



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 18

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier. Over the last couple of days the Premier has been blindsiding and snookering the people by, as I indicated, preaching one thing on potential conflict of interest in this House and then practicing another. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, in response to questions by me, the Premier said, and I quote from Hansard, "I have done, with respect to the hon. member" - referring to the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) - "precisely what I asked the former Premier to do with Dr. Collins, ask him to resign or dispose of the asset, one or the other. That was the request."

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me take the hon. the Premier back to June 2, 1988 Hansard, when the Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, said the following: "But I said clearly to the media that I did not blame the Minister of Health, I blame the Premier. If the Premier says that it is okay, then what I complain about is that the

standard is unacceptable."

Now, Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is this: How can the Premier argue that that standard was unacceptable on June 2, 1988, yet admit publicly, on June 18, 1989, in **The Sunday Express** that both circumstances were similar, when the only thing that has changed in that period of time is that the Premier has moved from here to over there? How can he argue that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
I do not. The Leader of the Opposition is not stating it accurately. He has read correctly what I asked former Premier Peckford to do, either have Dr. Collins resign or dispose of the asset, one or the other. He could not maintain a situation where his company was negotiating leases with the government and entering into business deals with the government and still be in the Cabinet.

To the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans I said exactly the same thing. And I say it again now: You cannot have a situation where you are doing business with the government and you remain in the Cabinet, where your company does business with the government while you remain in the Cabinet. Either you dispose of the asset, or you resign, or you terminate the lease. The lease cannot be renewed. Now that is exactly and precisely the same as I asked of

Dr. Collins. It is totally exactly the same.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No.

PREMIER WELLS:
The hon. members opposite can say no all they want, the reality is true. They can say no all they want, the reality is true, it is exactly the same standard, so there is nothing to explain, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:
If the reality is true.

MR. RIDEOUT:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I say to the Premier, as he said to then Premier Peckford, I do not blame the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, I blame the Premier.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier this: Is it not a fact that when the present minister informed the Premier on this matter, of this particular lease before his appointment to Cabinet, is it not a fact that the Premier did not then order the minister to dispose of those assets within three months, but that the three month decree only came down after the story was exposed in The Sunday Express? Is that not the real fact, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
No, Mr. Speaker, that is not the fact. I never did direct the three months, before he was appointed or since.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No.

PREMIER WELLS:
Read the record in the House the other day, and what the record in the House will clearly indicate is that I said to the minister you cannot remain in the Cabinet and negotiate that lease. That lease is there now, the lease cannot be renewed if you remain in the Cabinet. If you want to renew that lease you must resign from the Cabinet. The minister himself set the three month standard. And if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition cares to look at Hansard of the last couple of days, he will see that I said clearly the origination of that idea came from the minister himself. I did not ask that of the minister.

And I have told the media exactly the same thing in an interview. I did not set the three months. Frankly, the standard that I set for the minister was, 'You cannot renew that lease. It is done, it is in place, it was done before you were elected, it was done before you went into Cabinet, but you cannot renew that lease and remain in the Cabinet. So you make your choice as to what you want to do. It was the minister himself who decided he was going to set the standard of three months to get rid of it. That is what I explained to the House.

MR. RIDEOUT:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I specifically asked the Premier in this House this week: Did the minister have sixteen months to dispose of those assets and allow the lease to expire, as the minister himself indicated in The Sunday Express story, or did he not? The Premier specifically said that he did not, he had three months. Now, here is the quote: "No, he does not. He has to do it within three months."

Now, will the Premier tell this House what is the case?

MR. SIMMS:

Make up your mind.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Does the minister have sixteen months? Is the lease going to be allowed to expire? Or as the Premier, after the fact, given the minister three months to dispose of the assets?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

I have not given the minister three months now. What I have said to the minister is you cannot renew that lease and stay in the Cabinet. That is what I told the minister.

Now, it was the minister who set the three-month standard. If you want to consult with the news media, and consult all of Hansard, you will find that I explained it was the minister who set that standard, not me. I did not set

the three months. When you asked that, the minister had told me, so I said, 'Yes, he has three months. He told me he was going to do it in three months, so I accepted that.' I have not set that standard.

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is what The Express said.

PREMIER WELLS:

Well, if that is what is there, it is incorrect. The three months came from the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The record we have to go on, and the people of this Province have to go on, are the formal transcripts of the House. Now, the Premier has said here quite clearly, "No, he does not." In other words, he is not allowed to let the lease run for sixteen months, he has got to cancel it, he has got to get rid of it, and he has three months to do it. He has to do it within three months. Now, is that a fact or is that not a fact? Which is it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

No! No! No! It is not a fact. Now, I cannot make it any clearer than that.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, Hansard, June 19, 1989, I say to the Premier: Yes! Yes! Yes!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier cannot read I will read it for him. "Premier Wells: No, he does not. He has to do it within three months." Now, is it three months, is it sixteen months, or what is it? Or is this another case of jackrabbiting around by the Premier and he does not know what he stands for?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know why he is having such difficulty understanding it. The minister himself said, 'I undertake to do it in three months.' So I told the House he has three months to do it because he set the standard, not me. I did not set the standard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

PREMIER WELLS:

Excuse me, Mr. Speaker! The answer is, he set the standard, and I have told that either to the House or the media - I have forgotten which - on the day concerned. So he has three months and he set that standard. I did not. I told the minister, Mr. Speaker, that he could not renew that lease, he could not negotiate a business deal with the

government. There are sixteen or seventeen months, whatever it is, left to run on the lease. So he knew that he could not negotiate a renewal of that lease or he would have to resign.

The minister said to me, 'I am going to terminate the lease. The choice I have taken is I am going to terminate the lease within three months.' If he can do it, fine. So when the questions were asked with regard to how long he had, I said, 'He has three months to do it.' That is what he told me, that he was going to do it within three months. I accepted it.

MR. SIMMS:

That is not what it says here. It says he has to do it within three months.

PREMIER WELLS:

Well, that is okay. He has three months to do it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, let me refer the Premier to page L753 in the June 19, 1989 Hansard where he was responding to a question by me. The Opposition House Leader says, "He has sixteen months." The Premier then comes back, definitively, "No, he does not. He has to do it within three months." Now, does the member have sixteen months, or three months? And, more specifically, Mr. Speaker, how can the Premier stand there, day after day in this House, when he pontificated around this Province that not even a potential of conflict of interest could exist in his government? How can he stand there and squirm

and try to get out from underneath his own words in the official record of this House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not squirm and I have no intention of squirming. I will tell the hon. members and everybody in this Province the simple, straightforward truth. Now I will go through it once more. If they are so thick-headed that they can not do it or so stubborn that they do not want to do it, I will go through it -

MR. RIDEOUT:

Do you think you are the only one with sense in here?

PREMIER WELLS:

Well, there is not much indication of it coming from the other side, I must say that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the minister was invited to join the Cabinet he told me about the lease in Buchans, and I said to him, 'You cannot renew that lease and remain in the Cabinet. The lease must end now, you cannot do it.'

The lease is in place. He cannot terminate it. He has no unilateral right to terminate it.

MR. SIMMS:

He cannot terminate it?

MR. SPEAKER:

As far as I know, he has no unilateral right to terminate it.

He was going to seek to terminate it within three months, which is what he told the House, what he told me the other day. Now I do not know whether he can achieve it or not. But you cannot just wipe out something when you enter into an agreement with somebody. I understand that and the hon. members opposite should. So I told the minister he could not remain in the Cabinet and negotiate a continuation or a renewal of that lease. It was done, it was in place before he came into the Cabinet, and that is it. He cannot renew it.

I will explain it. Let us look at the whole Hansard of June 19, not pick out a few words and distort the truth. Look at L751, this is where I spelled it out. I was answering a question: "It is easy to explain, just state the facts correctly. The facts are simple. The position that I took with respect to Dr. Collins and his situation at the time was that he either must resign or he must dispose of the assets."

And the hon. members opposite agreed and nodded and approved, including the Leader of the Opposition, and the House Leader and that is exactly the position that I took with Dr. Collins.

"So when the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans told me what his situation was, my statement to him was you must dispose of those assets, or the" - then there was an interruption. I went on to explain, "You must dispose of those assets, or the government or any agency of the government cannot do any business with that company, you cannot continue that rent, or you must resign. One of those three things must occur." Now that is not very clear there,

I must say, but just read on: "He took the position that he would take steps" -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

Listen now!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Are you going to read the whole Hansard or what?

PREMIER WELLS:

Well, I am going to read the truth. I know that the hon. member is not interested in the truth, he is just interested in trying to make a bit of noise.

Listen now, it is here. It is on the record.

"He took the position that he would take steps immediately to dispose of the asset. He has assured me that is precisely what he is doing. He knows that if the asset is not disposed of, and he has been told this, before the lease expires, this lease cannot be renewed." Now that is what I said. That is what I told him. He had taken the position that he will either dispose of it within three months, that time he has allotted himself. Now that is -

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is what you say.

PREMIER WELLS:

The comments the hon. member referred to L753 appear later than that, when he was told exactly what the situation was.

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is what you are saying he said. That is not what he said publicly.

PREMIER WELLS:

I do not know what he said publicly. I have no idea what he said publicly. I can only tell you what he told me he was going to do.

MR. SIMMS:

Who said earlier today he had sixteen months?

PREMIER WELLS:

Well, that is the position that I gave you. You asked me what I instructed, and I instructed that the lease could not be renewed or he would have to resign. He himself set the standard of three months, as I advised the House on the 19th of June, and it is right there. So what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has done is misrepresented the position, skipped over that, and gone on to page L753, to say that it was my stand.

Now be fair, read the total record. It is there to be seen. "He has taken the position that he will either dispose of it within three months - the time that he has allotted for himself - or he will seek the termination of the lease, by agreement, with the Board of Liquor Control. Now he cannot cause it to be terminated because a lease is a two-way agreement, both parties agree. So he knows he must either resign or that lease cannot be renewed. He also has indicated to me that he intends to seek termination of the lease if he cannot dispose of the asset in the meantime."

MR. SIMMS:

We all have Hansards.

PREMIER WELLS:

Yes, you all have Hansard, but that is not the story the Leader of the Opposition tried to lead

everybody else to believe. There is the truth of the matter. It is there.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The story is your double standard.

PREMIER WELLS:

There is no double standard, and the members do not like it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

You preach one thing and practice something else. You are a walking contradiction and the people are seeing through you.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to follow up on that same line of questioning with the Premier, because it is still very, very unclear what the Premier's intentions are when it comes to establishing an acceptable code of ethics for his ministers to follow, and that is the issue here whether the Premier wants to admit it or not. Are we now to believe that the same set of rules that the Premier applied to the members who are over here now today when we were ministers, are we now to believe that the same set of rules he then applied to us now no longer apply to his own government ministers? Let me ask him would it not be more acceptable to the public of Newfoundland and Labrador for him to ask the Minister of Forestry to step aside until this conflict of interest

matter is settled? If it takes a week, fine, if it takes a month, fine, and if it takes a year, fine. Will he not ask the minister to step aside here today, now, until this conflict of interest matter is settled once and for all, so the Premier can be a little bit consistent in what he says and what he does?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

There were two questions, Mr. Speaker. The first question that the hon. member asked was would I apply the same standard that I asked the Premier of the day to apply when I sat on the opposite side of the House. The answer to that is that is precisely the standard that I have applied. The minister must dispose of the asset or eliminate the lease, he cannot renew the lease, or the minister must resign. That is the standard precisely that I asked the former Premier to follow. The former Premier said, 'No, that is alright. I looked at it and he can continue to do business. Some other director of the company did the negotiations. That is okay. The minister will make many thousands of dollars profit out of doing business with the government, but that is okay because I say it is okay.' I said to the Premier, 'That is not okay. The minister cannot sit in the Cabinet and have a partner of his negotiate a lease for him. That is wrong.' The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture knows that that lease cannot be renewed, it must end, that is what I told him first, or he must resign. He himself, as I explained in the

House, which the hon. the Leader of the Opposition conveniently overlooked, set the standard of disposing of it in three months, and for that I commend the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:
I think it was a noble thing for him to do and it showed a good and proper standard, one which the hon. members opposite would not agree to when they sat here, they thought it was alright for their ministers to continue on.

MR. RIDEOUT:
You did not when you sat over here.

PREMIER WELLS:
I most certainly did. It was the standard that I set. It is a completely consistent standard and the members do not like it. That is too bad. There was a second part to the question but I have forgotten now what it was.

MR. BAKER:
Would you ask the minister to step aside?

PREMIER WELLS:
Oh! Would I ask the minister to step aside?

The answer is, no, I will not ask the minister to step aside, because he is doing precisely what I asked that Dr. Collins do, dispose of the asset or resign. He is in the process of disposing of it. I commend the minister for it. I think his actions are highly commendable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, this is totally unbelievable. We cannot believe over here on this side what we are hearing coming from the Premier today. If the Premier thinks for a moment that we are going to let this one drop and he is going to be able ride it out, then he had better think again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:
The Premier is acting in a very hypocritical fashion. Let me ask where is his sense of balance and fairness now? Where does he suddenly get that new set of rules that everybody is supposed to be playing by? And who or what is responsible for, all of a sudden, bringing the Premier's standards down to such a low level as they are right now? Is this the standard? Is this the bench mark that the ministers on the other side are going to have to live by from now on?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I have been tolerating the member asking three or four questions. This is a supplementary, so the hon. member knows that he should get to the supplementary quickly.

MR. DOYLE:
That is my question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. I would like him to respond.

Mr. Speaker, obviously the Premier has decided he is going to ride this one out. He is not going to answer any more questions. So let me ask him a new one. Let me ask

him a further supplementary.

I thought the Premier's administration would take a little more than a couple of months to break down. Let me ask him a very, very clear question: In view of the fact that the Minister of Forestry has admitted to the Premier that he was in a conflict of interest by renting this building to the government, can the Premier indicate to the House if any other minister in his Cabinet right now, upon invitation to the Cabinet, indicated to the Premier that he was in a conflict of interest or that he might be somewhere down the road in a potential conflict of interest?

MR. RIDEOUT:

That cannot be tolerated either, according to what his standard used to be.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Let me address the first premise. The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans never indicated to me that he was in a conflict of interest. He indicated to me the factual situation, and I said to him, 'When that lease expires, you cannot negotiate a new lease. You would be in conflict of interest, so it cannot happen. The lease must terminate on its date, or you must resign. You would be in conflict if that occurred.' He told me that. Since, one other minister has indicated to me that there is a lease situation and that he is in the process of terminating that lease. That is accurate.

