



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 20

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Tuesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

27 June 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, hon. members of the House of Assembly, I am pleased to announce that Government has approved \$200,000 to improve the Province's tourism information facilities during 1989/90. The following projects have been approved:

The Government has approved \$100,000 for the purpose of providing a new interpretive display for the interior of the provincial information center at Port Aux Basques. As you are aware, Port aux Basques is the major gateway to the Province for non-resident visitors who arrive by automobile. A major center in this area, capable of providing an awareness of what this province has to offer the visitor is of primary importance to our tourism effort. Preliminary work to prepare the design and construct the new displays will begin at once so the project will be completed for the 1990 tourism season.

The Port Aux Basques facility was opened in 1978. Unfortunately, the temporary interior display installed at that time has received very few improvements over the past few years.

Considering the fact that more than 20,000 visitors stopped at the center last year to view the displays, it is indeed unfortunate more emphasis has not been placed on such facilities in the past.

With respect to Whitbourne and Deer Lake information centers, improvements to these centers was commenced in 1988/89 and due to deteriorating weather conditions, work was halted earlier than expected. The funding approval to complete these projects is budgeted at \$20,000. This funding will be utilized to complete the parking lot and the associated lighting at Deer Lake and to complete the improvements to the grounds surrounding the information center at Whitbourne.

With respect to highway signage, we must continue to improve tourism signage and this government will continue to stress the importance of promotional aspects of highway signs for tourist establishments and public attractions. In the near future, I will be presenting my colleagues with details of a partial deregulation policy for highway commercial signage. In the meantime, in an effort to improve the plaza signage system, arrangements have been made with local information center operations at Grand Falls, Gander, Wiltondale, Corner Brook and Goobies to move local plaza signage from their remote sites and relocate the signs at the information centers. Funding approval has been provided in the amount of \$40,000 for this event.

With respect to mapping, to enhance the interpretive nature of these information plazas, construction of five cromolin maps are approved at a cost of

\$30,000. These maps will cover the areas served by these local information centers.

In terms of general improvements, improvements of an ongoing nature are required for the four regional information centers at Deer Lake, Notre Dame Junction, Clarenville, and Whitbourne. \$10,000 has been provided to improve these facilities.

Mr. Speaker, given the importance of such information facilities to our tourism effort, I will be pursuing the improvement of similar facilities, particularly those that are located along the major travel corridors in our Province.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that our Federal counterparts do not appear to place the same importance on the tourism industry as this government has, and the previous government has. Recent announcements that there will be no future tourism development subsidiary agreements and that the federal tourism marketing plan will be reduced from \$35 million to \$20 million over the next two years is indeed damaging and discouraging to this Province. Recognizing that this Province does not have the competitive level of tourism development as other Canadian Provinces, I want to assure all members, on all sides of the House, that this Government is making strong representation to have these decisions overturned at the earliest possible opportunity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me thank the hon. minister for providing us with a copy of the statement. We certainly welcome the initiatives contained in the statement. Anything we can do to attract more tourism dollars to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador would be welcomed by those of us on this side of the House, I can assure the minister of that. We compliment him on those initiatives and we are hopeful that they will be useful in improving the tourism plant and enticing people to visit the Province.

In terms of the lack of a federal/provincial arrangement, Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister and the government have to do more than just announce they are going to Ottawa looking for a \$60 million agreement and expect that it is going to fall into their lap, as I understand some of the responses from the Government of Canada, not to be defensive for them, they are big enough to defend themselves. But as I understand it, that is all that has been done to this point in time. So for the minister to be crying foul before detailed negotiations take place might be a bit premature.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
I am pleased to inform my hon. colleagues of my Department's

decision to relocate the Youth Remand Service which presently operates out of Building 1045, Pleasantville - commonly known as the Pleasantville Remand Centre.

On or before July 31 of this year, the remand operation will be relocated to a wing of the St. John's Youth Centre at Building 43, Torbay Airport East. Building 43 currently houses a secure custody centre for sentenced young offenders.

The results of the research and planning which has recently been completed on the needs, characteristics, and behavior of remand young persons in this Province has clearly shown that the vast majority of them are non-violent and do not pose a serious threat to themselves or others. My department is of the view that most of these young persons can be housed in less restrictive environments in which they can be treated in a more normalized fashion by being integrated into a broader range of educational, recreational and social activities.

