ten or fifteen minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
I appreciate my colleague's support.

MR. SIMMONS:
One delegate.

MR. SIMMS:
What was that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
I am sorry, I did not hear my cousin.

MR. SIMMONS:
One delegate.

MR. SIMMS:
Yes, one delegate.

All my colleagues are in the backroom there, I know, listening with bated breath to what I have to say.

Mr. Speaker, on this particular resolution introduced by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long), I have a special interest and a personal interest in many ways, having had the opportunity to serve this Province as Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth for a period of nearly three years, succeeding some pretty good people. As well, there have been some who have succeeded me, and all of them, to a person, have one thing in common, including myself, and that is, I think, we thoroughly enjoyed our tenure as minister of that particular department. One of the main reasons for that particular enjoyment was because of the cultural affairs portion, or division, of the department.

MR. TULK:

You may have, nobody else did.

MR. SIMMS:

If hon. members opposite want to continue interrupting, that is fine, I have no problem with it. But I do have something to say with respect to the particular issue and with respect to the topic which is very important, I think, and I would like to say it.

During that three year tenure, in particular, Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to meet many, many groups who were involved in the arts community, all sectors. I was interested in hearing the comments of the hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount who said Soiree '88 is seeing involvement of Newfoundland artists like we have never seen before in Newfoundland and Labrador. I am not quite certain that is accurate, and I say that because of a personal involvement I had as the minister responsible for the 400th Anniversary Celebrations a few years ago, in 1983 - was it? - or 1984.

During that particular year, I can tell hon. members of the House, we indeed involved members of the arts community, all throughout the Province, in the many activities that were held. That, perhaps, was one of the most enjoyable years I ever had in my life. Because not only did I have the opportunity of being the minister responsible and being proud of it, having had opportunities to promote Newfoundland and Labrador in its culture and history on many occasions outside Newfoundland as well as inside, I had the opportunity to meet many people in the arts community.

MR. LONG:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

I thank the hon. member for that. He is probably getting that from my cousin. Well, the hon. member may not even be aware of this, but among the many people involved in the arts community are friends and relatives of mine, one of whom, I believe, may even have been the hon. member's campaign manager. Now, he may not have been aware of that.

MR. LONG:

You have a lot of relations.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes. Now, I am not sure whether he was your campaign manager. I understand he was the campaign manager for Cle Newhook, for example, in the last by-election. If it is the same person.

MR. SIMMONS:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, Jimmy Payne. Jimmy Payne is my second cousin.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, my God!

MR. SIMMS:

Well, he is probably too proud of it to tell you.

Yes, Jim is a second cousin of mine. His father and I are first cousins, and his grandfather and my mother were brother and sister.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I knew there was something wrong here.

MR. SIMMS:

This is Jim Payne. But our other cousin over here, on the other side of the family, might even be

aware of him.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, among the many people I met and knew who are involved in the arts community, were not only people who became friends of mine, some of whom remain friends to this day despite political differences in many ways, but even some relatives who have also fallen by the wayside and gotten involved with another political party and other political candidates.

I also had occasion, during that three years as Minister of Culture, to become fairly knowledgeable and involved with the Stephenville festival in many ways, having attended it, I am sure, every year I was minister and some years since then. I took a great interest in it, and was particularly impressed with the work of Maxim Mazumdar, especially the courses he used to run in training young artists in the Province, who turned out to be very successful, as well as the festival itself. It was just a magnificent week of activity and still is, and still will be, I hope, for many years to come.

I had numerous occasions to attend performances at the Arts and Culture Centre and at the LSPU hall here in this area, in particular, and outside St. John's in many other venues, and I always, as I said, enjoyed myself immensely. I would never be much of a critic, because anything I have attended yet I have always enjoyed; I have never seen anything wrong with anything put on by Newfoundland artists.

I might even have a better feel for it than the member for Twillingate. I do know, and I have not met one who was not, that

these artists are very dedicated and committed to their particular profession, without question, all of them to a person, all of them. I also know that with very, very, very few exceptions, for the most part they have a struggle to make a reasonable living. I know that applies to most of them who are involved in the arts community. I suppose that is not only true here in Newfoundland, that is probably the case throughout other parts of Canada, and, indeed, throughout the world for that matter, the Western world at least. What I am trying to say is that I had some personal experiences and knowledge of the activities of Newfoundland and Labrador artists in many, many ways.

It was interesting that the member for Waterford — Kenmount also said that government cannot be expected to provide the answers to all the problems and difficulties associated with this particular issue. I would have to agree. I would also say that government has, this particular administration, brought in some programmes in the nine short years it has been the administration, that have been an improvement, or have shown an improvement for the arts community in Newfoundland and Labrador. We should not take a backseat in that particular regard; we have brought in a lot of new programmes, a lot of new policies which did not exist prior to 1979, were never heard of prior to 1979.

The hon. member, himself, I believe, last week, or the member for Stephenville, made mention of the magazine that the member for St. John's East was involved with at one time. I do not know if he still is or if it is still on the go, but he, himself, was able to

access a small amount of funding from the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council to help get that off the ground, or help get it going. Prior to 1979, there was no Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council. There was no funding avenue, you had to go through the department and hope you might scrape a dollar here and there. But even the department, in those days, really had no funding avenue. So we did bring in the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Who brought it in?

MR. SIMMS:
This government brought it in. It has been surrounded at times with controversy and so on and so forth. It has been argued that they do not have enough funding. Nobody argues with that, certainly not on this side. You obviously defend what you have done as a government, and you acknowledge with pride that you have made some significant changes and improvements. But we need to improve more, there is no question about it. And that is why, in principle, we have no difficulty in supporting the resolution put forth by the member for St. John's East.

We have made significant advances in arts programming and, in fact, in highlighting, just highlighting, activities of the arts community - highlighting culture in Newfoundland and Labrador. If I am not mistaken, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was this administration, whilst it may not seem too meaningful to some, which responded to the requests and lobbies of many people in the arts community to change the name of the department

so that the department itself became the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth. I believe it was this administration which made that change to recognize and to highlight the importance of culture and cultural activities. So even such a small thing as that is something that was done by this administration.

Prior to 1979, I do not know if we even heard of the arts community in Newfoundland, no reflection on the arts community, but a reflection, perhaps, on governments prior to 1979. Because there should have been more initiative taken to highlight the importance of the arts community in the Province.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I was minister at the time, in association with the then Minister of Public Works, we brought in the arts procurement programme which has been responded to very favourably by visual artists in the Province. They have responded very favourably, very positively to that particular programme, and it has helped a lot of visual artists, it has helped them a lot. And we will continue with that particular programme. But that was an initiative of this government, something we should be proud of.

We brought in a book publishers assistance programme, and whilst there was some controversy surrounding that as to who should handle the disbursement of funds, and so on and so forth, the fact is it was a new programme, a new initiative to assist Newfoundland book publishers in publishing Newfoundland works. And they do get assistance from the programme and it is helpful. It is new and it is an improvement.

Also, we brought in the sustaining grants programme for performing groups. I am not sure that is the way it is worded but, anyway, everybody knows what I am talking about. It was a sustaining grants programme.

MS VERGE:

Sustained funding for permanent arts companies.

MR. SIMMS:

Sustained funding for permanent arts companies, right.

Again, that was a programme, I recall, that met with certainly a considerable amount of support from those who were going to get some help, and from others, I guess, perhaps not so much support. But I think deep down they probably had to support the initiative and the idea because it was new, and prior to that programme coming into place there was no such programme and these groups had to scrape and claw. They still scrape and claw, no doubt, but at least they have an avenue to get some help and some assistance, and it has been beneficial. We can see the results of it ourselves, if any members of the House will take the time to see some of their performances and some of their work. But it was a bit controversial. And it can be argued there is not enough money there for it, and that is an argument I cannot disagree with.

We did bring in funds to support the secondary tour groups who were going around the Province and who were perhaps too small and could not afford to buy the equipment required for them to perform in Springdale or wherever, small communities around the Province. The department purchased a

considerable amount of equipment to assist these performing groups who travelled around the Province to small communities.