MR. RIDEOUT:

How much longer does he have to terminate it?

PREMIER WELLS:

I think he is taking steps to do it very quickly.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Could the Premier give us a little more information today on who that minister is and what is the potential conflict of interest that he finds himself in right now? Could the Premier give us a little more detail on that issue?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

I have no hesitation telling the House who it is, Mr. Speaker. It is the Minister of Justice (Mr. Dicks). He and his wife have a substantial interest in a property in Corner Brook, in which there had been lease of a small office space for, I believe \$350 or \$375 a month rental, again to the Board of Liquor Control. The minister advised me his wife has indicated that steps were being taken to terminate the lease.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs about the abrupt resignation of Jim Baird from the position of his executive assistant.

Mr. Speaker, while Mr. Baird was

the minister's EA, he met with a provincial artist coalition and circulated among artists in the Province, saying the minister had given him special responsibility in the field of culture, and saying specifically that he, Mr. Baird, would be chairing the reactivated committee studying the cultural economy and the status of the artist. Would the minister tell the House whether he, the minister, authorized Mr. Baird to make these representations, whether the minister approved of Mr. Baird's chairing the study committee, or will the minister say that because the minister is overburdened with his 'everything but the kitchen sink' portfolio, that he lost track of what Mr. Baird was doing on the minister's behalf? Or is the explanation that the minister hung Mr. Baird out to dry? Finally, Mr. Speaker, will the minister tell us who will now be chairing the study committee?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure how many questions I have, but it sounds like twelve or fifteen questions. But I guess the gist of it is, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Baird did in fact resign. He thought, I suppose, that his mandate was other than being an Executive Assistant. I cannot speak for his confusion about his role, you will have to talk to him about that. But clearly, of course, an Executive Assistant's

role is not one of developing policy or formulating policy or doing anything with administration, and that is clearly the case irrespective of what may be said.

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs tell the House whether he has violated the principle of arm's length funding for the arts by approving of grants to groups in the Province on his own, independent of the Provincial Arts Council? And specifically will he say whether he has approved a grant to an amateur theatre company in Gander?

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GULLAGE:
No, Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge, but I will certainly look into it and report back to the House.

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:
I would like to ask the Premier whether in view of the fact that the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs has obviously

lost control of the culture part of his mandate, will the Premier concede that the Premier made a mistake in structuring the Cabinet in short-changing culture and overloading the minister? And will the Premier act now to give culture its place in the sun?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
Let me say to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that the premise of her statement is incorrect. I do not accept the premise of her statement. But then to go on and answer the question specifically, no, I think the structure is quite sound and I have every confidence that the minister is able to discharge the responsibility completely. I share his view that neither Mr. Baird, nor any other Executive Assistant, has any place developing policy. That is for the government to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:
He has been doing it for five weeks.

PREMIER WELLS:
I am sorry he has not been doing it for five weeks. He may think he has, but he has not been.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Finance. In light of the information provided at the Estimates Committee last night, that Newfoundland Liquor Commission Student IDs have increased from \$5 to \$15; a waiter's licence from \$5 to \$15; abrewer's retail licence from \$100 to \$200 -

MR. R. AYLWARD:
One hundred per cent.

MR. MATTHEWS:
- and abrewer's distributors licence from \$100 to \$200, would the minister undertake to table a complete list of all fee increases contained in his budget so that the people of the Province can see just how widespread and severe are the taxes being imposed in this particular budget?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker, I will do so.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:
I take that, Mr. Speaker, the minister said that he will table in the House, for the record and for the people of the Province, all fee increases contained in his budget for this year?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

That is what he said, yes.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The Wordless Wonder said that.

MR. MATTHEWS:

He had a great difficulty getting it out, Mr. Speaker.

My supplementary, by the way.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

He was not sure if he was allowed or not.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I would like to ask the minister, in light that he has increased student ID fees from \$5 to \$15, as 200 per cent increase, following very closely on the heels of his 10 per cent tuition increase for post-secondary students in the Province, why has the Minister of Finance and this particular government seen fit to take out their frustration and to slap it to the students of this Province in this budget?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Beat up on the students.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Krazy Glue is after striking again, has it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, boy! Oh, boy!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Shocking! Shocking!

MR. SIMMS:

Let me ask a question? Why did he increase the student ID fees by 200 per cent and not tell anybody?

MR. RIDEOUT:

And not tell anybody?

MR. SIMMS:

Old Suction Cup himself.

MR. RIDEOUT:

You could not handspike him out of his seat over there. What a display of arrogance!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

It is a shocking thing, shocking!

MR. RIDEOUT:

What do the Young Liberals think of you now?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Put Kevin Aylward in there, boy, to do a job of it. Tom Murphy or Kevin Aylward, one of them.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I think it was a very important question.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Sure it is.

MR. MATTHEWS:

The post-secondary education students of this Province have been slapped with a 10 per cent tuition fee increase. A number of students in our Province could not afford to go to our institutions before and even fewer can go now. Then to compound that with a 200 per cent increase on another student I.D. card I think is just terrible.

Now, a final supplementary to the minister. I would like to refer

the minister to Page VIII of the estimates and the budget and refer him to Estimated Provincial and Federal Revenues and, particularly, Other Provincial Sources. If he looked down there a little ways he would see Inland Fish and Game Licenses. Last year the revised figure of revenue was \$2,130,000. This year the minister is projecting \$2,630,000, an increase of \$500,000. Now, will the minister rise in his place and tell us where he is going to get this \$500,000? Are the present categories of licenses going to be grossly increased? Or is the minister seriously considering taxing and putting licenses on a new category of fish or game? Would the minister stand and tell us that please? Is it directly related to the question I asked yesterday as to where he is going to get the \$500,000?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, this question came up in estimates last night and I then told the member that I would get this information and convey it through the Chairman of that Committee to him and, perhaps, I will bring it to the House. It is part of the same question that he asked earlier about any increases in licensing fees.

This morning I started that procedure - because it is not in our department, it is in another department - and I asked for that information to be gathered and conveyed to me so I can convey it to other people.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question Period is now finished.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker, I came into this House for the first time about, maybe, twenty years ago.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I think the hon. gentleman is coming in a little too early; we are not down to the Orders of the Day yet. He is talking on the concurrence debate, I expect. We have not reached that Head yet.

Notices of Motion

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a list of temporary loans raised pursuant to Section 44 and Section 45 of The Financial Administration Act, 1973 as Amended. I am tabling this list in accordance with the requirements of Section 45 of the Act.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the requirements of Section 51 of The Financial Administration Act, I wish to table a list of guaranteed loans paid by the Province during the previous financial year.

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

MR. DICKS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DICKS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On Order Paper 11/89, the hon. the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) asked that the following information be laid upon the Table of the House: An Itemized list of travel expenditures incurred by the Minister, his Executive Assistant, or any member of the Minister's personal or Departmental staff who may have accompanied him since May 5, 1989.

In answer there were three trips taken by the minister. The first on May 12, 1989, to Corner Brook. The cost to the taxpayers was \$356. The purpose of the visit was to attend two functions: One on behalf of the government, the opening of the Canadian Paraplegic Association in Corner Brook; and the second one was an annual inspection of the 511 Humber Squadron of the Air Cadets.

On May 19, 1989, a similar function in Corner Brook, wherein the minister officially represented the government at the 60th Annual Lions Atlantic Canada Convention at a cost to the taxpayer of \$380.20.

On June 9, 1989, the minister attended the Federal/ Provincial Meeting of Attorney's General in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, for four days, from Tuesday through Friday of that week, at a cost \$1,265.21. On that trip he was accompanied by the Deputy Minister, whose expenses incurred were \$1,049.09 for the same time period.

The second question, appearing on the same Order Paper, was: An itemized list of expenditures for any office equipment, personal equipment, furnishings and photographs purchased for the Minister's Office since May 5, 1989.

The answer is: There were three certificates framed by the Department of Works, Services and Transportation. However, there was no cost to the department for this service. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You can advise me if this is the appropriate part of the agenda which would allow me to provide additional information to a question raised by the hon. the member for Green Bay yesterday with respect to the Abitibi-Price, Grand Falls situation, his reference to an explosion.

Mr. Speaker, I did hear a media report last night, if I can make brief reference to that, which indicated that the minister, myself, had no information to provide the House on the situation. In case that was misunderstood by the media, I just want to reiterate that part for the member and for the House. The soot emission, oily residue was in fact a combination of factors. One was the lightening strike on the TMP, and there was some detail with respect to starting up number two boiler. The other was the

explosion which occurred in the boiler's superheater tube, which resulted in the expulsion of steam through the stack, the end result being the oily waste or the soot being desposited around the town. In case one particular media rep did not get that information yesterday, I just want to reiterate that.

To follow up, I indicated in my response yesterday that if there was additional information available I would provide it to the House and to the member who raised the question. I want to tell him that our officials from the Environment section checked with Abitibi-Price this morning and from the point of view of the cause of the explosion and the soot emissions, there was nothing further to add to that.

He also expressed some concern, Mr. Speaker, about claims and so on. From the information we have received from Abitibi-Price it is our understanding that residents are indeed registering claims. I suppose that probably started today or some time yesterday. The attitude of Abitibi-Price at this stage of the game is to accept the claims and judge them on an individual case-by-case basis.

That is all the information we have at this time. If there is anything further, I will bring it to the House and as well, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to present another petition from citizens of our Province calling on the Department of Health to give access to modern screening mammography to women throughout the Province so that breast cancer is detected early, and so that resulting death and radical surgery are minimized.

Mr. Speaker, I will quote the prayer of the petition:

"Your petitioners pray that your honourable House may be pleased to provide the funding for the Department of Health to introduce immediately a Province-wide screening mammography program, including modern mammograms in the major hospitals, and mobile units to serve the rural areas."

Mr. Speaker, women throughout the Province, realizing that Health and Welfare Canada are recommending that screening mammography be made available to all women so that those women over fifty can have an annual routine screen, and younger women with warning symptoms can be tested, are rushing to sign these petitions. Women have been disappointed to hear the Minister of Health respond by seeming to trivialize the issue and attempting to score political points with it.

Mr. Speaker, although I did not hear this myself, I am told the minister said in a CBC radio interview at lunchtime today that he is not even convinced by the current research findings, and that he wants to do his own research before taking any action to make available for women across

our Province modern screening mammography services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous. Health and Welfare Canada, after having received the results of a major study last year, have concluded that all women over fifty should be able to have annual mammograms, and that screening mammography should be universally available in the country. That recommendation was passed on to all the provinces at a national meeting in Ottawa last December.

Mr. Speaker, I, in presenting this petition, wish to reiterate my support for its prayer and call on the Minister of Health to accept the respected, credible medical research findings, to embrace Health and Welfare Canada's recommendations, and instead of dillydallying and making excuses, act immediately to spend money on putting in place screening mammography services across the Province.

As has been pointed out in this House before, these screening mammography services are not expensive compared to other medical technological services. I understand one screening mammogram costs only about \$110,000, and if bulk purchases are made for several hospitals and for mobile services, the unit cost might turn out to be less. Again, I urge the Minister of Health and the government to act immediately to introduce a Province-wide screening mammography program for the women of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

What does the Minister of Health have to say about this?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Nothing.

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

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for presenting this petition to the House. She did not say how many signatures are on it. How many signatures are there?

MS VERGE:
About twenty-five or thirty.

MR. DECKER:
About twenty-five or thirty. The other one had thirty, and another twenty. The minister is not soliciting petitions, of course.

I want to draw the member's attention to the difference between mammography screening and mammography services. We are talking about mammography screening, I would assume. Now, the member refers to women under fifty and I would have to advise her that she is getting into a very dangerous area, because the jury is indeed still out on mammography screening for women under fifty. After all, X-rays are radiation and, according to the experts, there is a clear danger.

Basically we support the prayer of the petition. We support the the prayer of the petition, that this Province bring in mammography screening. However, we have chosen to approach this professionally, we have chosen to approach this carefully. We have had seventeen years of crisis management in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and we do not intend to

carry on with crisis management. We intend to do good planning.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a good thing that we have taken this rational approach, because after the hon. member and the member for St. John's East got up the other day and panicked over this issue, I received a letter, and a cassette, which I will make available to the hon. member, or any member of this House, or the media, if they want to listen to it. It is from a well-known obstetrician in this city and she suggested that we are taking the right approach; this is something that has to be done very carefully and we have to listen to all sides. This tape is here which any hon. member of this House or the media can have.

MR. SIMMS:
Who is she?

MR. DECKER:
Dr. Cornelia J. Baner.

I am sure anyone who is familiar with the medical profession has heard that name before. Now, Dr. Baner explains the benefit of breast self-examination, she explains the importance of physical examination, and she also makes some very valuable points about mammography screening. Although she does not condemn mammography screening, she does point out that there are things we should consider before we starting exposing the whole population to radiation. She also points out the danger of overconfidence, the danger of a false sense of security.

And Health Canada is not recommending a screening every year, they are recommending every two years, for women over fifty.

She is saying the false sense of security which mammography screening could encourage would stop women from exercising self-examination and it would stop women from going to have physical examinations at regular intervals.

This is the kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health is looking at. We are not going to rush into something before we have had time to look at it from all the sides. Because we are not doing this for the sake of some hon. member who wants to make a few political points by rushing out with a petition and seeking signatures, we are doing this from a very professionally planned approach. And if at the end of the day we are convinced that mammography screening will indeed cut down on the cancer deaths or even the amount of cancer in this Province, we will indeed bring in a mammography screening program for this Province. We will do that, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, if are convinced that there is any indication that there might be some danger to the people of this Province, we have a very serious obligation to them and we will not be bringing in something which is dangerous to our people.

So we have to hear all sides, we have to think it through. And the hon. member can scream all she likes and she can squeal all she likes, but we are going to stand firm on this one. We are going to do it reasonably. We are going to plan it, Mr. Speaker. But if there is an absolute, proven benefit, unlike the hon. member I will not be waiting ten years to do it, I will do it as soon as it is proven to us that it is a reasonable direction in which to go. And I am quite serious when I say I would like all hon. members

to listen to this tape, because I think what Dr. Banes is talking about is a very sensible approach to take when dealing with mammography screening. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MS DUFF:
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MS DUFF:
In adding a little bit to this debate I would like to say that I would certainly like to hear what Dr. Banes has to say. She is not an obstetrician I am familiar with, but I am sure she is a very competent professional. But nothing that the minister said she has said has really strengthened his own argument for delaying any properly planned mammography screening.