Building 43 at Torbay is organized on a living unit model. It is the intention of my department to have one of these living units programmed to serve as a remand unit for up to seven young persons remanded by the courts. This relocation of the remand unit will enable the department to house remanded young persons in a physically less secure, and less restrictive environment. It will make it possible to implement improvements in the nature and quality of the day-to-day living arrangements for remanded youths by facilitating the process of integrating these youths into the full range of programs and

activities available at the St. John's Youth Center.

Building 43 is an older building which, when renovated last year, for use as a secure custody and remand center, was intended only as a temporary site of operations. Therefore, the arrangements now being put into place for remand are intended to serve only for a interim period of two to three years until the Province's proposed new secure custody and remand facilities are constructed. Due to the limitations of building 43 in terms of its physical suitability as a site for a secure custody and/or remand operation, my department will, as it has done in the past, continue to exercise caution in choosing which young persons are housed at building 43. Also, in recognition of these limitations, my department will ensure that appropriate back-up resources are in place for the accommodation of those youths who, because of their offence history, behaviour, or personal characteristics, would pose a threat to themselves or others if they were housed at building 43.

To this end, my department will continue to have available remand spaces for up to three youths at the Whitbourne Youth Center and will also continue to maintain a limited number of beds at the Pleasantville Remand Center for emergency use. However, the use of these reserve spaces, both at Pleasantville and at Whitbourne, will be very strictly controlled in accordance with a set of policies now being developed by my department. They will be used only on a very short term contingency basis, only after a broad range of other control methods have been attempted. They

will be used only to accommodate youths who cannot safely be housed in the less secure environment at Building 43. The use of these reserve spaces will require special approval and will be very closely monitored by senior officials in my department. The approval criteria will limit the use of these reserve spaces to only those situations - and only those time periods - when the young person in question would pose significant danger to himself/herself or others if housed in the less secure environment at Building 43. It is anticipated that the necessity to use these reserve remand spaces will be infrequent.

My department is very confident that the relocation of the remand service to Building 43 will be very successful and will result in a much more humane and productive experience for those youths who are remanded by the courts. The department is highly committed to this move.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, in keeping with its commitment to deinstitutionalization and the maximization of the use of community-based services, the department will continue to work with the police, the courts, and the community, to seek effective community alternatives to residential remand. As I have expressed in the past, I have particular concern over the numbers of youths being ordered to periods of remand and over the lengthy duration of some of these periods. In this respect, I will personally continue to work very closely with my hon. colleague, the Minister of Justice, to explore, co-operatively, what our departments can do to ensure that the justice system and the courts

as well as the young offenders service system all work in the best interests of the youths with whom they deal.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, let me say that as I listened to the minister read this, I was expecting something a lot different from what he put forth.

The minister starts off by saying he is pleased with his department decision's to relocate the Youth Remand Center which presently operates out of Building 1045 at Pleasantville, and he goes on to say in his statement that there will also be, because of the situation there and the less restrictive aspect of it, the old Remand Center will still be in place and there will be beds made available at Whitbourne for people who are considered to be of some significant danger to themselves or others.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say that there is nothing new in this statement. This is a policy that was outlined by the previous administration.

The previous administration decided some time ago, when I was minister, and I was not the last minister, by the way, Mr. Speaker, to move the Boys' Home into the old School for the Deaf, building

43. At that time, Mr. Speaker, we took one wing for people who were considered not dangerous; we had all the materials ordered and the announcement made to move people who were considered to be no threat to themselves or to other residents into another wing of the Remand Centre. We also said at that time that we would keep the Remand centre intact for people considered to be dangerous and a threat to other people. That is exactly what the minister stated here today, Mr. Speaker. Nothing has changed!

Today, the minister is trying to put himself forward as someone who has done something for the people in Remand, when actually, as the records will show, what he announced today is exactly the same as that announced by the previous administration. That does not get the Minister of Social Services off the hook for not fulfilling the commitment he made to the people of the Province. This clearly states, Mr. Speaker, that the Remand Centre will be used for the people who are considered to be dangerous.

MR. EFFORD:
No.

MR. TOBIN:
Yes, Mr. Speaker. And that the cells in Whitbourne will be used. That is what the minister is saying. I know. I was there. The wing we announced would be put in place, that is what he is announcing.