I remember some of these things from the past: We have assisted the LSPU Hall, for example. We did help the LSPU Hall, I remember, in their time of need, I think with respect to some capital funding in particular.

AN HON. MEMBER:

For renovations.

MR. SIMMS:

I remember, yes, renovations and so on.

With respect to the arts and culture centres around the Province, there are groups who get some help through that programming in the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth to assist them.

We have the Arts and Letters Competition. In fact, it was held just last night, I understand from the minister, a very successful programme again this year which encourages Newfoundlanders to participate in all kinds of activities, writing and so on.

I had occasion to attend the Arts and Letters Competitions in the past, and some of the people who have won those competitions have been just absolutely elated with the kinds of awards, kinds of acknowledgements and kinds of recognition that came from that programme.

Mr. Speaker, all I am saying in the few minutes I have is, first of all, to give a bit of the background of my own interest in the thing, and to also indicate that the government has, in fact,

been innovative and brought in some initiatives. By the way, most of those initiatives were brought in as a result of consultation with members of the arts community. Many of them had input, made suggestions and it was as a result of that kind of consultation that those programmes were brought into being.

We have to be honest here at least in terms of acknowledging that we have made some progress in this area in nine short years, because none of this really took place prior to 1979, nothing very positive or effective. So I think it is fair, and would be fair, to acknowledge that we have made progress.

We can argue where programmes should be, in what area, whether it is arts council or the department, those kinds of arguments that have gone on in the past, and we can argue very strongly that there is not enough money in those programmes, or certainly in many of the programmes, and again one would find it difficult to disagree. It is, therefore, the reason why in principle, Mr. Speaker, and again I repeat, we have no difficulty with the idea contained in the hon. member's resolution. Because after eight or nine years maybe it is time for us to have a review, maybe it is time to have a look at the programming, maybe it is time to look at the funding and it is for that reason we support the resolution. The only thing, as the hon. member is aware, that we have done is we differ in the way it should be undertaken, but we do not differ strongly.

I understand the member for St. John's East has no difficulty with the wording of our amendment,

which I should take the occasion to repeat in conclusion, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to remind members what we are talking about here. As a result of this amendment, if the amendment is passed and approved and the resolution then is approved and passed as amended, we are saying 'the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Butt) immediately authorize a review commission with two objectives.' The two objectives would remain intact, as the hon. member proposed, 'A comprehensive survey of the cultural economy of our Province, with specific reference to market definition and audience makeup across discipline; spending levels on materials supplies and services and in spinoff activities; all related employment factors; tax revenues; comparisons of public expenditures in this Province relative to other jurisdictions and an analysis of relative public spending levels on capital, production and operating costs and direct grants to artists. And, two, to produce, as far as possible, based on a survey of working artists, a report on the economic status of the artist in this Province.'

Mr. Speaker, I look forward, I truly look forward to the results of such analysis, such a survey and such a study. It is time to do it. After eight or nine years, it is definitely time to do it and I am anxious to see what the results will be. I have a suspicion what some of the results will be, and they will probably confirm what is often said, that there is not enough funding and things of that nature, but, hopefully, it will also acknowledge that we have, in fact, made some progress over the last eight or nine years and that, indeed, the government should get

some credit for the bit of work they have done in that area. And hopefully through it all will come a resolution on the part of all those people who are going to be involved in this, and all those groups and people who are involved in this activity, to do something that will make life a great deal better, especially for those who make their living in the arts in our Province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
If the minister has a meeting or something to go to, I will be glad to yield.

MR. BARRETT:
No, that is fine.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to join this debate for ten minutes or so to talk about the problems in our artistic community and to commend the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) for bringing forward this resolution with respect to drawing attention and focusing on some of the problems artists in this Province are currently experiencing.

I particularly like the opening recital where the hon. member says, "individual artist, art groups, and members of the cultural community in our Province are experiencing collective hardship as a result of inadequate support to meet financial, material, production and

infrastructure needs."

If you listen to the government, Mr. Speaker, talk about the monies spent to date, there really are no problems with respect to infrastructure. Everything is there for artists. It is just a matter of trying to find other monies so they can pursue their activities.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker. I had a letter from an artist in this Province two years ago which gave me cause to think very seriously about some of the problems. I think the line in the letter, if I recall, said particularly to me that artists in this Province have a tough enough time to make a living and the experience can sometimes be agonizing and can cause an awful lot of grief sometimes, just to try to make ends meet. This particular person referred to, 'unlike' other jobs or 'like' other jobs, depending on what your job is.

I made some comments in the House particularly about the arts community two years ago, and it gave me cause to reflect and think deeply about what this person was saying. I came to believe, Mr. Speaker, drawing from my own experience, not as a professional artist, but as one who, as a professional teacher, engaged in the direction of theatre, public speaking and these forms of art in the high school system, that had I not had the security of a cheque coming in every two weeks, Mr. Speaker, had I had to go out and do it on my own professionally, to teach young children and high school kids theatre and to direct, it would have, indeed, Mr. Speaker, been agonizing, hard, at times painful, and at times

depressing.

So along with the good side of the arts, no matter what art you are pursuing, there are also down sides. This woman's letter gave me cause to think about that and to think very seriously about it. I just raise that, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is worth thinking about for all members, that there is agony, there is pain, and there are times of depression, despondency, and there are times when you want to give it all up.

Mr. Speaker, as many people before me have said, the heart of any culture or any society is its collective artists. An important sign of that society, Mr. Speaker, is how we treat artists and those who are out there pitching in day and night for long hours in a difficult profession to try to make ends meet.

So I was glad to see the hon. member from St. John's East's recital say it is most difficult to make it out there when you choose it freely as your profession, to pursue it out of love, really. You love to do it and that is why you are doing it, but you have to put bread on the table as well.

Mr. Speaker, if I may just divert for one second, I want to draw to the attention of the House an important cultural event that is going to happen in the Gros Morne National Park next Friday morning when Prince Edward is there. I think it does all of us proud to know - I am sure the hon. Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) knows this and is equally as proud as I am - that Gros Morne National Park will be named the second international World Heritage Site, our other one

in this Province being L'Anse-au-Meadows, further north on the Northern Peninsula.

Mr. Speaker, it will be admitted to the list of World Heritage Sites under a UNESCO Convention signed by ninety-two countries, including Canada, and the purpose of this convention is to identify, designate and protect areas of outstanding beauty and value as part of the entire world's heritage, so that all of the human family can enjoy it forever.

It is a tremendous honour for the Gros Morne National Park, particularly when it is such a relatively new park and particularly when Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, already has a World Heritage Site at L'Anse-au-Meadows.

Gros Morne National Park now joins such well known international World Heritage Sites, Mr. Speaker, as the Grand Canyon in the United States, the Taj Mahal in India, the Rocky Mountain National Parks and the old Quebec City in Canada. There are about 250 such sites throughout world. They are not only important, Mr. Speaker, in their heritage sense, but are major tourist attractions because of their international reputation. With this designation, we now have a start to build on our reputation and knowledge about Gros Morne throughout Canada and the world.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to be now included as one of 250 sites on the entire planet which have been designated as special, as worth protecting, as worth keeping in its natural, beautiful state forever and ever for all of the human family to enjoy. Mr. Speaker, I am just proud to say to the House that now Newfoundland

has two sites and all fifty-two of us should be very proud of that significant achievement.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

I thank my hon. colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, just to come back to this motion. There is one other thing I want to draw to the House's attention, Mr. Speaker, while I am still on the Northern Peninsula in my remarks.

A young man by the name of Ben Ploughman, Mr. Speaker, on his own just published a book called **Born and Bred On The Rock**. It is a 134-page novel of original Newfoundland stories, recitations and poetry. It is his first book. It just hit the bookshelves, I think, about three weeks ago in this Province.

I like what Mr. Ploughman said. He said, the idea for the book was conceived while he was serving as an interpreter at Gros Morne Park seven years ago. In this post he wrote for the park publication, known as **Tuckamore**, and described the natural and cultural history of the park and the province and produced **The Uncle Jarge Show** during which he told stories about the new and old way of life for tourists in the Province as they came through.