Everything the minister has said about this has tended to be defensive, has tended to be political and has tended to try and say you did not do it for seventeen years, so that is a good reason for us not doing it now. But the minister is well aware, if he has in fact read the report from the National Health people, that up to last December, in fact, one of the reasons why a Province-wide screening program was not put in place was simply because there was some concern; there were pros and cons, there were people who were for and against it because of the very thing the minister cited, the risk of blanketing people, perhaps unnecessarily, with radiation.

What the report concluded, and why other provinces have in fact adopted a mammography screening -

there is more than one province - program, has been because this report has shown that the risks are far, far outweighed by the benefits for those categories of women who are at risk, namely, people over fifty and women who have a genetic predisposition or some other factors which would indicate that they are at high risk of breast cancer. You are not going to blanket the Province with women over fifty who do not have any breast cancer in their family, who do not have any medical conditions which might indicate they are at risk. So that, I think, was an attempt to deflect without being totally truthful in terms of the risks.

I do not know what kind of research and careful planning the minister is intending to do, or what kind of research capability he thinks he has that would be greater than the research capability in the National Department of Health and Welfare. It seems that that particular national body, which is a very responsible body, is willing to recommend this kind of screening mammography as having a very great advantage to the health of women in this Province because, in fact, it has been shown to be able to save lives. And the most reputable radiologists in this Province, who would, I think, be very able to speak to this, have said that mammography screening has not just a slight effect or a possible effect, but a profound effect on morbidity, which means on lessening death - morbidity means death. It also has a profound effect on lessening the degree of radical surgery that has to be done. So if, in fact, the risks are far outweighed by the benefits and we can save lives through early detection of at

least some of the 160 women who statistically will develop breast cancer in the next year and may not even know it, then I think it should be well worthwhile doing. I think the technology exists. I am sure that people in the Department of Health would not have great difficulty in establishing this kind of program, and I can see no rational reason, except for the fact that the minister did not consider it important enough to put in his budget and is now trying to bail himself out on some kind of excuse of trying to be rational and careful about the whole thing.

The minister has also tried to cloud the issue in terms of the difference between mammography screening and mammography services. I think we all realize that you cannot have a mammography screening program in this Province unless you have the equipment with which to do it, if that is what he means by mammography services. There is no point instigating a program that is Province-wide if, in fact, our current equipment, which I have been told by competent and reputable radiologists is too slow to attend to our existing waiting lists, without mentioning adding to them by a developed program of screening mammography, cannot cope with it.

So the minister has to do two things: He has to put money in his budget to help regional hospitals around the Province upgrade their existing equipment. He told us in the House the other day that the hospital in Corner Brook had ordered equipment; and I think the minister is aware that that equipment was ordered to take advantage of tendering that was done by St. Clare's Mercy

Hospital, but at the moment, the hospital does not have any funds to pay for it and does not know where it is going to get the funds unless it uses the begging bowl approach.

The minister has also indicated that he is going to have one mobile unit in the Province and that the other areas are all right. But one mobile unit will hardly get to people once a year. It may not get to people once every two years. And 70 per cent of the population of this Province live within a convenient radius of the existing regional hospital centres.

Now, there was another remark the minister made that I found very strange when he was quoting this reputable obstetrician. He says that if women have a mammography screening it will give them a full sense of security, it will stop them from doing self-examinations or going for physical examinations. I think that is a very insulting remark to women, because when they get their mammographies, they will be told by the professionals about the importance of self-examination and physical examination. That is a totally ridiculous and insulting remark.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, before you call Orders of the Day, I would just like to tell the House of an event that I think is significant, at least for older members of this House.

Mr. Bren Walsh - I do not know if any members remember him - was a newspaper reporter from the days of Confederation and was a fixture in the news gallery of this House twenty-odd years ago, when I was first a member. He was a man who was highly regarded in the Province, highly regarded in his field, very fair-minded and very thorough. Not only the news media, but all members of the House of the day regarded Mr. Walsh very highly and with good reason.

He operated with a significant degree of physical impairment, but that did not stop him from going and being wherever it was necessary to be to do a thoroughly good job. I know that everybody who was a member of the House at the time when he served as a reporter in this House, and everybody who remembers him reporting as far back as the National Convention days shares the view and opinion of him that I am expressing to the House now. He has just died unexpectedly in Ottawa, and I regret to inform the House of that. It is a matter of great personal regret to me, because he called me about a month ago and asked if we could agree to meet on the next occasion I was in Ottawa. Frankly, not only would I agree to meet, I would consider it to be a great honor. I was anxious to meet him again and have a chance to talk with him. I regret that that will not now be possible and, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that Your Honour prepare an appropriate letter to express to Mr. Walsh's family the condolences of all members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House we certainly want to associate ourselves with the remarks made by the hon. the Premier.

For the first five or six years I served as a member of this House, Mr. Walsh was still carrying on in his capacity as Legislative Reporter. All of us came to know him, either in that capacity or as an individual in his retirement, and as a writer. He wrote at least one novel, which I think was very well researched, on how Newfoundland came to be the 10th Province of Canada, and he did it in his usual thorough fashion.

So certainly this is a great loss for Newfoundland and Labrador. Bren Walsh was a great Newfoundlander and Labradorian. He believed tremendously in the potential of Newfoundland and Labrador. We are sorry to hear of his passing, and we would certainly like to have the official Opposition in this House associated with the comments made by the hon. the Premier, and with the condolences which I assume will be sent to his family.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair will carry out the wishes and request of hon. members in this respect.

Orders of the Day

Order 3. -Concurrence Motion (Resource Committee)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. REID:

I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for getting up a little early. I was anxious.

With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments before I begin my report to the House on the Resource Estimates Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am often quite ashamed to sit in this House and share in a debate of such a nature as we had here earlier this afternoon. I think that every single member in this House demands a certain amount of respect. And when you condemn, no matter if it is coming from this side of the House or the other side of the House, a certain member by using derogatory comments, you are condemning the constituents and the people who elected each and every one of us. I do not think it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, for one to lose composure when asking a question of some minister or some member of the government. This is a personal comment, Mr. Speaker, and I have a fair amount of respect for a lot of hon. members on the other side of this House, and I know that sometimes when they do not get the answers that they ask, that they do go a little bit too far with their comments, especially in the backbenches when someone is speaking.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that when I look around at the people who are in this House, quite often in the past three weeks students, I remember the comments that my students made to me some three years ago when I brought them into this House. That 'we', that is, 'them' were a bunch of animals. Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, I am sure that we on this side of the House as well

as the other gentlemen respect each other, and respect each other to the point where we do not need to scream and yell and call each other names in order to get a response. On that note, Mr. Speaker, I will begin my report on the Resource Estimates Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say that the Resource Estimates Committee, which included the hon. the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor), the members for Lewisporte (Mr. Penney), Menihek (Mr. A. Snow), St. George's (Mr. Short), Green Bay (Mr. Hewlett), and Placentia (Mr. Hogan), did not have to get on in Committee like this House gets on quite often, maybe because the Vice-Chairman (Mr. Windsor), and my hon. colleagues on the other side were gentlemen enough to discuss and debate without getting out of order, is the reason why we have had such success in bringing the estimates to the House as quickly as we have.

I will compliment the Vice-Chairman and say that everything I did as Chairman or Chairperson I consulted Mr. Windsor on and Mr. Windsor, in return, consulted me on anything that we needed to have done. It was an honour and a privilege, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, to work with Mr. Windsor and your people on that Committee, and I think we succeeded in doing quite well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

It is often difficult for me to sit here, knowing that I am part and parcel of this government, and say sometimes to myself, 'Why are those people on the other side being so callous and rough with

some of the people on this side?' The reason I say that is because it comes to my mind, 'My gosh, we have only been here for seven or eight weeks and we are trying our best. We are making mistakes and we will probably continue to make mistakes.' But at least give us a chance over here to prove ourselves in the next year or so, see where we are going, and then if you want to jump down our throats because we are making mistakes, when we learn the ins and outs of the various departments, certainly do so at that point. Because I can guarantee you there is not going to be another election for at least three years. At least I hope there is not.

Mr. Speaker, I think I can speak on behalf of my Committee and say that in every instance, Mines and Energy, Fisheries, Forestry and Agriculture, Development, Environment and Lands, we were surprised, because we discussed it after the meeting, to see that the ministers were so well-versed in their departments, and even to me it was a surprise, to be able to ask questions of the various ministers and be able to get the answers from the ministers, as such.

Now, I do not know what is happening in the other committees and, really, it is not my personal concern what is happening in the other committees, but I can honestly say, Mr. Speaker, that each and every one of the ministers we interviewed and questioned for the past two weeks were surprisingly well-versed on questions that I did not expect some of my ministers and some of my friends to be able to answer. I congratulate them because they must be doing something over in

those offices in order to be able to get up and answer the questions that they have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

I will make a few brief comments, Mr. Speaker, on particular departments.

I found, when we were debating the Fisheries Department, a lot of questions that were posed by both the government members and the Opposition members sort of overlapped with questions that only the Federal Government of Canada could answer rather than the provincial government. We have to remember that the fisheries in Newfoundland is controlled, practically 100 per cent, by the federal government. Often we find ourselves overlapping into areas and asking questions about things that we assume are provincial issues but are federal issues.

The offshore question, for example, that we are faced with right now, the problems that we have with the cod glut and the caplin and all the other things that are involved in the fishery, a lot of the responsibility lies within the federal department, and it is pretty difficult for a minister of provincial fisheries to be able to answer, debate or justify moves within the fisheries portfolio that he or his department does not have very much to do with.

I complimented the Minister of Fisheries, but I guess the Minister of Fisheries had good training in previous years. I think out of all the Cabinet he is probably the most experienced, at

least with some past experience as a Cabinet minister, and that certainly showed up in the estimates on the Fisheries Department, a very well versed, educated man in the fisheries. I think one of the hon. members in the Opposition said some time ago that the hon. the Premier could not have picked a better person for the Minister of Fisheries than the hon. member for Twillingate.

In Forestry and Agriculture: There were a number of questions posed to the hon. minister, and I can honestly say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans certainly handled himself well. We were not necessarily all unanimously agreeing that he did answer all the questions, but I think that the questions that he did answer he answered quite well, and he was educated to be able to do that. There are some questions that the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture was asked that you could label as political types of questions, and he handled them quite admirably. I can honestly say that in certain instances I guess ministers - and I am not sure; I never was a minister and I really do not know if ever I want to be one, considering the hard times that some of these ministers are getting - are wrong sometimes not to answer a question, because it only causes more controversy and more argument and gives a little bit more ammunition for the hon. members on the opposite side.

I have problems, Mr. Speaker, with some of the members of the Opposition because some of them are very good friends of mine, longtime friends. I must say that most of them do behave in a way that if they do make a comment across the floor they usually look

over at me and my hon. colleague from Placentia and grin or wink and say, 'We got you again.' In that type of, I guess, atmosphere I enjoy being in the House. I certainly do, because I know that what is coming is not necessarily serious comments to the point where they are trying to upset anybody or get anybody against them, it is just a matter of doing their job. And, of course, the cliché or the statement that good Opposition makes good government is also true. I agree with that. I think that the better that this Opposition is the better we will be as a government. And I have no problems with that.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I will make a brief comment on the program that, from what I can gather, is put on hold for further investigation. My hon. friend for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) brought the question to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture re the school milk program. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, and I do not know if I am speaking here against my government or for my government, certainly agree that that program will be a worthwhile program. The reason I am saying 'will' is because I firmly believe that this government will implement that program as soon as they can set the wheels in motion to do it. I hope they do, and I congratulate the minister on how he handled that.

I was lucky enough, Mr. Speaker, to have the hon. member for Humber Valley, who is a longtime friend of mine and a farmer, in on the estimates on Agriculture and Forestry. Of course, the man is an expert in his own right. He has walked through it and he has shovelled it for a long time, and I guess he is still in here at

it. I was very pleased to have him there because basically when the hon. member gets up to ask a question he knows what he is talking about, and I think that the minister enjoyed the fact he was with us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. REID:
Mr. Speaker, in the Development Department, and I am sort of going to go between the Development and Mines and Energy because I want to make a few comments on the megaprojects that are looming on the horizon for Newfoundland, I know that the hon. Premier has announced an Economy Recovery Team or an Economy Team to look at Newfoundland's future, and I know that group will in the next few years help bring Newfoundland probably further than we are right now, and I hope it does.

But I would also like to say, under the Development and Mines and Energy portfolios, that I believe, and this is a personal comment, too, that if we do not get the Lower Churchill project on stream, if we do not get something to replace Long Harbour, if we do not get the Hibernia deal started, at least, it is going to be a long time, and it is going to take that Economy Recovery Team a long time to see some substantial gains in the creation of employment in Newfoundland.

I was very pleased with the Minister of Development, in fact I was surprised, because that particular department is a tough one and covers a large array of items under one heading, and for him to be in the situation to be able to answer the questions, and to present to the committee

government policies and plans for the future, I thought was admirable and I thought he did an excellent job.

Mr. Speaker, I often hear people say that Newfoundland was sold out when we sold Upper Churchill to the French Canadians, Quebecers, and the deal that the hon. Mr. Smallwood signed with Quebec was a bad deal. I worked in Churchill Falls - I am starting to sound like the hon. member now on the other side who talks about the fishery all the time - I worked in Lobstick, and I worked down North for a number of months -

AN HON. MEMBER:
The hon. the member for St. John's South.

MR. REID:
The hon. member for St. John's South. That is who it is.

- and I know at that particular time that when I was lucky enough to get the job there in the beginning, the last thing on my mind, Mr. Speaker, was who was actually going to reap the benefits from the Churchill Falls deal. At that time I was more interested in going down there and how much I was going to get an hour, how much money I was going to make, than I was in who was going to sign what deal with whom and for how much.

I can honestly say, Mr. Speaker, that going back now with the bit of knowledge that I have, the bit of education that I got after I left Churchill Falls, that Joey Smallwood gave me when I left Churchill Falls and went to Memorial University to become a teacher and got two degrees, I have to honestly say that Churchill Falls has certainly

benefited me because I do not think I would be in the House today if it had not been for Joey Smallwood and the deal he struck with the French Canadians on Churchill Falls. Who would think at that particular time in life that a light bill that my mother or I was paying for back in those days for \$3.00 or \$4.00 a month would go to \$250 or \$300 a month? The reason I am making those comments, Mr. Speaker, is because I feel there has to be a deal negotiated with Quebec on the Lower Churchill, and as good a deal as we can get. I am sure the Premier and this Cabinet will work towards getting a good deal, but I just hope, Mr. Speaker, that they do not let it go down the drain because the deal is not satisfactory to other people in Newfoundland, other than ourselves.

MR. SPEAKER:

I remind the hon. member that his time has elapsed.

MR. REID:

Can I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if I have had twenty minutes?

MR. SPEAKER:

Fifteen.

MR. REID:

I will finish up, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. REID:

Thank you, hon. gentlemen.

I was sure that the hon. the House Leader said twenty minutes yesterday, and you said fifteen, and there was not an agreement. Anyway, I will finish up.

Long Harbour, Mr. Speaker, is very, very important. The hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan) is looking at me because that is what he wants to talk on later on today. I do not want to interfere with him. The only thing I want to say to him is that there are a number of people in my district of Carbonear working in Long Harbour, and I am as concerned about Long Harbour and what is going to happen to Long Harbour as any member of this House is.

One thing that maybe the Minister of Environment and Lands was not quite happy about, when I asked him after the debates, was the fine system in Newfoundland for littering the landscape and the environment. We were talking about bottles, cans and different things on the sides of the roads. I am a firm believer, Mr. Speaker, that the Justice system in Newfoundland is not handling the problem of litter and garbage seriously enough. I really do not think they have been in a number of years. I took time the other day, Mr. Speaker, to stop in a certain area in my district and there was a big sign up 'Maximum of \$1,000 for littering' and so on. There was more garbage around that particular sign in that area than there was anywhere else on that road, and that road was seven miles long. That is an indication of how serious some people in this Province are taking those signs. I am certainly sure that there are times when you could throw an empty beer bottle or can out of the window and an RCMP Officer would be behind you and he would swerve to get away from it rather than stop you and fine you.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that both Justice and Environment and Lands should take a stronger stand on

controls in the environment and this is one of the things that came up in our Committee meeting.

One final comment, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about hydro power. I talked about Churchill Falls to a certain extent, but I wanted to talk about also the need for us in Newfoundland to develop enough hydro energy to be self-sufficient. We are gradually reaching the point where water power is supplying energy to us, but we still have to spend millions and millions of dollars each year to generate electricity at Holyrood. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this new government should put emphasis on trying to become self-sufficient. In order to do that the Lower Churchill project has to go ahead. With that, of course, Mr. Speaker, I am allowed to speak on the subject later on this afternoon and I might have the opportunity to get up again and speak.

On behalf of myself and the Vice-Chairman I want to thank the members of the Committee sincerely, because we, like I said when I began, did not have any problem. They were all very cooperative and I think every one of the ministers enjoyed the evenings and the mornings that we had in regards to questions. I thank the House for bearing with me as Chairman of that Committee and I hope that I can be of some assistance in the future to the government and to the Opposition if the case or need arises.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the Report be concurred in by the House.

Thank you very much.

MR. HEWLETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEWLETT:

I, too, enjoyed our Committee, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly would like to second the hon. member's motion. I would like to compliment the very smooth and efficient handling by our Chairman from Carbonear, and I must say the debate was lead ably by the Co-Chairman from Mount Pearl. My colleagues on the Committee asked positive and sensible questions and the ministers for the most part were forthcoming. Incidentally, I do apologize to the Chairman of our Committee for not making the little social luncheon today but I was unavoidable detained. Yes, Mr. Speaker, even the press attended our Committee meetings.

Our Committee dealt with Forestry and Agriculture, Development, Fisheries, Environment and Lands, Mines and Energy. I will make a few brief comments on each department and sum up with some general remarks.

With regard to a matter that my Chairman mentioned a moment ago with regard to our behavior in the House, I want to make it clear that there is nothing personal against the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. However, his Leader set down some pretty tall and tough standards for conflict of interest when that man was Leader of the Opposition, and that is what we are reacting to.

I would say to the Minister of Development, Mr. Speaker, that he should be a concerned man. His department has a very broad mandate, but many of its functions have been superceded by the new Economic Recovery Commission. The minister is now in the position of having to play second fiddle to a superminister from the university, an unelected superminister I might add, Mr. Speaker. I wonder very much if that is good for our system of government.

Mr. Speaker, there is a saying that 'It is better to be born lucky than rich.' The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture was lucky to be appointed at a time when the insect infestation in our forests is low. As the minister is fully aware, our society is split on this matter. There are those in our society who believe that the use of approved, legal pesticides is standard forest practice. But, as I found out at an environmental conference in Corner Brook, where the Green Party was represented, there are those in our society who believe that the introduction of Bt, that foreign microbe, is tantamount to throwing acid on the face of the forest. So the minister has to deal with points of view that are very divergent.

As I said, the insect infestation is now at an ebb. Sooner or later, like the tide, there will be a flow. Then the minister will have a hard decision to make. His decision this year involves but a few acres, but a major infestation will require a very difficult decision, with hot tempers on all sides of the issue, and good luck will do the minister no good under those circumstances.

The Minister of Mines and Energy

is a man who comes to his portfolio with probably more insider knowledge on his department than any other minister in this House of Assembly. However, Mr. Speaker, his department handles a couple of matters on which he is likely to be superceded by the Premier, namely, hydro and the offshore. Whatever the merits or faults of the Meech Lake Accord, Mr. Speaker, and there are probably divergent opinions in this House, the Premier's position on that matter cannot but do harm to our negotiations with Quebec. I would also warn the Premier, Mr. Speaker, that in our economic environment there are people and forces at work who would just love to see the Hibernia agreement reopened, and not from the point of view of the best interests of this Province.

To the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, I would say he certainly has his hands full. Fisheries are buffeted by many outside forces. I would submit that having a degree of power, a degree of control over our fisheries is the only way we are ever going to get our way with regard to the fisheries. The current government's wimpish attitude towards Ottawa and federal-provincial relations, especially as it relates to fisheries, will get us nowhere. Ottawa will not be impressed with our wimpish attitude. Ottawa, no matter what party is in power, saves its wimpish attitude for the international scene.

To the Minister of Environment and Lands, Mr. Speaker, like the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture he has got a wide spectrum in his constituency. Fairness and balance will have to

be on the top of his agenda in dealing with sensitive environmental issues.

With regard to the Park Service under his jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker, fairness and balance, the old 'f' and 'b', has gone straight out the window. Six months ago Crescent Lake Provincial Park was the only provincial park in the provincial system under construction. There is no construction at Crescent Lake Park right now, Mr. Speaker. Construction is going on elsewhere, at other parks in the Province. The park was next to a gravel pit. The pit was frozen. Now the park is frozen, and the residents of the areas have neither a pit nor a park. That is fairness and balance, the same kind of fairness and balance I got when I got shut out of the roads program and nearly shut out of the water program.

I have a community in my district where water has to be delivered door to door by trucks because you cannot have wells on that island. They got nothing. They got zilch. That is fairness and balance. Having the Premier as your minister is an honour, as the people from Baie Verte - White Bay and Bay of Islands know, Mr. Speaker. It is not something that makes you the subject of a petty vendetta.

To the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, we did not have his department but his budget is involved in the departments that came under us. I would say, 'If you cannot stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.' Now, our overtaxed population, Mr. Speaker, are saying, 'We cannot stand the heat, get rid of the Kitchen.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEWLETT:

Mr. Speaker, I indicated earlier that the press were in attendance at our sessions. To **The Sunday Express**, who I am sure attended on many occasions, who called me 'Alvin the Great', they know by now, after watching television, that Communist China is exactly what I said it was, a Communist country, a country where the police forces and the armed forces will oppose and, if necessary, murder the citizenry. I am not saying that is right or I like it, but I am saying that is the way it is. China can turn its face or its back to the world as it sees fit, and there is very little that we can do about it. It has done it for thousands of years. And when China turns its face to the world again, the Western world will be there with open arms because the Western world has done business with the totalitarian regimes for hundreds of years and we are not about to stop now. It is not right, but it is the way it is.

And to the Premier and the government, as a whole, this government promised much and delivered very little except taxes. Its Economic Commission will make the Sprung lights seem like a glimmer, Mr. Speaker. This government is economically conservative and socially conservative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEWLETT:

This is a cold, clinical government with a mediocre social conscience. And you know what the Bible says about the lukewarm, 'I

will spew thee out of my mouth'. This government has no economic vision of its own, either, Mr. Speaker. In short, Mr. Speaker, this government has no soul. It is a cold, clinical government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEWLETT:

In contrast, Mr. Speaker, those of us in Opposition, we have never felt so good. We are spirited, we are enjoying ourselves and we think we are doing well at the people's business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

You may as well enjoy it because you are going to be there for a long time.

MR. HEWLETT:

Yes, we have a heart and a soul, Mr. Speaker.

A note of levity before I clue up, Mr. Speaker. There has been much talk in this House about Liberal fried chicken. Rumour has it, Mr. Speaker, that Liberal fried chicken is all left legs and right wings in the box. Mr. Speaker, the featherless bipeds opposite they stand on their left legs, but when they fly, Mr. Speaker, they fly on their right wings. But we in Opposition, Mr. Speaker, as was said in the poem Ulysses, Mr. Speaker, 'We are one equal temper of heroic hearts,' blooded on the leadership of the member for Baie Verte - White Bay and determined, Mr. Speaker, 'To strive, to seek, to find and not to yield.' Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Social Services.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Whose job is it to co-ordinate who is giving speeches?

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We are taking the same route you take over there, Sir. You do not know when to turn right, left, back up or stand on your head and everything comes out a babble.

MR. RIDEOUT:

There will be no knives in my back, like you over there did with Leo.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I want to take time to make a few comments, especially in relation to the hon. the member for Green Bay, from whence he came from the eighth floor. I believe just about every word he utters must have been knocked into him by the former, former Premier. I cannot talk about the former Premier, because he was there such a short period of time the Province hardly knows he was there at all. His stay was short, never to return to the premiership again, according to rumours coming from his party, from his caucus. He just made reference to Mr. Barry and what happened. I suspect he had better wear a steel vest not only on his back but all around.

AN HON. MEMBER:

If there is (inaudible) you should know.

MR. EFFORD:

Believe me we did the Province a favour. We removed you people, and that was the idea. It is the

best thing that could ever possibly happen to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. After seventeen years, this Province could not stand another seventeen months or another seventeen weeks of Tory Government. The people of this Province recognized that, Mr. Speaker, and the people of the Province made a move to rid themselves of the poor administration, the disoriented government that was here. They knew the drowning hour was drawing near and they had to move, and the people of the Province moved wisely and removed them.

Now the change is here, the real change; the alternative is here, and there is a bright light at the end of the tunnel for the future of this Province. This administration, Mr. Speaker, is going to make sure of that.

Economic recovery is about to happen. Dependence on social assistance is about to fall off, not increase as it has done over the past decade, and no member sitting on that side of the House can argue with that. The fact is, we have approximately 20,000 people dependent on social assistance and, except for employment opportunities, that number would increase by 13,000 so that we would have approximately 33,000 people, if the true figure were known, dependent on social assistance. That is as a result of poor administration - no direction, no long-term jobs, nothing except misery at all times, and that is what you are bragging about. That is what the hon. member bragged about when he came out of the Eighth Floor, Buckingham Porch, where they would rather spend money on expensive furniture and expensive equipment, Mr. Speaker, than to give it to

the poor people of this Province.

MR. HEWLETT:

(Inaudible) furniture needs more (inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

We inherited it. Unfortunately, we cannot get rid of it, because it costs too much to get rid of. We have to use it but, at the same time, we have to watch the people of this Province go hungry because of the way in which you spent the money. You were a part of that administration and you cannot get away from that fact. That is the reason you are sitting over there and we are sitting over here, and we are going to stay over here, gentlemen. We are going to stay over here, make no mistake about it!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Any more conflicts and we will see how long you will be over there.

MR. FLIGHT:

They do not know the meaning of the word.

MR. EFFORD:

Believe me, they know the meaning of conflict. They had lots of experience with conflict. They spent seventeen years raping the people of this Province, Cabinet Ministers signing contracts; the former minister of - in excess of \$500,000, when he was in Cabinet. Now, talk about experience with conflict! The former Minister of Health, his company and partners received \$500,000 from the provincial treasury for rental buildings around St. John's.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You ought not bring that up here today.

MR. EFFORD:

That is a fact. Does the truth hurt? You have been bringing it up. The member was not in Cabinet when that deal was made. He is getting rid of it. That is not conflict. Your leader knows full well what I am talking about. When you are in Cabinet and you make a decision in Cabinet that a rental accommodation is going to bring you in money, you can hide it, you can put it in trust, but the fact remains, it is still there. That is conflict of interest.

MR. RIDEOUT:

What does that have to do with the resource estimates?

MR. EFFORD:

The fact remains that those experienced in conflict of interest are sitting over there, and you people know it all too well.

I can go on and on. The former Minister of Public Works, put out rental accommodations to his campaign manager in Harbour Grace and his campaign manager in the district of Port de Grave to the tune of \$175,000 a year, for buildings the Department of Social Services were renting. No problem! That is not conflict of interest; that is not helping his friends, that is not political patronage, is it? No, that is right, by their standards. The trouble is, their standards are right for them and everyone else's are wrong.

If you want to bring up political patronage and political appointments, just ask me sometime. I spent four years showing the people of this Province what kind of administration they had. I did such a good job, Mr. Speaker, that

the people woke up and saw what was going on. That is the reason why we are here, as I said earlier, and Opposition members are over there.

Mr. Speaker, we are moving in a new direction, and the people of this Province can now have confidence in what is being done by this government.

In recent committee meetings held here in the House of Assembly and in the Colonial Building, as my hon. colleague, the MHA for Carbonear said, the ministers had no trouble whatsoever with answering questions. The other night, in my own estimates, we had no problem dealing with the questions at hand, unlike the years when we would come into the Estimates Committee and sit down and ask questions - as I have done for the past three years - and never get a straight answer from the former Minister of Social Services.