I just wanted to let the House know Mr. Ploughman did this on his own and, I think, we should be all very proud he did this on his own in publishing this book. I hope many more will come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, this Province is not only brimming with fish, which is really our *raison d'être* and why Cabot came here in the beginning, Mr. Speaker, in 1497, but we also have an importantly rich cultural heritage. We really do. The Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) spoke about it at the Shrimp Festival last year and gave, what I would call, a very good talk. He did the same, by the way, at the Labrador Festival, what is the name of your festival?

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Bakeapple Festival.

MR. FUREY:

The Bakeapple Festival, yes, I saw him there as well. He gave a very good speech. I would presume the minister himself wrote it.

MR. KELLAND:

He is going to speak at the cucumber festival this year.

MR. FUREY:

He spoke about our heritage and the pride we should take in it. I commended him before the speech for being there and I commended him afterwards, as he will acknowledge. He gave a very good speech. It made me very proud to hear him talk about our history, our roots and the fact we have to be very proud of our past in order to be very proud of our future. The Minister of Development and Tourism, Mr. Barrett, gave a very good speech and I commend him for it.

MR. KELLAND:

Who wrote it, I wonder?

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, our Province is not just brimming with history, it is

brimming with culture. Sometimes we go past all this and forget about it in economic hard times. We tend to allow our cultural heritage to suffer the worse brunt whenever the economy goes into a downswing or whenever our economy is performing, as it currently is performing, like a fish just hove up on the wharf, Mr. Speaker. It is flipping and flopping all over the place. The economy is very unbalanced and unstable. One only has to look, Mr. Speaker, at the statistics to see it.

We know that the economic pie in this Province from one coast to another has to be shared as equally as possible amongst the various disciplines in Cabinet portfolios and the various sectors. We know there is only so much money reasonably that can be provided for the arts and for our cultural heritage. We know that, Mr. Speaker.

We understand why the government only has the amount of money they have their now because where else are they going to find it in an economy behaving like a fish just tossed up on the wharf, flipping and flopping all over the place. It is not a stable economy.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is we have to exercise economic competence before the pie can swell a little bit and before we can look after the various disciplines and the various Cabinet responsibilities across the various sectors.

What happens is, when an economy begins to flounder, when an economy begins to flip and flop all over the place, like my colleagues in the corner, when an economy is not performing well, the knife becomes sharpened the

most on areas that are the most vulnerable and that are in the least possible position to defend themselves. I am talking about areas such as the arts community, Mr. Speaker. The knife goes in deep and it cuts and clears away money to pay for things like light bills, to pay for things like the maintenance of buildings, to pay for things like current account deficits that have swollen to \$50 million, and this government is proud that it shrank from \$170 million to \$50 million. They created, Mr. Speaker, the \$170 million and they have responsibility for the \$50 million. That is nothing to be proud of at all.

MR. HODDER:
Relevancy.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, the relevancy is this: - I am glad the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) brought that up - you cannot have extra money for the arts if the economy is in this desperate a shape. If it is in this desperate a shape, they become the most vulnerable. They become the ones who have to take the government's knife in finance and have it cut away, have no increases.

So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Port au Port smiles and giggles and laughs. Hopefully he is laughing at my tie. I hope he is not laughing at the artists in this Province, who have to suffer through this. He heard my preamble to my remarks, talking about just how difficult it is to be a professional artist in this Province. It is difficult, painful, and agonizing, as one woman wrote to me privately in a letter telling me her views on my remarks two years ago. I

appreciate that. But also telling the deep agony there when you try to survive solely and with no other help in a community where you have to sell paintings or sell your acting abilities, etc. So it is very difficult.

He asks what the relevance is. How can you expect more money in the artistic community when you see the economic indicators in this Province of the last nine years giving us what has come to be known as the highest of everything bad and the lowest of everything good? How can you expect there to be extra money for all the things we would like to have extra money for when you have an unemployment rate that averaged in 1987 at 18.6 per cent, when that compares to the Maritime average of 12.9 per cent, and when that compares to the Canadian average of 8.9 per cent? For the entire year, Mr. Speaker, 18.9 per cent of our people were unemployed in 1987, versus 8 per cent for Canada. Of course, the money has to be diverted for social causes and issues.

When I hear the Minister of Social Services stand and say, 'Mr. Speaker, we have increased our budget by 146 per cent since 1979 in social services,' how can you be proud of that?

The pride is in the decrease, Mr. Speaker. The pride is in taking people off the social service roles, restoring dignity, and allowing them to have an opportunity to have a job in an economy that works. There is the pride.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, with the highest of everything bad, look at youth unemployment. Just imagine a young person aspiring to be a full-time artist in any of the performing arts when he has to look at the staggering unemployment statistics between the age groups of fifteen to twenty-four years of age for the year 1987. Newfoundland and Labrador had nearly 30 per cent of her young people, officially 30 per cent, looking for work. That is not to deal with the unofficial numbers, Mr. Speaker, those who have given up hope or those who have left the Province, more importantly.

DR. COLLINS:

You are wandering a bit, I am afraid.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I am wandering because the hon. Minister of Finance is responsible, because he wandered for eight years as Minister of Finance and gave us these incredible numbers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

That is why I am wandering.

DR. COLLINS:

You are wandering furiously afield.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, could you protect me from the kick-start Finance Minister over there who had to be taken out because his leg got sore trying to kick start the economy, so he went and closed some hospital beds instead. That is what that minister was up to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, if a young person aspired to be a full-time professional artist, what was his chance in 1987 with an unemployment rate of 30 per cent versus the Canadian average of 13 per cent between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four? What did they tell those young people?

Mr. Speaker, here is another interesting statistic our leader brought out in the House just recently which is even probably more frightening. In the last three years we have learned that some 18,000 people have left the Province, left Newfoundland and Labrador, -

MR. TULK:

Most of them were probably young people too.

MR. FUREY:

- left the Province in search of work. Talk about staggering, that means today, Mr. Speaker, if those figures hold true, another fifteen people left today, left their home for good. Fifteen men, women and children every day of every week, of every month for the last three years picked up, packed up and left their homes. Now, that is the brutal reality of an economy going mad under mad direction.

MR. J. CARTER:

What are your proposals?

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a good proposal for the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). Talk your Premier into talking to the Lieutenant Governor today. There is a good solution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, we have to be pretty proud of our arts and cultural community, Mr. Speaker, deeply proud at how they can manage to survive in our economy which has gone mad, gone into a mad, negative maelstrom, spiralling out of control. There should be monuments build to the artistic community, given the economic conditions they have to survive in, given the limited dollars which come from the public purse, and given it is very tough to survive out there in a full-time job in that particular industry where it is agonizing and sometimes depressing, but many of them hand in there. Who are the many that hang in there?

Mr. Speaker, we should be proud of the likes of Christopher and Mary Pratt. We should be proud of their daughter Barbara Pratt-Wangersky whose paintings are commanding wonderful prices, whose art is taking off, through the roof.

We should be proud of people like Conrad Furey, no relation, but a terrific artist. I talked to his member of Parliament yesterday in Ottawa and she told me he is doing exceptionally well but, of course, he had to leave the Province. He is in Hamilton where his paintings are commanding fabulous prices.

We should be proud of people like Andy Jones who is an exceptional actor. I saw one of his plays three or four years ago in Ottawa, **Out of the Bin** it was called. It was a comedy piece and it was absolutely terrific.

We should be proud of the likes of Bob Joy who is filling the houses on Broadway now, who has been in three major movie productions and

whose career is taking off.

David Blackwood, the painter and Jeff Pitcher, who is a wonderful actor in this Province and has chosen to stay here. Amy House from Port au Port who just did a one woman show, I think, Kevin, out there.

We should be proud of Donna Butt, Donald Cook, Greg Malone and Tommy Sexton. We should be proud of all these people.

They are, Mr. Speaker, the core, the heart and the soul, the lifeline of our culture in this Province today. They chose to keep it alive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FURFY:

Mr. Speaker, they chose to keep it alive under extraordinarily, difficult circumstances.