In these Estimates Committees, the answers now are direct and accurate, and they deal with today's needs.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I could not get an answer last night (inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

There are answers if you want to listen.

Mr. Speaker, the point of this whole system is that there is a new government, a government which has a realistic view of what the needs of the people are, not only the social needs but the economic needs of the people and the need to have our resources developed. We have enough resources in this Province which, if developed

properly, could support the population of this Province and we would not have to be dependent on handouts.

The people of this Province should not have to depend on social assistance to buy a few meager groceries for their table, or depend on six or ten weeks work to get stamps. In the past seventeen years they have lost all their dignity, they have been reduced to going to companies and saying, I will work for nothing. All you have to do is give me my unemployment stamps. That is what the people of this Province were reduced to from one end of the coast to the other, in Newfoundland and Labrador. They could not even scrape up ten weeks work, but now that is changing, Mr. Speaker. The people realize that change is coming and they are beginning to have some confidence in themselves. People are starting to realize that there is some hope at the end of the -

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we have a quorum in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have a quorum.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When you cannot take the heat, get out of the kitchen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

True words are being spoken, and the truth hurts, so they leave the kitchen.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to be here for a long time yet and they are going to have to listen to true facts. They may be able to stand up in Question Period and insinuate and try to create something, but when they hear the true facts, they run and hide.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) on the table?

MR. EFFORD:

Anything you want to put on the table, this hon. gentleman will answer, and he will stand by any statements he makes. If you have a question, anytime you wish to stand up we will answer it. And if I ever make a mistake, I will do what I did the other day, I will stand up and admit that I made a mistake. That is what the human factor is all about.

Mr. Speaker, to continue for just a few minutes. In the Resource Committee we talked about one of the most important resources in the Province, the fishery. While listening to the evening news on television last night I heard mentioned the committee that is going around the Province. You talk about a repeat. I think the former Minister of Fisheries and members of the former government will agree with this, because there have been enough studies done around this Province on the fishery and the situation with the fishery. What has not been done, federally and provincially, is enough proper action taken.

When the federal government realizes that the problem with the Newfoundland fishery is caused by overfishing on the Grand Banks by Canadian and foreign trawlers, then our future is going to take on a brighter outlook.

Then they put grinders on the draggers a few years ago to grind up all the small fish they could catch and bring in the large fish because of the biggest dollar, the biggest revenue, and they were catching three or four times their quota, our own Canadian draggers and foreign draggers, and that is what happened to our fishery. Everybody is alike.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. EFFORD:

I was just getting started. I will continue later and give you a better insight into the fishery.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed. I was about to say that when I was interrupted.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Opposition House Leader.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Leader of the Opposition. I am sorry!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Right! Thank you, Sir.

MR. SIMMS:

It has only been six weeks.

MR. SPEAKER:

My apologies.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest as the gentleman for Carbonear introduced the Concurrence Debate on the Resources Estimates here today. I

particularly listened with interest to his opening remarks, following in the usual line of lecture, I suppose, that his Leader gets on with from time to time, telling us how we should perform in this House, what our responsibilities were, and how we should, to use the Premier's favourite expression, "Discharge those responsibilities" and so on. And, you know, it must be interesting for the hon. member, having given us the benefits of his thoughts, to sit back and listen to his own Minister of Social Services just get up and undo, totally undo and destroy and take away any credibility whatsoever to any of the remarks that the hon. gentleman from Carbonear made.

That is exactly what the Minister of Social Services did. The decorum, the respect, and so on, that the gentleman from Carbonear waxed so eloquently about, was nowhere evident at all in his colleague, not evident whatsoever. All he wanted to do was personally assassinate, for example, the member for Green Bay, who happened to occupy another position in the government of this Province at one time. That is not the kind of thing that the member for Carbonear was talking about at all, I do not believe. He was going after us for being so unkind to the Premier, and so unkind to other ministers. Then his colleague gets up and totally undoes or undos - whatever the proper word is, -

MR. EFFORD:

Backupable.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Backupable, a very good White Bay term. I told you that before and you should check it, by the way.

Remember what I told you once before, too, that at least something is backupable, the Minister of Finance is not even getupable. We saw that again today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
We saw again today, Mr. Speaker -

MR. EFFORD:
You be nice.

MR. SIMMS:
Listen to who is is talking about being nice!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Listen to who is talking about being nice! The problem with the Minister of Social Services, Mr. Speaker, is he has not yet, after five or six weeks, come to grasp the fact that he is a minister. He still thinks he is operating from this side of the House.

MR. SIMMS:
Exactly.

MR. RIDEOUT:
He gets up in Question Period, or he gets up in debate in response to a point and it might be raised from here.

MR. EFFORD:
You have not asked a question.

MR. RIDEOUT:
No, and I do not intend to.

MR. SIMMS:
Hear, hear! Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to

ask a minister, who does not have the courtesy, number one, to give a civilized response, I do not intend to ask that minister a question.

Let me tell the hon. gentleman something, Mr. Speaker: When I ask a question in this House I do not ask the question looking for an answer. Unlike the Minister of Social Services, when he was over here asking questions, he did not know where he was shooting, right, left, center, in the dark or what, and every once in a while he happened to score a hit. And he was in the dark quite often, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:
I destroyed you fellows.

MR. RIDEOUT:
You destroyed nothing. I will tell you what the hon. gentleman is destroying, Mr. Speaker: He is destroying his own credibility and the credibility of this government and he is doing it very, very quickly. He gets **The National Enquirer** award of the week, Newsmaker of the Week from **The Sunday Express**, and it goes right to his head, Mr. Speaker.

He thinks he has the world by the tail because **The Sunday Express** had made him Newsmaker of the Week, I believe in the first week he was in Cabinet. I believe it was the first week he was in Cabinet he was nominated and given the Newsmaker of the Week Award, and ever since that he is as cocky, Mr. Speaker! You see him over there during Question Period, 'Ask me a question? Ask me a question? I would like to get on television today, I have not been on television, I have not gotten the Newsmaker of the Week Award lately. Will the Opposition

please ask me a question?' And, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. gentleman-

MR. EFFORD:

Did you not see me on TV last night?

MR. SIMMS:

We should try to get him on, because every time he is on it is better for us.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I might change strategy on that. My colleague from Grand Falls is right. I might change a bit of strategy on that next week and try to get him on more often. We just might do it, because every time he gets on, Mr. Speaker, every time he and the Minister of Health, those two gentlemen in particular, and the Minister of Finance, those three ministers, every time those three ministers get on television, Mr. Speaker, the popularity and the bloom starts to go off the rose.

Now there is normally a bloom on the rose for a few months. You could take David Peterson, for example, where it went on for two or three years. But, Mr. Speaker, the way that this government is performing, the bloom will be gone off the rose within six months, that I can tell you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

You can see it in minister after minister. The arrogance and the self-pompousness of the Minister of Social Services! He thinks that he is God's gift to politics in Newfoundland and Labrador. He is so full of himself, Mr. Speaker, that he had to get a larger jacket to go down to

Government House to get sworn in as the minister. His chest just about busted. The arrogance of the Minister of Health! The silent, inept Minister of Finance! All he can do in Question Period, with the galleries looking down on him and the reporters and the media looking down on him, is mimic his mouth at somebody over here asking a question. He cannot get up and get sound to come out.

Then, on top of it all, of course, there is the tremendous arrogance of the Premier. So, the people of this Province are seeing very, very quickly that this government is a government that is going to be a one-term government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

This government will be a one-term government unless the Premier starts to make some moves, like moving the Minister of Finance straight out of the Cabinet.

MR. GRIMES:

Listen to the one-month Premier.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The one-month Premier. That is fine. I had no desire to hang on to the Premiership of this Province, or the leadership of this party, or to hang on to anything. The people had the right to make a decision, they made it and I respect that. I have no desire to hang on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

I have no desire to hang on whatsoever. So when the people make a decision I respect it.

Forty-eight per cent of the people said they wanted me to stay on. Forty-seven per cent of the people said they wanted the hon. gentleman. The man that I see in the galleries practically every day since the House is open, every hon. lady and gentleman on that side, when they see the Leader of the NDP enter this House, should do this: They should kiss his feet and kiss the feet of the NDP because it was not the majority of the electorate of Newfoundland and Labrador who decided the government. The majority did not vote for the government. Forty-seven per cent voted for the government. With the total collapse of the NDP vote they were able to get ten seats more than we got. Therefore, every day you should go thank Peter Fenwick for getting out, you should genuflect to Mr. Newhook when he comes into the House, and you should thank your lucky stars that he led that party to a disaster. You are the people who gained from that, we did not. I say that frankly, we did not but you did, and that is how come you are over there. In our system that is fine and I have no quarrel with that. But let the credit go, Mr. Speaker, to the place where it is deserved. It is not deserved with the hon. gentleman on the other side. It is deserved with a person who does not have a seat in this House. That is where it is deserved. That is how come you are over there.

So I say to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, enjoy it. You have gotten awful cocky. You have gotten awful arrogant. You are not worried about the people of the Province, only to sock it to them in tax increases, to get into their pockets and haul out \$100 million in tax increases. You are

worried about that but you are not worried about the people of the Province and longevity in government. So stay on the road that you are on. I should not be giving the government this advice, Mr. Speaker, but you hear it everywhere you go in the Province now. Stay on the road, do not dither, do not detour, do not move, stay on that road and we are in good shape. We are going to ensure that the government is kept on it.

I am not going to worry about the member for Carbonear, whether he likes the way I ask questions or not. When I was in government I did not like the way the Minister of Social Services asked questions. He did not worry about that.

MR. SIMMS:

The Speaker said you asked excellent questions.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I had the Speaker give me the greatest vindication I could ever want in private session yesterday about how I ask questions. So I could not care less whether my style or the way I ask questions or the subject matter pleases hon. gentlemen on the other side. I am not here to please hon. gentlemen on the other side. That is not my role here. That is not the role of the Opposition. And they are not there to please us. You are there to govern and we are there to offer competent, credible opposition to the government, and that is what we are going to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, this House so far, in the time that we have been in

session, has seen the best opposition since Confederation. No doubt about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

We have seen the worst government, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

You know, Mr. Speaker, normally it takes a government five or six years -

MR. EFFORD:

Look how long you lasted.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I can shout just as loud as the hon. gentleman, I am not worried about him.

Normally it takes a government five or six years to become as arrogant as this government has become in five or six weeks. It normally takes five or six years. But if this government continues on on the trend that it is on now, it will not last this term, it will not last this mandate, because the party is starting to fall apart at the seams. We saw that with the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, another Walking Contradiction. He cannot even hold on to his Executive Assistant. We saw that. We know that the Liberal Youth Federation in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is as mad as a room full of hornets. We know that they are livid with this government, the Liberal Youth Federation. We know that some stalwart party supporters are livid with this government, so they are bolting, Mr. Speaker,

already. We know this from the backbenches: There are two sectors in the government; there is what you would call the old crowd and the young crowd. And the Young Turks are driving the ministers mad, we know that for a fact.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER:

It being Thursday, 4:00 p.m., I want to advise the House of the questions for the Late Show.

Question No. 1 is from the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and it is to the Premier regarding space leased by the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to the Liquor Corporation.

Question No. 2 is from the hon. the member for Humber East and it is to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs on the question that she posed today during Question Period.

The third question is from the hon. the member for Grand Bank, and he is not satisfied with the response to his question by the Minister of Finance pertaining to the various fee increases in the 1989-90 budget.

These are the questions.

The hon. the member for Placentia,

MR. HOGAN:

I was wondering today to what section of the Resource Committee I was going to address my remarks,

and it was shortly after lunch when something came to my attention, that storm troopers, in the guise of fisheries officers, went into Fair Haven and closed the fish plant there without notice and seized three tractor loads of fish. And we wonder what is wrong with the fishery?

One hundred and twenty thousand pounds of fish, Mr. Speaker, were seized from the fishermen of Southern Harbour, Little Harbour and Fair Haven, who, by the way, did not do very well in the caplin fishery and were looking forward to a good codfishery.

To give you an idea of some of the things the fishermen are encountering, let me read why the plant was closed down without notice: 'The floors were wet; the floors had slight depressions in them and formed small pockets of water.' I cannot exactly make out the writing. The person who wrote the inspection report cannot write too well, along with his other failures. 'The floor joints are not curved around the support columns. The drains: The main floor drain is not rodent proof, there is a two inch hole in it.' I guess one of these storm troopers crawled into it. 'The walls: The lower section of the procuring area walls is not the right colour.' Serious stuff, Mr. Speaker, serious stuff!

'The ceilings: There is a cold water pipe that is suspended from the ceiling and should be insulated. Two light fixtures not in place. Hand washing facilities: There was no soap there and there was not a single-use towel' - there was a roll of towel paper there instead of the single-use ones. And, to beat it all, 'The toilet

facilities: The doors are not self-closing.' They had to use doorknobs.

'The splitting table has a plywood top.' I think that is a serious one. 'It is not an approved material. The frames and legs on the splitting tables are constructed of wood, which is also not an approved material.' For this, Mr. Speaker, 150 fishermen lost 120,000 pounds of fish, and tomorrow they have to take in their nets because they will have no place to sell their fish. We stand in this House, on both sides, and, as I said in my maiden speech, if I could take one subject in this House that has been addressed most articulately, most professionally and with the unanimous support of every person in this House, it would be the fishery. We might have differences on approaches or policies or whatever, but the support was there, the common denominator was there to leave no stone unturned to support our fishery.

Then, without notice, they did not even have the courtesy to go to the process operator - by the way, that is our plant. That is a provincial plant.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Who is the operator?

MR. HOGAN:
Kevin Wadman.

The fisheries inspector, I think, even lives in the community with Wadman. He drove past his door, went to St. John's and sent him a Fax, and before the Fax even got to his office and could be interpreted, because the writing, as I said, was not that good, the fisheries inspectors were into

Fairhaven with a tractor trailer and forklifts. I do not know if they had an armored car, but a lot of gear went in there, and it was not fishing gear, to seize everything that was in the control of these people. And we ask ourselves every day what is wrong with the fishery!