We commit to them today, if my hon. friend for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) talks to his hon. friend, the Premier, who will talk to the hon. Lieutenant Governor, that will change fairly quickly, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Thank you, very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism.

MR. BARRETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I find it a particularly pleasant duty this afternoon to have the opportunity to participate in this

particular debate.

There are many issues which I think are important to this Province, but I do not think there are any which might be of more importance to the legacy of the Newfoundlander than his culture.

Our culture, Mr. Speaker, is our past, it is our present and it is our future. Culture can take on many roles in this Province: It can be the role of the writer of song, or verse or prose, it can be the singers in our various communities around the Province, or our dancers or our actors, it can be our painters or our photographers.

There are many elements in this whole diverse area that you wrap up in a word called culture. One must not lose sight of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that culture is not something that just has an identity with the past that Newfoundland can relate to in terms of its association with Europe, with the European community. Our culture backs beyond that to our experiences with the Scandinavian countries some thousand years ago, or it backs beyond that, Mr. Speaker, to the Innu and the Innu of our Province, those very early settlers to our shores who are predated again by the Dorsets of some 3,500 years ago, a culture on the shores and within the land mass of this Province, or beyond that to the Maritime archaic of 7,000 years ago, when a culture existed in this Province.

We do not talk necessarily of culture any more in this Province, nor should we. We should more appropriately talk of multicultural, and not just to recognize our past of some 7-odd

thousand years ago, but the influences being brought to the Province today.

My friend from St. Barbe talks about the outward migration of Newfoundlanders to find various opportunities, or to improve themselves in other jurisdictions. He fails to recognize the inward migration of very many peoples from all over this world who find new and better opportunities and bring their culture to the mosaic of this Province. It is not just a one way street. We have all experienced, and certainly we all know if we want to truthfully assess and understand what is happening not just in this Province but on the globe, a global nature. People are migrating people. Newfoundland was settled because people wanted to move away from Ireland, or from Scotland, or from Southeast Asia, or somewhere else.

The most affluent society in the world today brings a great many of those same people to Newfoundland from the United States of America. From all over Canada, even Ontario, people come to Newfoundland to live to work and to find employment and to better their lifestyle. They come here from Alberta, they come here from British Columbia, not because they are on the unemployed roles. And a lot of Newfoundlanders who go out of this Province are not going out because they are on the unemployment roles, they are going out because they are seeking new opportunities and new challenges. And a great many of these return to this Province to bring back to this Province what they have learned and sought elsewhere. We do not captivate and have everything for everybody in this

Province. It is a global community and everybody benefits from being able to address and being able to participate in that.

It is no adverse reflection on a Province because so many thousand people might migrate out of the Province on an annual basis because, at the same time, there are several thousands of people immigrating into the Province with new skills and new technologies and new opportunities and new participation in the cultural mosaic of this Province.

So, when one talks about the value of culture to this Province, one must look at broader prospective. And one cannot speak in isolation of the adverse effect because an artist had to go somewhere else. Ask the question, 'Did he go somewhere else because he had to or because he wanted to?' Or she. Surely that is the question. How many artists have come to this Province and are living here today by choice, people who were never born in this Province, who are living in our bays and our towns and our communities all over the Province, including Labrador? I run into them every other week. I do not know why anybody else cannot find them. They are out there. They are doing work. They are living a lifestyle, as they choose to do, in this Province, even though they were not born here. It is not a one-way street. We have a great deal to be proud of in this Province.

I should just reflect for a moment on the foolishness of concern about somehow losing our culture because of a free trade agreement with the United States. Here we have had an ongoing culture for something over 7,000 years that

has never been waned or destroyed or interfered with in any way, with all kinds of immigration, with all kinds of upheaval, socially, financially, economically, and politically, yet, for some reason, we are somewhat concerned that we are going to lose some culture. I will guarantee you a Newfoundlander is not going to lose his culture because of association with Americans. We have had association with Americans now since the 1700s and we have not lost any of it. I would say they are more influenced by our culture than we are by theirs, if the truth were known. If you go down and talk to people in the Boston area or New Bedford and find out what they say about Newfoundland, they know more about us than half of us know about ourselves; an interest in Newfoundland and Labrador from outside of our Province and we do not know what is going on out there.

The biggest contributor to the financial resources of the International Grenfell Association happens to come from the Boston area of Massachusetts, because of our strong cultural heritage. We have not lost anything because of it, have we? Have we been somehow denuded of culture because we have had an association with somebody else? I think we are too strong, we have too strong a culture and a heritage in this Province to be worried about that foolishness. Absolute, utter nonsense! If that is all we can hang our hat on, then God help us, with all the other important issues that are confronting us today.

With respect to the financial burden of performing artists, sure there is a financial burden but

that is known, is a given when a person accepts that as a way of life. And Newfoundland does not own financial impairment to artists. We are not the only jurisdiction in the world that has it. Go down and walk the streets of New York and talk to the emerging artists who are there in hundreds of thousands. Go to London, Paris. Go to Vancouver. The symphony orchestra in Vancouver has had to shut down because of a lack of financial support and all of the sudden we, somehow or other, point the finger at Newfoundland as the only one that is experiencing this. What a bunch of garbage! The reality of it is that that is a universal problem. Do not try to point the finger and say it only happens here in Newfoundland and it is because of the inactivity of this government that it is happening. A lot of foolishness! The reality of it is it happens globally, not just here in Newfoundland.

As a matter of fact, the lifestyle of many artists in Newfoundland is as good and as rich as it is anywhere in this world, and a lot of them choose to live here because of that. Sure, we would like to have it easier. We would all like to have it better. I am not saying that they should not have more. I agree that they should have more. But let us keep it in perspective. You would not know but we are the only place in the world where all this stuff happens, that we are the only place in the world to lose people in an outward migration, that we are the only place in the world in danger of losing our culture because of an association with another society. What absolute rubbish!

Why do we not talk about the

positive things that culture has brought to our lifestyle and our community, talk about what is happening in every part of our Province today in terms of cultural experiences, people who are performing all kinds of activities which are culture related, bringing the message to the world that this Province of ours has a rich and unique heritage and culture? Talk to the people around our Province. The excitement, Mr. Speaker, of it all is that we are again renewing our faith in our culture, and I think that is probably causing some concern to a lot of people. We are renewing our faith in our culture through many, many issues, and not because I, as a minister, or this government has done a whole lot to change it. The people themselves are starting to sense the value of culture to their lifestyle, how important this element is in tourism.

MR. FUREY:
Lip service.

MR. BARRETT:
Lip service my you-know-what! Forty-five cultural events around this Province are being funded this year alone by this department.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Forty-five?

MR. BARRETT:
Around the Province: Buchans; Twillingate; Burin; Bishop's Falls; Ferryland; Un Long Veille, Port au Port, Le Terra Neuve Francais; and Cow Head; Springdale and Burin; the Humber Valley and the Exploits Valley; Gander and Bell Island; in St. John's, too; in Plum Point or in Goose Bay; in North West River or Reidville, or Carbonear, or Eastport; Cormack or Steady Brook; or Roddickton; or

St. Anthony; Burgeo; Burin, all over the Province. Tell me where in this Province you are not feeling the excitement of culture today?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Here.

MR. BARRETT:
We have it. You can be flippant about it, but you will not be flippant out in your constituency when you say that, because they know different. And every one of you know it because it is happening, it is out there. The excitement that is surrounding tourism and culture in this Province, the economic benefit that that will bring and is bringing to the Province should not be lost, because it is happening.

The Stephenville Festival of the Arts supported by this government for ten years, this is its tenth anniversary and I am sure it would have been supported by any other government - a direct contribution in support of \$35,000 a year for ten years, which is pretty good money, helped with the production of brochures and a lot of other things, one of the foremost performing art festivals in all of Canada, probably in all of North America, brought about, for the most part, by support from government, by support from the community.

There is something which was started in a place where somebody said, 'What? Bring a festival of artists of this caliber to a municipality like Stephenville? You are crazy!'

It certainly was not crazy. The success speaks for itself. But these are the kinds of things that

are happening all over our Province, important to our lifestyle. And, as I said before, it is our past, it is our present and it is also our future. The significance of this could not be understated.

I am delighted the member for St. John's East brought it in as a private member's resolution. I think it is important, and I cannot recall any real contradiction to the message that he was trying to bring here. The methodology of getting it done, sure, we have indicated that we think there might be a better way or a different way which might accommodate us better, and he has agreed, I think, to that. Even the members in the other opposition, for the most part, have sensed the importance of this as a private member's resolution and the importance to see an early resolution or, at least, an identification of what can be done to better the lot of those who are involved in cultural activities throughout our Province.

As I said, and I should reinforce, let us not get hung up on the shallowness of our culture, but let us look at the broader picture, let us look at the multicultural aspects of this. And hopefully the terms of reference, when they are written by the department, will recognize that we have to go beyond just pure, simple cultural involvement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, we just heard a member give a typical Tory speech, the maintenance of the status quo, inordinate reverence and adulation for the past. Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is not about the past, this resolution is about now and the future. That is what this resolution is about.

The thrust of this resolution is not to praise the government or to condemn the government, for that matter, the thrust of this resolution is to do something for the artistic community, to do something to promote, to encourage the development of the artistic community. This is what this resolution is about, not to stand here in self-praise, self-glorification of what the government have done over the last ten or fifteen years. What we want to hear them say is what they are going to do now and in the future. This is what we want to hear. There is nothing wrong with reflecting on the past to see what we come from, but we want to tell this government through this resolution that it is not a matter of the status quo that we are concerned about, we want to tell them to take their proverbial heads out of the sand, this is what we want to tell them with respect to the artistic community, and stop navel gazing. This is the total essence of this resolution. Mr. Speaker, nobody in this House, nobody but nobody, recognizes the great progress that has taken place in the past dozen years in Newfoundland with respect to the development of the artistic community in all its areas, right throughout the entire Province.

MR. LUSH:

As I have said, the essence of

this resolution is to look to what we can do in the future to remove the obstacles to creativity, to remove the obstacles which stymie and restrict the full development of the artist community. This is what this resolution addresses.

I do not see any great change in the amendment the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Butt) has suggested. I do not see any great change from the previous resolution made by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long). To my mind it does two things: One is to delay the time, to delay the action. The member for St. John's East asked for something to be done, I think, by sometime in July to coincide with the Stephenville Festival. This almost looks like it is going to be the starting point now with this resolution. The other difference is to name the individuals, groups and so on they would like to see in the commission. So there is really nothing wrong with that.

I could support the resolution either way because it does not do a lot to change the resolution, other than, as I said, the major thing is to delay the timing somewhat and we are not concerned about that, provided the right and proper things are done during that time. It is not a long time, I suppose, we are looking at December. I think is when they recommended that the report be in. So, Mr. Speaker, that is not, I suppose, an excessive period of time, depending on how serious the government plan to approach this and hoping they will not be dragging their heels, that it is just not a procrastinating technique, and indeed they are serious about the amendment and we will see appropriate action from the commission.

So, the thrust of this resolution is to create the proper financial, economic motivational climate so artists can develop to their maximum and so we can have people developing their skills in whatever area it happens to be, to remove all of the obstacles, to remove all of the impediments so this great creativity, Mr. Speaker, in this Province, can become free, so we can have freedom of the mind and freedom of the spirit to preserve, promote and enhance the culture of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. That is the sum and substance of this resolution. I hope the government realizes this is the sum and substance of this resolution.

The artist community, Mr. Speaker, are saying they are not satisfied with the status quo. They are not satisfied with things as they are. They want initiatives from the government which will assist in the full development of the artistic community. They want initiatives from the government which are going to provide the proper infrastructure so artists can perform and develop the way they should in any society. So, Mr. Speaker, that is what the resolution is about.

But I too, along with other members, want to commend and compliment the artistic community for the great progress they have made and the great effort each and everyone of them have made over the past number of years under -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Severe.

MR. LUSH:
Well, not severe, but certainly under unfavourable circumstances in many cases. But yet, through

their own courage, through their own perseverance, they have carried on and have done a marvelous job right throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The influence of artistic groups in the urban centers of this Province is having a great effect right throughout the whole Island and throughout the Labrador section of our Province. All over the Island we see arts groups being established.

In my own district of Bonavista North, last year I am sure it is not province-wide, it does not stack up with the Stephenville Festival or other festivals, but it is in its infancy, actually - I attended the second annual artistic event. They call it the Blueberry Festival. It has nothing to do with blueberries, but it is called the Blueberry Festival because it happens to fall in with blueberry harvesting time. I attended that particular event last year. It is carried on for approximately a week in Wesleyville. It is the Cape Freels - I just forget what it is called, but it takes in the area from Greenspond to Cape Freels basically, all of these communities. So it is that arts group. It might be called, as a matter of fact, the Cape Freels arts group.

In any event, this year they will be into their third year and I attended the second annual event. I was told the second annual event was 100 per cent better than the first one, and hopefully the third one will be 100 per cent better than the second one.

Mr. Speaker, I was absolutely amazed and impressed with the

talent I saw displayed at that particular event. They were employing the anecdotal talents of Newfoundland and skills of Newfoundlanders.

Mr. Arthur Wicks was performing in his usual top-notch manner. There were musicians and there were actors and signing groups, choral groups, just absolutely fantastic, I thought, for a little local, rural area, doing it on their own with no great assistance from anybody, other than the group, just getting together on their own and doing their best. They probably had a small grant from the minister's office. I am not sure about that, but if they did, that is fine.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of thing is happening all over the Province. So there is no question of the work being done artistically throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

We have, on our own side here, a gentleman who is making a great contribution to the cultural heritage of this Province and to artistic development. He just published a book last year, Mr. Speaker, a book, I say, that reflects the environment of the area in which he grew up in a superb manner.

Here is the book and it certainly reflects the culture of his area, of Northern Newfoundland, in which he grew up. I was absolutely amazed at the gentleman's writing ability. I certainly was, and I commend the gentleman for his first effort.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

I was talking to his publisher, as a matter of fact, and his publisher thinks he has many books left inside him yet. I will say - I have not told the hon. gentleman this before - his publisher told me he believes this is where he is going to leave his mark, in the literary area, not in politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

I did not necessarily agree with that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Have you read the book, by the way?

MR. LUSH:

Oh, yes. I have read the book. I have read every short story in it. For hon. members, so they will know, it is not a novel, it is a collection of short stories and I have read them all under different circumstances. I will tell the gentleman which one I will like best.

MR. SIMMS:

Which one?

MR. LUSH:

There are some great stories in the book, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Which one?

MR. LUSH:

I will not be detracted by the hon. member now from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms). He should read the book. If he wants to be motivated, just see me outside of the curtain after I finish talking and I will give him just a few little motivating sentences or

thoughts so he can get into the book. Mr. Speaker, I think we should acknowledge and recognize the talent on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, there was just one item I wanted to raise, I think there was somebody who talked about the Arts and Letters Competition in the Province. No doubt it is a great activity, again to motivate the artists in this Province and to give them recognition for their writing skills.

However, a problem which has come to my attention, and I have not really thought it out too, too much, but it is this: Apparently only artists living in the Province can enter that competition. Now, I am not sure it should be as stringent as that. We have some great artists, some great writers outside of this Province, Newfoundland artists, who spend their time writing about Newfoundland. Let me name one: Frank Blackwood, the brother of David Blackwood.

Frank Blackwood is a Newfoundlander through and through. He cannot write an article, but you can see Newfoundlandia just coming out through it, Mr. Speaker. It comes right off the page and blasts you in the eyes, the spirit of that particular gentleman, the Newfoundland spirit.

I received a letter from that gentleman a couple of months ago and this was the complaint he was making, that he could not enter this particular competition. He thought that was discriminatory.

The gentleman, as a matter of fact, does a regular column, I

think, with Robinson-Blackmore Papers. Hon. gentlemen just want to read that to find out how deep rooted, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland culture is embedded in that man's soul, in that man's body. He writes, Mr. Speaker, about -

DR. COLLINS:

Are people not (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

I do not know what the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins) is babbling about over there. Mr. Speaker, I am onto a serious matter.