I understand from our provincial department - I am sure the Leader of the Opposition is familiar with it - there was financial assistance given to the owner by the department, probably when he was Premier, to upgrade the facilities a certain amount. I do not know the number of dollars right offhand, but in the neighborhood of \$5,000. That work was done and the other work was ongoing. But the fish could not wait for the soap to come, the fish could not wait for the towels to be single-use instead of rolled, and the caplin could not take the doorknobs off the door so the doors would be self-closing.

These people walked in and because some fisherman said to them, 'Boy, you are not taking that fish out of here,' they had the gall to go off and come back with the RCMP. And we ask ourselves what we can do to support the fishery! I do not know, but I have been speaking to our own officials and they have been attempting to talk to the federal people. I say attempting, because I do not think there is anybody on the other end receiving.

Mr. Speaker, all members of this House, all peoples of this Province, if we are to be successful in the undertaking of the fishery, surely God we have to be able to listen to, we have to be able to communicate with, and we have to be able to deal with these people who are in the

fishing industry with some sensitivity, with some heart, some compassion and a little bit of leeway.

I am fully cognizant, learning from my friends here in the House of Assembly, on both sides, of the necessity of quality control and all these things that have to be done to improve our fish as it gets to the market place, but the House rules will not permit me to say what I think of this piece of paper. That is just nit-picking. That is going too far, Mr. Speaker, in squashing the livelihoods of some 150 families.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Were they federal officials?

MR. HOGAN:

Yes, federal officials. I suppose ours would do the same thing but for the fact that there is some understanding amongst them, which was bred into them over the years.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of high-handed approach has to stop.

It just has to stop. We can talk ourselves blue in the face here, but if we do not educate our officials in administering the laws of our land, the laws pertaining to the fishery and other laws, God help us! if this is what is out in the workplace representing us.

It has distracted me, Mr. Speaker, from the proper approach to the subject today, which is the Resource Committee. I would like to express my gratitude to my fellow members on the Committee in addressing the various departments and their estimates. I concur with our Chairman's remarks about all seven members, co-chaired by the member for Carbonear and my

good friend, the Mayor of Deer Park, who is not here today. We talked about how it should go, we laid down our own rules, we worked at it, and everything went fairly smoothly. Some pointed questions, good questions from all members of the Committee were put forth to the ministers.

Some items which probably deserve my attention today just escape me at the moment, Mr. Speaker, because of the urgency of this matter in Fairhaven, and I am probably running out of time.

But I would like to comment on working with Mr. Windsor, whom I have worked with before - not Mr. Windsor, the Mayor of Deer Park, the member for Mount Pearl. It was quite an experience, a good learning experience. I certainly admire his knowledge of the subjects we discussed, even those portfolios he did not serve in. I am sure it was a learning experience for all the rookies who were on the Committee with him.

I would reiterate the remarks of fellow members who talked about the environment and the problems along our highways and byways, littering and the destruction of our forests and our waters. If there is one thing we should undertake in this House, it is to educate our fellow Newfoundlanders and visitors alike. It is only some of them, because there are always a few who spoil things for the majority. If they would treat their environment a little more seriously, and if they would, for want of a better word, clean up their act and treat their surroundings properly, then this Province would be a much better place in which to live, and it would be much more attractive to tourists.

I again have to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, and ask for the support of all members in the House in addressing situations like that at Fairhaven. I cannot get away from it. We should do something about it. The Minister of Fisheries and officials of the provincial department are working very hard at it. I do not know what happens to the 120,000 pounds of fish. I did not get that far, to enquire of officials. Probably it is all lost. The fishermen have not been paid for it, and obviously the fish plant operator is not going to be paid for it. So 120,000 pounds of fish valued at about \$40,000 to \$50,000 is gone out of the pockets of our fellow Newfoundlanders today because of high-handed actions by the Federal Department of Fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. HOGAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak for a few moments on a matter of interest to my constituency, since the member has raised the matter in Fairhaven.

I want to raise a matter dealing with a situation that occurred in Grand Falls over the last twenty-four hours or so. I will just say to the hon. member, by the way, with respect to his plea for support from members of the House to urge the Minister of Fisheries to do something with

respect to the Fairhaven situation, from what he described and from what little I know of it from what was told me, it appears as if the minister needs to lay the heavy hand on the federal bureaucrats in the department and try to insist that they not be so callous, that they learn to deal with people to resolve problems such as the one he has described. It seems to me that it is a simple one to resolve.

I see the Minister of Environment there poking his head in through the door. I wonder if he is going to be around for a few minutes, because I want to talk about the issue that arose in Grand Falls. He will be within hearing distance, I have no doubt.

Mr. Speaker, as the House is aware as a result of some questions in the Legislature yesterday, a situation arose in Grand Falls which has been aptly described by both the member for Green Bay, who is our environment critic, as well as the Minister of Environment in responding to questions yesterday. I would like to touch on two matters, and I was hoping the minister might be available so he could respond.

I have spoken to officials of the company, Abitibi-Price, and last night I flew to Gander with my friend and colleague the member for Gander, the Government House Leader, and we discussed a number of House matters on the way.

Having heard the situation described on the airwaves, I then went on into Grand Falls to see what the situation was, because sometimes you are not sure if it as great a problem or as serious a problem as it sounds. We experienced that many times when

we were in government, and I am sure ministers over there are now experiencing the same thing; everything you hear on the airwaves is not always exactly as it is.

I wanted to go out to Grand Falls to see what the situation was, and I fly out last night. While I was there, I had occasion to talk to fifteen or twenty people, I suppose, I had occasion to visit some homes, and some of the situations described to me by these residents, by my constituents, were rather scary in many respects.

I know the company held a press conference yesterday afternoon sometime, 4:00 p.m. or 4:30 p.m., and I know they also have accepted responsibility for the situation which has occurred. I did not hear the details of their press conference, so I today, myself, called on the company to do two things, two things which I would like to see addressed, and the minister will probably be able to tell me if he is prepared to do what he can from his perspective.

First of all, of course, many residents have been affected by this soot emission. I know by late afternoon yesterday the company had themselves received in excess of one hundred telephone calls from people who had had different experiences. Some of these experiences I will just explain to the minister and to members of the House.

Just to give an example: I was in a house last night the occupants of which had, just the evening before, finished painting their fence around the House, and had just finished painting all their outdoor lawn furniture that one

might have in the backyard. It was freshly painted. They had just finished painting it the evening before.

MR. EFFORD:

Who is going to paint outdoor furniture?

MR. SIMMS:

Well, this is the old wooden type the hon. member has seen down around Bay de Verde many times, I am sure, when he is down around there. In any event, this is not a humorous situation I am trying to describe. Perhaps I will engage in humour with the minister a little later on.

Of course, that was a very costly thing for one to have to do and it was ruined by the soot.

Another example is that of an individual who had just had his car freshly waxed the evening before, which cost \$100. I guess the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation would know about it, it is one of these professional jobs that you get done on a car and it cost him \$100. That car was actually ingrained, this stuff was ingrained into the wax, and, of course, that is going to be a costly venture.

I went into another house and the woman in the home at the time was down on her hands and knees trying to scrub the soot out of the carpet. I even spoke to a person who told me - it is secondhand - for the information of the member for Exploits that a resident of Bishop's Falls had, in fact, experienced some of this soot on his car in Bishop's Falls - obviously it must have been because of the wind or something - and there were some damages or

some problems in Windsor.

Then there is the example of a drycleaning business in Grand Falls which, because of the time the incident occurred and later on during the day, I guess, the doors and windows were open and all the clothes in that drycleaning establishment were covered with this soot. So there are going to be considerable expenses incurred.

So, number one, I would like to see, and I hope the minister might be able to do something about it, the company, Abitibi-Price, who have accepted the responsibility, and I understand have also said that people could submit their claims which will be forwarded on to their insurance agency, I would like to see them be a little more specific and set up a mechanism, perhaps a more personal mechanism, have the company to set up an office, or something like that, for a couple of days, where the residents can actually go to submit their claims and explain their claims. Because I suspect the cost of damage will run into the tens of thousands of dollars. That is my suspicion.

MR. FLIGHT:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. SIMMS:

Sure.

MR. FLIGHT:

How about the amount of insurance they carry? Is that a factor in the equation, whether it is possible for remuneration under their own private insurance?

MR. SIMMS:

My understanding is that it is not. The company have accepted the responsibility and they have

indicated that their own insurance will pay for it. So whether an individual who gets turned down or rejected by the company can then pursue it with their own insurance company, perhaps they can.

That is point number one: To adequately compensate people who have suffered some damages from this incident, and to make it easy for them to do so.

Point number two is a point that my friend from Placentia mentioned to me yesterday after Question Period, and wondered why we did not raise the matter in Question Period. It was simply because the experience we had during the day was phone calls from constituents and residents who had suffered damages. But there is another very important point here that should not be forgotten, and that has to do with health and safety.

The member for St. John's South, who I know is very actively involved in that area, would want me to mention it, as well. So, I do mention it and I mentioned it this morning publicly, and I will be encouraging the authorities, the Department of Labour, the Department of Health and the Department of Environment, to do some follow-up work and some follow-up investigation on this situation; find out how it occurred, make sure there are precautions in place so that it does not occur in the future, and perhaps more importantly, to do whatever is necessary to find out whether or not there have been any health residues, if you want, as a result of this particular incident. That we do not know.

Again, I am not attempting to be an alarmist or anything here, but it is an important factor and one

which I would hope the Minister of Health might have his officials, in consultation with the Minister of Environment's officials and, indeed, the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations -- I think her department would have some role to play in this regard as well.

So those are two very important factors associated with this particular incident I would like to see pursued. I will be contacting the ministers I have referred to officially, in writing, asking them to follow it up. Perhaps, since we have some time in debate here today, one of the ministers might be able to respond to it. I know the Minister of Environment might have some more information to add. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There are two or three different things, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to which were raised by hon. members, not exclusively the points raised by the hon. the Opposition House Leader. The member for Green Bay made a couple of points that perhaps I could make some brief reference to. He talked about the Crescent Lake Park situation, and, as he is the member representing that area, he would be understandably upset with the fact that there was no allocation of funding in this year's budget to do anything with Crescent Lake.

I share his concern, but, at the same time, we have to be responsible in how we handle the public purse. I think we are

doing that. I can inform the hon. member who was not a member of the House prior to the most recent election but who had some involvement, I guess, with the governing party of the day - I do not know how far back his tenure goes as an employee of the former, former Premier or anything like that, but he may have some knowledge of what I am about to say - that other parts of the Province are also very distressed by the fact that there was not a particular allocation for parks this year. In fact, we can go back over quite a few years in which particular areas of the Province were not able to receive adequate funding to establish a park or upgrade existing parks and so on.

I can make particular reference because, I, myself, was involved since the early seventies, starting 1974, in my own particular district, Naskaupi district in Labrador. And this goes back to long before the time I was an MHA, but I was mayor of Happy Valley/Goose Bay from February 1974 up to October 1983, and in that period of time our town council, along with the town council of Northwest River, entered into considerable correspondence with the government of the day requesting that we get a provincial park in the Upper Lake Melville area, or in Naskaupi district. I continued that effort after becoming an MHA, in 1985, and now as a minister my constituency, if you could say that, has broadened in that I am no longer only responsible for Naskaupi district but, indeed, have a Cabinet responsibility with respect to Labrador and have a Province-wide responsibility with the portfolio.

But, the response we received for years, and years, and years, Mr. Speaker, from the government was that the next new provincial park to be constructed in this Province would be constructed in the Upper Lake Melville area, or the Naskaupi district. We were told that by a number of different ministers. I do not see any of them here right now, unless the hon. the member for Grand Bank might have been one of them. I believe he was for a period of time, but there were others; the hon. the member for Grand Falls was one, I believe, and the hon. the member for Ferryland was another. All of these ministers, and there may have been others, did promise us that the next new provincial park in this Province would go to the Upper Lake Melville area, Naskaupi district.

Now, that never really did come about so, therefore, I can appreciate the frustration, perhaps, the hon. the member for Green Bay feels in not seeing the allocation this year, when he was led to believe by his now colleagues, I suppose, former political friends that indeed there would probably be considerable funding to go to Crescent Lake. I share with him his concern, because I understand the frustration; I went through it a number of year of it, as I just pointed out.

In fact, I can enlarge on that a little more, Mr. Speaker, in saying that in 1983, the exact month I do not recall, there was a commitment by the former government that, yes, indeed, the Upper Lake Melville area, Naskaupi district, would get a provincial park, and I think there was a small amount of money allocated at the time; the site was selected

and so on and some work was done. But after 1983, there was no more funding for the project.

Now, in 1985, as I guess everybody is aware, I became the member for that district and I was not able to convince any of the ministers who had the responsibility in that four year period to continue the funding, complete the project, and honour the commitment they had made. The sad part about the fact that Naskaupi district was chosen in 1983 was that it was a purely political reason. The government of the day decided, and we can ask the member for Grand Bank to pay particular note to these points, the government of the day decided to close the hospital in Northwest River, which is in my district. It employed some ninety-odd people, the major employer in the community, and, I believe, even though we said it may have been political, or people said it may have been political - I was not the member at the time - they said it was being done for economic and efficiency reasons. What bothers me about that, in an aside, is the fact that when another government in an attempt to manage the affairs of this Province in a responsible manner takes a similar step, the hon. members opposite criticize the exact same procedures that they themselves followed just a short while ago.

So, having closed the Northwest River Hospital, the hon. member for the House of Assembly at that time, in a public meeting in Northwest River, told the residents there that even though he was a member of Cabinet, and even though it was his district, he was not made aware of the closure by his colleagues. He stood on a public stage and said he was not aware of it because he

had been out of the Province. Now, that, to me, does not sound like a responsible way of handling things.

But, that is not the point I wanted to make. I just wanted to bring that into the record to say that the reason for the decision to create a park in the Lake Melville area was political.

Having caused ninety-some-odd people to lose their jobs in Northwest River, a few of them I think were able to relocate to jobs in Happy Valley/Goose Bay, the Parks Division of the day had officials in the Lake Melville area looking for suitable sites for a provincial park. My understanding is, without checking the records today, that a park that had been constructed at Gosling Lake, better known to Labradorians as Salt Water Pond, would be the ideal location for a provincial park if the organization responsible for the construction of it, the Lake Melville Tourism Association, of which I was Founding President, would be agreeable to pass it over to provincial parks.