As I have said, I have really not thought it through. I do not know what the implications are in this particular thing. I do not know why a Newfoundlander living outside of this Province should not be permitted to enter this particular contest. Maybe there is a real reason for it. I do not know.

MR. LONG:

(Inaudible) a residence.

MR. LUSH:

Well, he tells me, yes, if he were to have just some shack somewhere in Newfoundland which he could say was his home, he would then qualify. But the gentleman does not have the money, as he says he does not. He works in Quebec. He teaches at Laval University, I believe. He does not have the money to build a second home here. He would like to have the right to enter that competition.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, may I have a word?

MR. LUSH:

Yes, if the minister would like to. I will give the minister a chance to address that.

MR. BUTT:

I will supply the member with an answer. He may not be happy with it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. BUTT:

In drawing up guidelines, we had to have a residency ruling because we have so many talented and gifted Newfoundlanders living all across Canada that, in fact, it would be very, very difficult for the department to administer some kind of a programme which would affect Newfoundlanders living in other provinces. We are only doing here what every other province does in that regard.

MR. SIMMS:

He qualifies in Ontario then, Frank?

MR. BUTT:

Of course, or in Quebec or British Columbia or wherever he lives. The programme is working very, very well in that this present year - I attended their banquet last night - this year has been their biggest year ever. They have almost 800 people participating this year, 400 basically in the junior and senior levels.

MR. SIMMS:

Quebecers living here, like the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), would he qualify to win an award in Quebec?

MR. BUTT:

No, he would not. I guess now the hon. member would be considered

pretty much a Newfoundlander.

MR. SIMMS:
No, no, no.

MR. BUTT:
In any event, to answer the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), we had to put in those guidelines really because it is a relatively small programme, but the people who administer it, under the direction of Dr. Gordon Jones at the university, have done a tremendous job this year in the reallocation of money so the prizes are bigger. Last night there was a gentleman who won \$1,000, another young lady won \$1,500, and those kind of things for first, second and third place, whereas before that funding was down to \$100, \$200 and \$300 respectively.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
I appreciate the hon. minister's answers. I do believe, and the minister says it is done in other provinces, but that does not make it right either, because it is done in other provinces. As I said again, here we have a gentleman who writes entirely about Newfoundland and Labrador. We do say we are a unique Province. He wants his literature to enter that particular contest and to be a part of the Newfoundland literature of this Province. I expect by entering the contest it also gives the particular winner, the particular author, some profile as well, where it would be more difficult probably for that gentleman to get

his literature to be accepted among the literature in Ontario, or in Quebec, for that matter, where according to Meech Lake, there is a different distinctiveness from this Province here. So, Mr. Speaker, I just mentioned it and I thank the minister for his answer. Maybe this is not a popular notion among the artists of this Province, maybe they will limb me out for trying to get Newfoundlanders outside the Province, but it was just a concern and I thought I would raise it since it does concern a gentleman who does come from my district, and a very noteworthy family of Newfoundland, the Blackwoods, Mr. Speaker, who have done tremendous work in terms of promoting and enhancing the culture of this Province through his brother David, his artistic work, and now through Mr. Blackwood himself, Frank Blackwood. I hope I would have gotten hon. gentlemen at least interested enough to follow his columns in the Blackmore line of papers. I think it is in all of them. I am sure it is in **The Beacon** but, I believe, it does appear in all of the Robinson-Blackmore papers.

MR. SIMMS:
No.

MR. LUSH:
The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) says, no, but I cannot be sure.

MR. SIMMS:
No, I am not saying no. I am saying I am not sure.

MR. LUSH:
I see. I am not sure either, but I do know it does appear in **The Beacon** and probably that is the only one.

MR. SIMMS:

What does he write about?

MR. LUSH:

He writes about Newfoundland. His experiences growing up and this kind of thing, fishing, blueberry picking, bakeapple picking and the kinds of the things Newfoundlanders like to write about, his background and this kind of thing.

Mr. Speaker, I will not delay the proceedings of this particular resolution any further other than to say, Mr. Speaker, I endorse and support wholeheartedly the thrust of this resolution which is to establish, which is to create, and which is to promote a climate in this Province conducive to the development of the artistic talent we have in this Province so we can preserve, so we can promote, and so we can enhance the cultural heritage of this Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker,

The member who just sat down, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), I did not realize he was so sick. I did not realize he had such a severe illness. I understand he has been told to stick to short stories.

Really, Mr. Speaker, my few remarks should have been made at

the beginning, because the theme of the few remarks I want to make is why art is important. Obviously everyone who has participated in the debate agrees art is important, but why is it important? Again, because it is such a wide topic, and I do not have long to speak, I would rather stick to two aspects of it and that would be architecture and landscaping, two of my chief interests in art. I think they are both artistic endeavours.

I would point out the importance, first, for instance, of the landscaping aspect of it. Whereas it might be attractive and pleasant, I think it is also extremely important.

The reason it is so important is that in my memory and to my knowledge many severe accidents, complete wipeouts, have occurred where the highway is least interesting and most straight. The part of the highway you would consider most safe is precisely the spot where the worst accidents have and do occur. This is probably because after two or three miles of not even turning, eventually the driver either becomes sleepy or inattentive, and if you have two drivers, one approaching the other, you can have a head-on collision. I can cite instances of my own -

MR. SIMMONS:

You are for billboards, are you?

MR. J. CARTER:

No, I am suggesting, for instance, the secondary type roads you see on the mainland are much more interesting, and even though the speed limit is slightly less, they are much more interesting to drive over, time passes more quickly and much more pleasantly than the

super highway system. I am just saying when a super highway system is designed, I think -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Is this relevant?

MR. J. CARTER:
I think it is very relevant. It is relevant in terms of life saving. It is relevant in terms of landscaping and the artistic design of highways so they are not boring and uninteresting. I think this is an important aspect of art, and it is something to be considered.

Now, the member for St. Barbe North, St. Barbe South, I am sorry!

MR. FUREY:
It is St. Barbe now.

MR. J. CARTER:
St. Barbe now. I am caught in time. He has mentioned the Pratt family so I will not mention them again. You have mentioned the Pratt family and how gifted they are and their tremendous contribution to the arts. The danger of mentioning anyone by name is there are so many that you must leave out. I would only mention one other person, and I would hope that he would forgive me because we do not like to bandy peoples' names around in the House.

Garnet Kindervater has done a wonderful job. He is a builder rather than an architect, but in terms of implementing architectural designs, he is quite remarkable. I might mention his own house at the bottom of Rennies Hill, where he took a very ordinary house and has developed it and is developing it in a most interesting and imaginative way. If more architecture in

Newfoundland were like that, it would be much more interesting.

While I am mentioning architecture, two of the greatest architectural monstrosities are the building we are in at the moment and probably Atlantic Place, two of the ugliest possible buildings, least functional, and most ugly. I hope we will learn by our mistakes. They were very expensive mistakes and we are unlikely to pull this one down, although we are doing our best. I think this building will be here for a long time and it will be a monument to architectural imbecility.

Bowring Park, which we all know about, is a by-word for beauty. If anyone says to you, 'Oh, look, your place is just like Bowring Park,' you take that as a great compliment, naturally. So it is important that we pay attention to the artistic aspect of many of our designs.

For instance, the first fine day that we have in the Spring, all the garden supply stores are crowded and this is an artistic endeavour. This is why people are patronizing these stores. It is entirely to do with art. But I would ask, what about the other priorities?

I see our member for council here, the member for Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Gullage), and I would remind him that a good part of the Kenmount Road, the part that abuts on his district and my district, is now entirely without water or sewer. Now, there are two possibilities. One is they will be connected at great expense; the other is that they should be given some rebate on their taxes. Unfortunately, St.

John's City Council has seen fit to give only 1 percent discount for no water, and only 1 percent discount for no sewer, so I would suggest to the member for Waterford - Kenmount he look at this and look at it quite closely.

I have suggested to the Mayor the existing sewer line which goes out the Kenmount Road, its usefulness could be doubled if the large industrial concerns had holding tanks and they could pump their affluent after midnight when obviously the line is not so heavily used. So this would be a possibility of getting double use out of the same line because the cost of doubling up that line would be both prohibited and incredibly disruptive.

So when we do talk about money being spent on art, we have to say, what about the other priorities? There has to be a trade off. So what I am saying is we should try and at least develop an artistic consciousness, be conscious of what we are doing. If we are doing something, is it going to be attractive, it is going to be pleasant? We should avoid the more gross mistakes, and there are plenty examples of gross mistakes that we have made. The old is not good just because it is old, and the new is not good, just because it is new.

We do not want Newfoundland to look just like any other part of North America. We want Newfoundland to look distinctive. I do not agree with the Holiday Inn -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! It is now twenty minutes to five.

MR. J. CARTER:

Just to conclude, I do not agree with the Holiday Inn slogan, 'the best surprise is no surprise.' I think that Newfoundland should be a pleasant surprise for people to visit.

Thank you.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I was not here last week when the resolution was called. I was going to do it in my speech but there is no opportunity, so by way of point of order, I just wanted to draw the attention of the House, particularly the mover, and the perhaps the House Leaders too, to the fact that while I support this motion and the amendment, the form of it is unusual in that it has a private member proposing a motion which involves an expenditure of public money. I wondered if the minister would consider wording that as having the House urging the Minister of Culture to do something, rather than the present form which clearly would authorize the expenditure of public funds. That is my point, the form of it alone.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, clearly we did not view it that way and that is why we proposed an amendment. Maybe the hon. member has not seen the

amendment.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, I have.

MR. SIMMS:

The amendment merely asks a review commission be undertaken with two objectives. It does not commit the government to any expenditures. It asks to review expenditures of art and cultural activities and so on. Keeping in mind, in fact, the last part of the amendment clearly says, "the results of the study should be available by the end of December, 1988, in advance of budget considerations for 1989-90".

MR. SIMMONS:

But the study involves the spending of public money, does it not?

MR. SIMMS:

No, not really. It is people from the Department and some people from the arts community. We did not see that as a major concern, but I understand what the hon. member is getting at. We have no problem with that anyway.

MR. SPEAKER:

I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for St. John's East will close the debate.

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. the member for St. John's East would be very pleased to close the debate and to take the remaining fifteen minutes or so to review some of what has been said by other hon. members in the last two days of debate and also

perhaps, to introduce some new themes which have not been touched upon.

I have to say at the outset that it is indeed an honour to be able to conclude a debate which has occurred for two days on an issue that is of critical importance to many people in this Province and to myself, as one member of this House, to be able to come to an understanding that indeed all members of the House, if we consider the comments made in the last two days, take this issue very seriously. I believe that people have spoken in the last two days from the heart and have made a point of talking about their own districts and the importance of cultural activity to the quality of life in various areas of the Province.

Last week, after I introduced the resolution, the member from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) got up and extended further some of the particular concerns I raised and I thought made a very good speech. I might say to the member for Eagle River I had comments of observers in the gallery who thought he made a very strong contribution in raising a number of specific points and calling for initiatives to be taken by the government outside of the process called for in this resolution.

In particular, he talked about the importance of taking the sales tax off visual art produced by Newfoundland visual artists, and he also, quite correctly, called on the government for the Department of Finance to put in place a procedure by which arts groups in this Province who are purchasing supplies, particularly thinking of theatre companies, but others as well, who would be able

to receive an exemption on the sales tax when they are purchasing fairly substantial supplies, worth substantial amount of dollars.

I would agree with the member for Eagle River these are two things government could do to indicate its commitment to the arts community in this Province, independent of the process which presumably will begin after today with the adoption of this resolution.

I would also want to say that the person to respond after the minister for the government, the member for Humber East (Ms Verge), the Minister of Justice, took time to address the resolution in some detail, and outlined some of her own concerns as an individual MHA, and to bring forward concerns from her area of the Province, but also to identify some of the things which might be closely examined with this review process.

It seemed to me the member for Humber East, the Minister of Justice, demonstrated a very clear understanding of the important issues facing the arts community in this Province. I think, for the record, if anybody were to review her remarks, she made a very direct contribution to the review process by calling upon some specific issues the Stephenville Conference should address itself to and that this Review Commission should investigate.

MR. FENWICK:

Tell her we still want her over here.

MR. LONG:

In particular, I think, it was a very important suggestion I will certainly be taking to members of

the arts community whom I have had consultation with in the process of bringing this resolution forward. Certainly many members of the arts community who live and work in my own district, the historic district of St. John's East, which is, of course, the home of many important arts institutions, not only the LSPU Hall, but a number of art galleries and a number of associations. My own district is a place where there is a lot of activity in this City.

I will certainly take the message in good faith from the minister that for folks in the arts community who are planning to be in Stephenville at the end of July, they have a responsibility to this process, and it is not just one being given to the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth, the Department of Finance, this Newfoundland Statistics Agency, and the minister, but that this process is a two way street.

For people who are intending to participate in the Conference for the Arts, which is a parallel activity to the 10th Annual Stephenville Festival, artists should come to that conference prepared to assist the work of the review commission by bringing information about their own situation as individuals, but also to begin to think in advance of the conference of the issues that are most important to them, so that, as the minister, in his amendment, has taken the initiative to do - I think it is quite a positive aspect of the proposed amendment - the Stephenville Conference can be taken as one important data gathering occasion, an opportunity to receive input from artists and

art groups across the Province. Indeed, that event may be the kickoff to what would then be a six-month process or so to produce a final report.

I would want to say to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Butt), who I believe is within hearing distance, that in giving my agreement to the amendment, I have really no problem with the change as proposed. I guess, at this point in time, I do not, myself, see it really quite feasible to expect such a task could be undertaken and completed by July.

Perhaps it was my original intention to push the government and to bring forward a sense of urgency on this matter, and also to focus on the Stephenville Conference and to assist the organizers in their efforts to raise the profile of this issue that I called for the work to be done for July, but I really have no problem with the perspective the minister has brought to this resolution which is to say July can be taken as one important event, but there is going to be more time needed for the commission to do its work. Then, of course, what I would take to be a commitment in this amendment is something which would be very important in my agreement to accept the amendment, and that is that the results - and I quote from the amendment - "should be available by the end of December, 1988 in advance of budget considerations for the 1989-90 fiscal year."

So I would assume, in good faith, the minister is making a very clear undertaking that the job of this commission will be to produce as thorough a report as possible,

given a limited time frame, but that this will be done and completed by the end of the year, so that all members of the arts community, and, indeed, all hon. members of the House who have participated in this debate and, indeed, the entire population of the Province, can be aware that towards the end of the year we will have another stage in this debate with respect to a long-term view to the development of cultural activity in this Province, because towards the end of the year, there will be a report officially commissioned by government which will produce a survey which will then invite further response and further participation and input and feedback by members of the arts community and the population of the Province.

I do, Mr. Speaker, in the last few minutes I have, want to come back to one issue which has been the topic of some recurring debate here in the last couple of days. That is the disposition, if you will, of the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council, the history of this organization and where it finds itself right now.

Before that, I might just, for the record, and I guess by way of personal appreciation for the positive tone of the debate we have had for the last few days, mention some of the other people who have spoken.

The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), who is not in his seat, gave, what I thought was a very fair approach to this issue in talking about his own position as a Newfoundlander and the particular difficulties he sometimes faces in coming from an area of the Province that is

famous for its particular and unique accent.

The member for Waterford Kenmount (Mr. Gullage) talked about the recent debate and developments that have happened at the municipal level in St. John's, and he made what I thought were some quite important comments with respect to the importance of addressing arts issues on a municipal level.

The member for Grand Falls brought some new information to the debate and talked about his own personal relationship and family connections to many people who are active in the arts community in this Province, some of whom are also close friends of mine. Political differences aside, I appreciated the comments the member for Grand Falls made about his own personal commitment to the arts community in this Province.