Now, the LMTA of that day was quite willing to do that. Quite a bit of money and quite a bit of volunteer effort had gone into that park, and we were willing to do that. However, one of the alternate choices was the Grand Lake site, just up river from Northwest River, which did become the actual choice, and the political reason that Grand Lake was chosen at that time, Mr. Speaker, was to try to offset the decision by the government of the day to close the Northwest River hospital. So, the decision on Grand Lake was initially purely political, by the former

administration.

Now, having locked us into that and promising a certain number of jobs in construction to the town of Northwest River, nothing else was done by that administration.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

It is now 4:30 p.m. We will move into the Late Show.

MR. KELLAND:
I will continue. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. There are a number of other points I am sure members opposite will be very interested in.

Debate on the Adjournment
[Late Show]

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, during the last several days, I have been questioning the Premier practically every day on the situation the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture finds himself in with regard to space leased to the Liquor Corporation.

It is not the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture or the lease that we are interested in, it is the double standard of the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador. Let me quote from the Premier's interview with The Sunday Express on June

18: "Mr. Wells said even potential conflicts of interest could not be tolerated under his leadership." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the bottom line. Day after day we have seen in this House, particularly on this issue and an issue which came to light today with the Minister of Justice, with the Premier being prepared, more than prepared to not only accept a double standard but prepared to defend a double standard.

The Premier cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. He cannot, when he was Leader of the Opposition, malign and demand the resignation of a person he was alleging was in a conflict of interest then, when he admits himself, to quote this article, "that the circumstances were exactly the same, that the circumstances were similar." When he admits to that, then the Premier does not have the luxury of trying to preach a principle in one position in this House and then tolerate something else when he is in another position in this House. And that is the double standard, that is the contradiction we are talking about here.

Now the Premier, Mr. Speaker, is very quickly developing a reputation as being a double standard person. We have seen it in the potential conflict of interest statement he made, we have seen it in some of the political appointments we referred to in this House over the last couple of days, we have seen it in letters that were sent from ministers to government backbenchers on the other side, and we see the Premier getting up time, after time, Mr. Speaker, and saying, "Oh, that is alright, because I said it. That is

alright, because I am doing it. The world is going fine, because I said it is going fine."

Well, I say to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, that he cannot and he will not get off with that kind of conduct. He has to either practice what he preaches, or day after day, week after week in this House we will consistently and constantly point out to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador where the Premier is being hypocritical. You cannot preach one thing and practice something else. You just cannot do it. We have seen the Premier, as well, Mr. Speaker, being an example of a walking contradiction in his political commitments to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

The first political commitment the Premier made during the election campaign was to build a road to Mainland. Every person in Newfoundland and Labrador saw that. We have seen the Premier ever since walk away from that commitment. A contradiction! We have seen and heard him say he did not make any promises. We saw the Premier on tape making a commitment to introduce post-secondary education in Labrador West by September 1989. Then we saw him get up and squirm and worm in this House and say, Well, if that is what I said, that is not what I meant to say. We saw him back off and they compromise on January 1989. We saw the Premier, Mr. Speaker, going from one end of Newfoundland and Labrador to the other talking about opening hospital beds, not closing hospital beds, and then he comes into this House and puts the axe to St. Lawrence and Grand Bank.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Right on!

MR. RIDEOUT:

So, Mr. Speaker, day after day, in statement after statement, whether it is conflict of interest, whether it is political promises, no matter what it is, this Premier has turned into a walking contradiction; every time he opens his mouth his nose gets an inch longer, and that is not good enough for the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I welcome the opportunity given me by the Leader of the Opposition to respond for a few brief moments. I find it highly amusing to listen to the Leader of the Opposition get up and talk about election promises and all kinds of things like that; I find it kind of amusing in the House to listen to members opposite continually indicate that because everything in the world has not been done in six weeks, that somehow there is something wrong over here, that somehow the government of this Province, because in six weeks it cannot do everything in the world there is to be done, there is something wrong with it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I find that highly amusing, especially coming from members opposite.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the real point at issue here. The

Leader of the Opposition talks about the double standard. He loves to talk about the double standard, and would truly hope that by continually repeating the words, these words would then become reality. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that that is not going to happen. It is not possible for that to happen.

The Leader of the Opposition and members opposite are obviously on a fishing expedition, and I wish them well. If that is their purpose, I wish them well. I am very happy I am no longer in the position where I have to survive on going on political fishing expeditions. I am very pleased about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

It has to be done, though.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I only have a couple of minutes, but I would like to address the real question and not get into the political extraneous material. Conflict, and perceived or potential conflict: I would like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition, and members opposite, that they should sit back and think for a moment. And in moments when the Leader of the Opposition obviously is not thinking only in political terms, he understands the situation. He very well understands the situation. A minister who is in conflict is a minister who stands to gain, either financially or some other way. Now it is difficult to define some other way, but financially, let us narrow it down that - 'stands to gain financially because of his position.' So that is a conflict.

Now, the real point I want to get to is the one the Leader mentioned a moment ago, potential conflict.

Potential conflict is when the possibility exists that because of his position a minister, or somebody else, can gain financially. Now, the reason I am narrowing it down to financial is simply because we all gain politically by things we do no matter where we are, or lose. So you have to narrow it down to financial gain.

MR. SIMMS:

Get to the point.

MR. BAKER:

I will, if the member will have a little patience. In this particular situation a lease was signed by the member for Windsor - Buchans when he was not a member of this House. The lease extends for a defined period of time. Now, the point at which there is a possibility of gain is when you are signing the lease. That is the point at which there is a possibility of gain. The lease is signed, then, months later, there is an election and the member finds himself in Cabinet. Now, at that point there is no conflict of interest because he cannot now use his position to gain something.

Now, we go to the second point. The second point is the potential for conflict. The potential conflict would come if, during his term, a minister would then re-negotiate that lease. However, as has been indicated many, many times - and the Premier has been very consistent in this - there will be no re-negotiation of the lease. The member has taken steps to ensure that there will be no re-negotiation of the lease, therefore, there is no potential

conflict.

The problem the Leader of the Opposition has, of course, is that in a well-publicized case a couple of years ago, negotiations had been ongoing for a number of years, a number of times, concerning a particular lease that a minister had an interest in, and that is what distinguishes it from the other case. I just want to make that very clear distinction for the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Earlier today, in Question Period, I asked questions of the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs about the surprising departure of his executive assistant. Mr. Jim Baird, another defeated Liberal candidate, as the minister's executive assistant, was quite active in the five or six weeks he held that job. He talked to many artists in the Province, particularly here in St. John's, he met with the Artists' Coalition Executive, he circulated widely in the art community here and he told all these artists that he had been assigned a special role in culture. He said his minister had given him a special mandate in the culture area, presumably because the portfolio is so huge and the workload is impossible for the minister himself.

At any rate, Mr. Baird told people hither and yon that he had a special arts assignment, Mr.

Speaker. Furthermore, Mr. Baird told artists that he would be chairing the reactivated study committee that is going to look at the arts economy and the status of artists in our Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Baird actually impressed many of the artists he spoke to. He seemed to be personally interested in the arts, and his presence at arts performances over the past few years had been observed. Suddenly Mr. Baird resigned, claiming that the minister did not back him up.

Now, I asked the minister earlier if the minister had, indeed, authorized Mr. Baird to carry out this special cultural assignment, and whether the minister had appointed him to chair the study committee. Surely the minister could not have been unaware of Mr. Baird's activities in the arts over the past five or six weeks; He was quite visible in the arts community and St. John's. Is the minister trying to claim now that the minister did not authorize Mr. Baird to carry out these activities and make these statements and chair the study committee? Or did the Premier put the clamps on the relationship between the minister and his executive assistant?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:

What is the explanation for the breakdown in the relationship between the minister and Mr. Baird?

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Emperor intervened again.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the word on the street is that a power struggle

developed between Mr. Baird and the professional public servants in the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs and that while the minister had authorized Mr. Baird to meet with artists and to chair the committee, when the senior public servants objected - possibly people are speculating - and complained to the Premier, the minister sided with the public servants and, if you like, sawed off the limb of the tree on which poor Mr. Baird found himself precariously perched.

Mr. Speaker, now that Mr. Baird has gone, would the minister tell the House who will be chairing the study committee and will the committee be able to get to work as quickly as the minister promised? I know the minister is familiar with the study committee, because I heard him discussing it on CBC radio. Mr. Speaker, will the minister say who will take over the committee now? And, when will the committee report to the minister?

Finally, does the minister have answers to my questions about funding being provided by him and his department to artists circumventing the Arts Council and violating the arms-length funding principle? Particularly, can he say now whether there has been a decision made by his department, without any involvement of the Arts Council, to give funding to an amateur theatre group in Gander? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, let me answer the last question first. I said I would find out about that particular grant the hon. member speaks about, and I will. I have no knowledge of it right now, but I will certainly find out and answer the hon. member.

Let me go back to the main question which has been asked, concerning the mandate of an executive assistant, whether it be Jim Baird or otherwise. I guess what you are asking me to do is explain what an executive assistant does? It sounds that way, because, apparently, even though you were a minister, you do not understand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Do not joke about it, because it is a serious matter.

MR. GULLAGE:

Yes, it is a serious matter.

MS VERGE:

I had my executive with me for ten years.

MR. GULLAGE:

Whatever mandate an executive assistant thinks he or she has, it is clearly not that of developing policy and it is not that of administering a department or any part of a portfolio in a ministry. So irrespective of what an executive assistant may think his mandate is, it is clearly not developing policy and not doing administration. Having said that, that is probably enough to say, because it is very clear as to what an executive assistant does not do. He does not do that. So, if he wanted to pretend that he could do it, and he had a mandate

to do it, that is not my problem. But I cannot permit that sort of thing to happen. Obviously, as a minister my role is to develop policy. The people who are underneath my ministry, my deputy minister and assistant deputy ministers and so on, have a mandate to carry out and administer the department. Now, that is clear and the hon. member should know that.

As far as the arts study is concerned, we have had dialogue with the Arts community since we have been elected and we fully intend to put a chairman in place. We consider the arts study very important, and I have said to that group that we are going to put a chairman in place. We want to reactivate the study which was dormant over the last year. We were not in office, if you will remember, the hon. member was in office. That study was dormant. I want that group reactivated under a new chairman. I have said to them very explicitly, I would like a report from you by September, and I would like interim reports in the meantime. If you have something of worth that you think we should act upon, then I would like to hear about it before September.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the applause from members opposite, Mr. Speaker, but I wish they would not take up my

valuable time. Being a man of very few words, who does not speak very often in this House, I would appreciate having my five minutes. Of course, you can tell the difference in the behavior of those opposite when the Premier is not here. I would suggest he is not here because he is very busy thumbing through conflict of interest statements. If there is one conflict of interest statement he cannot find, it is being amended by the Minister of Justice, I would suggest, at the present moment.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs that the comments I made in the budget debate a few days ago are, I think, coming home to roost, in that the Premier in reducing the size of the Cabinet by consolidating has brought certain divisions of this government to a standstill, brought them to a standstill, Mr. Speaker, and it is starting to show already. Instead of giving \$3 million to the Economic Recovery Team, he should have put three more people in Cabinet and perhaps government would function.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

The real reason I am standing today, Mr. Speaker, is to address the \$100 million man, the Minister of Finance, who in his Budget Highlights, Mr. Speaker, and in his budget document, outlined a number of increases for the people of the Province: a tobacco tax, on children's clothing the growth tax, fuel tax, corporate income tax, personal income tax, and he outlined fees for drivers' vehicle registration would be increased by

5 per cent. Then he goes on and he says 'a number of miscellaneous fees are to be increased.' A number of miscellaneous fees will be increased.

I hear the rabbit tax being brought up. Well, I am wondering today if, perhaps, in the miscellaneous fees the people of the Province are not yet aware of, the minister has indeed taxed rabbit wire, if he has taxed the snares they are now going to put out in the woods. Or is he going to tax the runs or what people find in the runs? Is he is going to tax that, Mr. Speaker?

But my point is, in the Estimates Committee last night the minister outlined that there are a number of fees - we were able to force this information out of the minister over the objection, I might add, of the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, who earned the reputation last night of being a muzzler, he did not want any questions asked of the minister, the real muzzler of the Committee.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I thought he was guzzler.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, he is a muzzler.

But certain fees have been increased. Waiters licences have gone up from \$5 to \$15; inspection fees from \$50 to \$75; brewers retail licences from \$100 to \$200; brewers agents fees from \$50 to \$100; brewers distributors fees from \$100 to \$200. Now, we forced that information out of the minister last night.

In this House, for the last two or three weeks, since the budget was brought down, we have consistently asked the minister for

information. We have not gotten any information yet; most of the time he refuses to get to his feet and answer a question.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) in ten seconds.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Well, all I am saying to the minister is we would appreciate having a full list tabled in this House of all fees that have been increased in his budget so that the people of the Province know exactly how much tax has been increased in this budget. What do miscellaneous fees in your Budget Highlights refer to? What are they?

Again, I would like to remind the minister of the point I made in Question Period today, and at the Committee meeting last night, because there is a glaring amount of money under Inland Fish and Game Licences projected for this year over last year; a half million dollars more this year than last year on a \$2 million allocation, or \$2 million revenue generator, and that is very significant.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That might be fresh water rabbits.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Now that may be just what it is. That may be what it is. It might be something like that.

That is an item we picked out last night. Of course, we did not get he answer last night and we could readily accept that. The officials were there. They could not give it either. One of the officials attempted to slough it off, I might say, and came up with the reason being the time the tax was imposed in the last fiscal

year and what would happen in this fiscal year. But that was a very weak argument, because when you look at the revised estimates, you see that \$2,130,000 came in last year. That is what came in, yet the minister is projecting \$2,630,000 this year. And that \$500,000 increase is very, very suspicious, particularly in light of the fact that the minister did not inform the House of all the liquor-related increases in his budget; he mentioned vehicle licences and registration. So there is obviously a cover-up. It is a sort of sneak tax.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

There is a tax on Tories.

MR. MATTHEWS:

A tax on Tories? Yes, there is. Of course more Tories in the Province are being taxed than Liberals, because, again, 48 per cent are Tories and 47 per cent are Liberals. So, yes, Tories are paying more.