The member for St. Barbe also brought some new information in when he talked about the park on the West Coast becoming a world heritage site. The Minister of Development and Tourism went much further into a historical perspective, which I was pleased to hear, because in the past I have made demands that the Minister of Development and Tourism go on record and state his personal commitment to the place of arts and cultural activity in the realm of development and tourism. He did so today and I appreciated that.

Finally, the member for Bonavista North, in his typical, inimitable fashion, made a very, very eloquent contribution to the debate and also talked about his own personal connection to the arts community in this Province

and to the area he represents.

I did, Mr. Speaker, with all that, want to say that it was quite an enjoyable experience.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. LONG:

I am sorry! When you begin a list like that, you are bound to miss someone, the member for Stephenville who, of course, is very involved in a personal way in the important cultural activity that happens on the West Coast, in Stephenville, gave a promise that he will be one person, representing the official Opposition, who will be watching this commission very closely and who will certainly be in attendance at the Stephenville conference and keeping the minister honest in terms of all the issues that will be raised there.

I did want to say that I took some pleasure in sitting in the House for two days listening to a debate which I had initiated - the first opportunity I had to have a private member's resolution - and to see that hon. members from all sides, from all parties, were able to come together in a very positive way and state their personal and collective commitment to advancing the cause of the arts community in this Province.

I am not sure exactly how this review commission is going to look and how it is going to conduct its work. We will see. That will be for people in the arts community to take on, and it will certainly be up to the minister to lead through. (If nothing else, I think the time we have taken in the last two days to talk about this issue

has accomplished a great deal along the lines of what I intended to do in choosing to introduce this issue for discussion.

With all that said, Mr. Speaker, I did want to come back to the issue of the Arts Council and say there is an interesting story in today's **Evening Telegram**, as it happens, because there was some disagreement among some members in the debate last week as to whether or not the Arts Council, as I suggested in the resolution, was unable to fulfill its mandate because of financial difficulties and fiscal restraint. In today's **Evening Telegram** the new Director of the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council, Mr. Paul O'Neil, who is the Chairman of the Board of Directors and not a staff person, and who is, of course, a well-known Newfoundland historian and writer, said that this session of awarding grants for the Spring of 1988 they are able to make more money available than they had in the last number of grant sessions, "But we are continuing our efforts to have government funding increased as we are still woefully short of fulfilling our artists' needs." He was bringing us up-to-date in terms of what the Arts Council has been able to do in the last couple of months, or been unable to do.

I want to, from my own reading of what the Arts Council has been doing in the last couple of years, just put on record to strengthen that part of my resolution which makes direct reference to the Arts Council and look at the grants awarded for the fiscal year 1987, in which they had two sessions, one in the Spring and one in the Fall.

Mr. Speaker, the total amount of

money the arts council was able to award for all of 1987 was a little more than \$93,000, representing requests from sixty-four individuals and groups. They had received applications from eighty-seven individuals and groups, with a value totalling \$240,111. So what we can see is that the Arts Council was able to meet about 40 per cent of the value of the requests it had received. Again I would say to the minister that this is not to score political points, it is to try and reinforce the fact that the Arts Council has not been able to do the job it has been given to do in the last number of years. The job it has to do is a very important one in that it is the only agency in the Province which makes monies available to individual artists, and it simply has not received enough funds from government to be able to do that from year to year.

Now, some hon. members whom I have thanked for their contribution in the debate are now asking for the question to be put and, in the next minute or so, I will wrap up wrap up. A point of order took away a few minutes of my time, so I will be brief in concluding.

Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of minutes I would like to say that I had been looking for more in the debate which I think we will struggle to achieve once this review commission begins to do its work. There is more than just a recognition of the economic importance of the cultural industry. I think many members have spoken and talked about the increasing recognition of the economic value of cultural activity in their own areas of the Province and across the Province, but I think we must, at times,

remind ourselves of the absolute importance, on its own terms, of promoting and cultivating creative activity. Some people will make the argument that it cannot be proven that cultural activity generates a lot of new economic activity, and some will argue there is not a lot of new money generated by arts activity.

Whether or not it can be proven, as the resolution suggests, that the cultural activity of this Province represents an important economic sector, it must be that this government and all members of the House, and society, continue to state a fundamental commitment to our cultural community and to our working artists.

I would, in conclusion, just like to read a motif that was adopted when the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council was established in 1979 by the Premier, which the government takes credit for, as it should. The argument remains that the Arts Council has not been able to do enough. Mr. George Story, who is, of course, a prominent and well-known and widely-recognized Newfoundland scholar, writer, historian, is the author of the quote which has been used ever since beneath the logo of the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council. It reads: "It is our creative ability that ensures our survival as a recognizable people and culture and enables us, also, to contribute to the enrichment of the nation of which we form a distinctive part." Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, with that quote from Mr. George Story I might come to my conclusion of the debate. I thank all hon. members for their participation and look forward to having further consultations with the minister on this process once it begins. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, resolution as amended, carried.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I asked yesterday if I could have just a second before the House adjourns.

I wish to advise hon. members that on Thursday and Friday of this week we will be continuing on with legislation on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 2:00 p.m.

CONTENTS

WEDNESDAY, 1 JUNE, 1988.

<u>Ruling Concerning May 25 Point of Order:</u>	
Mr. Speaker (McNicholas).....	2529

Statements by Ministers

<u>Conflict of Interest, Dr. Collins:</u>	
Premier Peckford.....	2529
Mr. Wells.....	2531

<u>Lobster Fishery study:</u>	
Mr. Rideout.....	2536
Mr. W. Carter.....	2537
Mr. Fenwick.....	2538

Oral Questions

<u>Free Trade:</u>	
U.S. President may be empowered to invoke GATT on fish from Canada. Mr. Wells, Premier Peckford.....	2539

<u>Impact on Fish Inspection Act and Regulations.</u>	
Mr. Wells, Premier Peckford.....	2540

Has government done an assessment of the potential impact. Mr. Wells, Premier Peckford.....	2540
--	------

<u>Mrs. Ting's Fishery Operations:</u>	
Update requested. Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Rideout.....	2540

Suggests leasing St. Lawrence plant to another operator. Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Rideout.....	2541
---	------

Suggests expropriating the plant and negotiate its purchase later. Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Rideout.....	2542
--	------

Child Care:

Status of child care in view of developments
in the House of Commons. Mr. Efford,
Mr. Tobin.....2543

When will an agreement be signed with Ottawa.
Mr. Efford, Mr. Tobin.....2543

The reason an agreement has not been signed.
Mr. Efford, Mr. Tobin.....2544

Planned Parenthood:

Government attitude and support. Mr. Fenwick,
Mr. Simms.....2545

Seeks direct financial support from
government. Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Simms.....2545

Seeks clarification of the Minister's
answer. Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Simms.....2546

Sprung Project:

Level of sales; out of Province sales;
disposal except through sales. Mr. Kelland,
Premier Peckford.....2546

Financial status of company. Mr. Kelland,
Premier Peckford.....2547

Why does the Premier refuse to give
information. Mr. Kelland, Premier Peckford.....2547

Municipal Capital Works Projects:

Purpose achieved by government members making announcements. Mr. Lush, Mr. Brett.....2548

Political purposes achieved by government members making announcements. Mr. Lush, Mr. Brett.....2548

Suggests since taxpayers pay for the projects, announcements should be made in the House. Mr. Lush, Mr. Brett.....2549

Is the department's policy to advise members by letter of projects in their districts. Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Brett.....2549

Elizabeth Park Subdivision:

Subdivision bombed by gravel pit blasting. Mr. Barry, Mr. Blanchard.....2550

Is the Minister satisfied safety procedures are adequate. Mr. Barry, Mr. Blanchard.....2551

Is the Minister aware residents dispute the claims of the Minister's department. Mr. Barry, Mr. Blanchard.....2552

Private Members' Day

(Arts Study):

Mr. Gullage.....2552

Mr. Simms.....2556

Mr. Furey.....2562

Mr. Barrett.....2568

Mr. Lush.....2572

Mr. J. Carter.....2578

Mr. Long, concluding debate.....2581

On motion, resolution as amended, carried.....2586

Adjournment.....2586