MR. MURPHY:

We do not need to tack them when you have nails.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, Old Landslide now, we nailed them. Old Landslide, himself, two votes. Two votes!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the Minister of Finance answering those questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, that crowd were not in office long enough to turnaround before they put on a rabbit tax, so that every youngster who went catching rabbits had to pay for the privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

And they have the gall to come and question things we do. Let me say this: During the past seventeen years, everything and everyone has been taxed. There were more nuisance taxes in this Province raised and operated and brought in by that hon. group opposite than ever before in this Province. Everything and everybody is taxed; the tax on waiters, identification cards, birth certificates, nuisance, nuisance, nuisance!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing they did not tax, and for the past seventeen years there has been open season on Liberals as these people put in their patronage tactics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

Every board one hundred per cent Tory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

Every government contract, Tory. They even brought their campaign managers in and made them deputy ministers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to -

MR. SIMMS:

Answer the questions.

DR. KITCHEN:

This is why we were elected, and we are not going to retaliate by declaring open season on Tories. We are not going to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

I am seriously considering, in the next budget, though, bringing in two taxes, one on mawmouths and one on lippers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did ask a question last night about the increases under the fish and game, the \$1.5 million increase. I told him then that I would get the information. He asked me, and I was not able to get it before Question Period this afternoon. He asked me again in Question Period. I still did not have the answer. But now I have been able to find out the answer to this question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

Thanks to the courtesy of the

Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, I will deliver this: \$350,000 of the \$500,000 increase is due to increased quotas for moose and caribou licenses for the 1989 season.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

Most of the remainder, Mr. Speaker, is for the implementation of fee increases that were introduced in the 1988 budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are seriously considering, after discussion with ministers - I do not want to make this a formal promise or announcement - reviewing all these nuisance taxes and fees and eliminating all those we can, all those Tory nuisances. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I just want to say to the hon. minister, on a point of order, that I knew the answers to those questions. But I wanted the minister to know them as well, and that is why I asked the questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Government House
Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Just briefly to that point of
order. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious
that there is no point of order
once again, for about the
hundredth time in the last few
weeks. Obviously the member
opposite must have known the
answer, because they were the ones
who introduced those taxes in the
first place.

MR. SPEAKER:

This House now stands adjourned
until tomorrow, Friday, at 9:00
a.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

June 22, 1989

*Tabled by Hon. Minister
of Justice 22 June '89*

Question:

On Order Paper 11/89, Mr. Len Simms (Grand Falls) asked that the following information be laid upon the Table of the House:

An itemized list of travel expenditures incurred by the Minister, his Executive Assistant or any member of the Minister's personal or Departmental staff who may have accompanied him since May 5, 1989.

Answer:

Minister:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Purpose of Trip</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Cost</u>
1989-05-12	- Canadian Paraplegic Association	Corner Brook	\$356.00
	- Annual inspection of 511 Humber Annual Cadet Squadron	" "	
1989-05-19	- Officially representing Government at the 60th Annual Lions Atlantic Canada Convention	Corner Brook	\$380.20
1989-06-09	- Federal/Provincial Meeting of Attorneys General	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	\$1,265.21

Deputy Minister:

1989-06-09	- Federal/Provincial Meeting of Attorneys General	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	\$1,049.09
------------	---	-----------------------	------------

*Tabled by Hon.
Minister of Justice
22 June, 1989.*

Question:

On Order Paper 11/89, Mr. Len Simms (Grand Falls) asked that the following information be laid upon the Table of the House:

An itemized list for any office equipment, personal equipment, furnishings and photographs purchased for the Minister's Office since May 5, 1989.

Answer:

Three certificates were framed by the Department of Works, Services and Transportation; however, there was no cost to the Department for this service.



Tabled by Hon. Minister
of Finance 22 June, 1989

GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Office of the Minister

East Block
Confederation Building Complex
St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5T7

June 21, 1989

Mr. Speaker,

I wish to table a list of temporary loans raised pursuant to Section 44 and Section 45 of the Financial Administration Act, 1973, as amended. I am tabling this list in accordance with the requirements of Section 45 of the Act.

HUBERT W. KITCHEN
Minister of Finance

Statement Of Overdrafts
For The Period March 10, 1988 - May 25, 1989

Date Borrowed		Amount	Date Paid	
March	16 ,1988	1,273,220.02	March	17 ,1988
March	18 ,1988	2,338,693.81	March	21 ,1988
March	25 ,1988	4,882,929.49	March	28 ,1988
April	5 ,1988	13,340,339.30	April	6 ,1988
April	7 ,1988	7,273,575.72	April	8 ,1988
April	8 ,1988	188,391.87	April	11 ,1988
April	11 ,1988	7,361,760.93	April	12 ,1988
April	15 ,1988	2,391,154.98	April	18 ,1988
April	18 ,1988	3,174,124.61	April	19 ,1988
April	19 ,1988	12,859,909.58	April	20 ,1988
April	22 ,1988	1,554,106.16	April	25 ,1988
April	25 ,1988	2,132,584.78	April	26 ,1988
May	9 ,1988	4,618,757.20	May	10 ,1988
May	10 ,1988	1,814,715.16	May	11 ,1988
June	3 ,1988	434,201.17	June	6 ,1988
June	8 ,1988	1,898,763.32	June	9 ,1988
June	15 ,1988	1,471,940.84	June	16 ,1988
July	25 ,1988	4,092,496.08	July	26 ,1988
August	1 ,1988	19,616,602.63	August	2 ,1988
August	4 ,1988	11,189,454.55	August	5 ,1988
August	10 ,1988	1,098,874.28	August	11 ,1988
August	17 ,1988	11,256,563.37	August	18 ,1988
August	25 ,1988	1,292,821.97	August	26 ,1988
August	30 ,1988	1,729,179.73	August	31 ,1988
September	1 ,1988	20,894,606.31	September	2 ,1988
September	2 ,1988	44,029.36	September	6 ,1988
September	9 ,1988	836,384.62	September	12 ,1988
September	12 ,1988	7,295,448.37	September	13 ,1988
September	15 ,1988	41,318,306.69	September	16 ,1988
September	23 ,1988	1,290,674.36	September	26 ,1988
October	3 ,1988	3,469,870.03	October	4 ,1988
October	7 ,1988	4,024,820.76	October	11 ,1988
October	13 ,1988	788,583.40	October	14 ,1988
October	18 ,1988	5,259,206.46	October	19 ,1988
October	26 ,1988	1,195,580.36	October	27 ,1988
October	28 ,1988	2,068,700.63	October	31 ,1988
November	7 ,1988	675,254.06	November	8 ,1988
November	14 ,1988	6,076,246.26	November	15 ,1988
November	15 ,1988	7,033,170.16	November	16 ,1988
December	1 ,1988	2,108,592.97	December	2 ,1988
December	8 ,1988	970,914.58	December	9 ,1988
December	19 ,1988	679,596.78	December	20 ,1988
December	21 ,1988	8,660,524.25	December	22 ,1988
December	22 ,1988	3,784,175.51	December	23 ,1988
January	30 ,1989	2,009,017.26	January	31 ,1989
February	1 ,1989	584,564.02	February	2 ,1989
February	2 ,1989	1,904,021.08	February	3 ,1989
February	8 ,1989	1,524,025.23	February	9 ,1989
February	10 ,1989	2,964,099.97	February	13 ,1989
February	24 ,1989	10,663,692.75	February	27 ,1989
March	2 ,1989	3,240,702.69	March	3 ,1989
March	3 ,1989	541,042.18	March	4 ,1989
March	10 ,1989	3,762,000.85	March	13 ,1989
March	17 ,1989	1,359,831.48	March	20 ,1989
March	23 ,1989	4,899,425.03	March	27 ,1989
April	7 ,1989	11,932,882.64	April	10 ,1989
April	10 ,1989	10,879,592.51	April	11 ,1989
April	11 ,1989	7,553,028.17	April	12 ,1989
April	12 ,1989	5,404,448.17	April	13 ,1989
April	13 ,1989	6,141,092.94	April	14 ,1989
April	17 ,1989	7,977,716.75	April	18 ,1989
April	18 ,1989	5,453,745.66	April	19 ,1989
April	19 ,1989	12,718,824.03	April	20 ,1989
April	25 ,1989	245,919.23	April	26 ,1989
April	28 ,1989	12,383,793.11	May	1 ,1989
May	2 ,1989	5,359,689.44	May	3 ,1989
May	3 ,1989	4,805,395.98	May	4 ,1989
May	5 ,1989	2,001,791.53	May	8 ,1989
May	10 ,1989	1,150,737.32	May	11 ,1989
May	11 ,1989	3,284,847.63	May	12 ,1989
May	15 ,1989	17,310,773.48	May	16 ,1989

Statement Of Temporary Borrowings Via
Province Of Newfoundland Treasury Bill Issues

Amount	Interest Rate	Date Issued		Date Redeemed	
9,794,050	8.434	March	17, 1988	June	16, 1988
9,790,450	8.585	March	24, 1988	June	23, 1988
9,790,800	8.570	March	31, 1988	June	30, 1988
9,789,150	8.639	April	7, 1988	July	7, 1988
9,787,180	8.722	April	14, 1988	July	14, 1988
9,784,500	8.834	April	21, 1988	July	21, 1988
9,783,200	8.889	April	28, 1988	July	28, 1988
9,783,200	8.889	May	5, 1988	August	4, 1988
9,782,000	8.939	May	12, 1988	August	11, 1988
9,783,200	8.889	May	19, 1988	August	18, 1988
9,781,570	8.958	May	26, 1988	August	25, 1988
9,774,800	9.241	June	2, 1988	September	1, 1988
9,773,300	9.304	June	9, 1988	September	8, 1988
9,774,600	9.249	June	16, 1988	September	15, 1988
9,776,350	9.176	June	23, 1988	September	22, 1988
9,775,200	9.224	June	30, 1988	September	29, 1988
9,774,700	9.245	July	7, 1988	October	6, 1988
9,772,700	9.329	July	14, 1988	October	13, 1988
9,773,200	9.308	July	21, 1988	October	20, 1988
9,772,000	9.358	July	28, 1988	October	27, 1988
9,772,000	9.358	August	4, 1988	November	3, 1988
9,767,350	9.554	August	11, 1988	November	10, 1988
9,763,400	9.720	August	18, 1988	November	17, 1988
9,761,500	9.800	August	25, 1988	November	24, 1988
9,756,910	9.993	September	1, 1988	December	1, 1988
9,754,100	10.112	September	8, 1988	December	8, 1988
35,980,200	10.040	September	13, 1988	September	15, 1988
9,747,850	10.375	September	15, 1988	December	15, 1988
9,747,300	10.399	September	22, 1988	December	22, 1988
9,747,360	10.396	September	29, 1988	December	29, 1988
9,748,700	10.339	October	6, 1988	January	5, 1989
9,747,500	10.390	October	13, 1988	January	12, 1989
9,749,950	10.287	October	20, 1988	January	19, 1989
9,748,700	10.339	October	27, 1988	January	26, 1989
9,744,100	10.534	November	3, 1988	February	2, 1989
9,739,040	10.748	November	10, 1988	February	9, 1989
9,739,950	10.710	November	17, 1988	February	16, 1989
9,739,450	10.730	November	24, 1988	February	23, 1989
9,736,900	10.838	December	1, 1988	March	2, 1989
9,732,750	11.014	December	8, 1988	March	9, 1989
9,731,960	11.040	December	15, 1988	March	16, 1989
9,734,250	10.950	December	22, 1988	March	23, 1989
9,733,200	10.995	December	29, 1988	March	30, 1989
9,734,000	10.961	January	5, 1989	April	6, 1989
9,729,160	11.166	January	12, 1989	April	13, 1989
9,724,950	11.344	January	19, 1989	April	20, 1989
9,725,900	11.304	January	26, 1989	April	27, 1989
9,725,610	11.316	February	2, 1989	May	4, 1989
9,723,600	11.402	February	9, 1989	May	11, 1989
49,970,500	10.850	February	13, 1989	February	15, 1989
9,719,900	11.559	February	16, 1989	May	18, 1989
9,718,800	11.605	February	23, 1989	May	25, 1989
9,709,090	12.018	March	2, 1989	June	1, 1989
9,710,050	11.977	March	9, 1989	June	8, 1989
9,709,500	12.000	March	16, 1989	June	15, 1989
9,704,250	12.224	March	23, 1989	June	22, 1989
9,705,000	12.190	March	30, 1989	June	29, 1989
9,704,100	12.230	April	6, 1989	July	6, 1989
9,703,250	12.267	April	13, 1989	July	13, 1989
39,934,000	12.030	April	14, 1989	April	19, 1989
9,700,700	12.375	April	20, 1989	July	20, 1989
9,699,200	12.439	April	27, 1989	July	27, 1989
9,699,250	12.437	May	4, 1989	August	3, 1989
9,700,850	12.380	May	11, 1989	August	10, 1989
9,706,250	12.140	May	18, 1989	August	17, 1989
9,704,900	12.196	May	25, 1989	August	24, 1989



Called by Hon. Minister
of Finance 22 June '89

GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Office of the Minister

East Block
Confederation Building Complex
St. John's, Newfoundland A1C 5T7

June 21, 1989

Mr. Speaker,

In accordance with the requirements of Section 51 of the Financial Administration Act, I wish to table a list of guaranteed loans paid by the Province during the previous financial year.

HUBERT W. KITCHEN
Minister of Finance

Pursuant to Section 51, Paragraph 3, of the Financial Administration Act, the following is a list of the guaranteed loans paid out by the Province since the last Sitting of the House.

<u>Company</u>	<u>Principal Amount Guaranteed</u>	<u>Payments (principal & interest) Made During The Period 88-03-17 to 89-06-20</u>
Atlantic Ocean Farms Limited	\$ 270,000	\$ 273,058.76
Port-au-Port Seafoods Limited	\$ 150,000	\$ 155,576.70
Brig Bay Fisheries Limited	\$ 150,000	\$ 155,822.59
Island Tile and Slate Limited	\$ 250,000	\$ 260,238.54
Bradshaw's Cove Fisheries Limited	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000.00
Ichthus Sea Products Limited	\$ 200,000	\$ 207,559.77
Easteel Industries (1984) Limited	\$1,349,000	\$1,394,740.48
Fisheries Loan Board Bank Loan Guarantee Program: Mr. Thomas Pittman	\$ 57,052	\$ 53,031.28

* In addition to the principal amount, the Province guarantees the interest accruing thereon as well.