The minister says there is going to be special approval required to put young offenders in the Remand Centre. Let me ask the minister, is there not approval required now, Mr. Speaker? Does someone not ask the courts for approval to

put them in there? It is not up to the senior officials in the department to decide who goes in there.

Mr. Speaker, let me also say to the minister that I am not surprised by what he said here today. Because I know the advice that was given to me by the officials of that department when I wanted to see if we could put all the remand people there. When I asked the minister the other night, in the Estimates Committee, if he made the decision to move the Remand Center, which we thought he was going to do, but we find today it is different, or if he did it on the recommendations of his officials, he refused to answer saying, 'I bear responsibility for the decision.'

I know the advice that was given him. Because in that facility down there there is piping which goes through the building that is not considered permissible, the windows, Mr. Speaker, are not permissible, the electrical outlets are inside the doors rather than on the outside which, if someone with suicidal tendencies wanted to try something, would permit them to do so; a person can run, hit the weights for the fire doors, bounce them open and go on through.

Because of those inadequacies, Mr. speaker, we were instructed not to turn that building into a full-fledged Remand Centre. It is quite apparent that what the minister has put forth here today is a sham. He is trying to slither away from the commitment he made. He cannot fulfill the commitment he made to the people of this Province, and what he announced today is exactly what was announced by the previous

administration. Mr. Speaker, nothing has changed. Not a thing!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to inform the House of Assembly that on June 22 the Lieutenant-Governor in Council considered a report from the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities, the PUB, setting forth recommendations with respect to the rates which Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro charges to its retail customers. This report and its recommendations also covered several other important issues.

Mr. Speaker, the following are the main recommendations of the PUB:

The interest coverage remain as proposed by Hydro at 1.15 to 1.25 times the gross interest. This range was established by the PUB at Hydro's first hearing in 1977 and reaffirmed at all subsequent hearings. The PUB has recommended that a cap of 120 times gross interest on earnings for retail customers, which was voluntarily accepted by Hydro in 1985, continue and that Hydro return any earnings in excess of this amount annually to its retail customers.

Number two: The methods of depreciation as are presently used by Hydro be approved. After hearing expert evidence on this matter, the PUB concluded that the depreciation methods used by Hydro

are of benefit to the consumers and do not affect the soundness of Hydro's financial position.

No. 3: The rate stabilization plan continue as approved by the PUB in 1985 with the exception that the price of oil used for the purposes of the plan be changed as proposed by Hydro, from \$30.00 to \$18.00 per barrel, and that certain minor changes in the monthly pricing of oil as proposed be accepted.

No. 4: Hydro submit, at its next public hearing, a comprehensive plan covering such items as proposed capital expenditures, interest coverage target, depth equity ratio, etc.

No. 5: The policy with respect to foreign exchange losses which was proposed by Hydro in 1985 be approved in principle. However, the PUB recommended a slightly longer period of amortization for two specific losses that have been incurred since the 1985 hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform you that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has approved all of the recommendations contained in the report, without alteration, and I now table a copy of that report for your review and for the information of other members of this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the hon. minister for, in his normal courtesy fashion, sending us over a copy of the Ministerial Statement. I guess I

would also like to thank him, as well, on behalf of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, for continuing the sound policies that were laid down by the Progressive Conservative administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:
For anyone who wants to look at this statement in any kind of clear detail, all parts of it are saying that everything, at least as it relates to the government's reactions with Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, are on pretty good ground and are not subject to the change policies of the new administration. The range established in 1977 stays in place, the method of depreciation stays in place as it was, the rate stabilization program will continue as approved in 1985, the policy with respect to foreign exchange, as proposed by Hydro in 1985, continues.

So I can only say, from this side of the House, that on behalf of all residents we are glad you are continuing the sound management practice as it relates to Hydro. I can also say, Mr. Speaker, that this side of the House and the people of Newfoundland are aware that the Public Utilities Board only makes recommendations to the Cabinet of Newfoundland and Labrador. In this case, the recommendations were approved without alteration. All I can say is that somewhere down the road, when the \$10 million fund that the public treasury is taking from Hydro this year is recommended by the Newfoundland Public Utilities Board for an increase in hydro fees, that the consumer of this Province is going to realize that Hydro rate increases are going to

go up because of that \$10 million fee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the former Executive Assistant to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs has publicly claimed that the minister lied about circumstances related to his hiring - that is, the EA's hiring - and that same gentleman has claimed that the minister has lied about his responsibilities - that is, the former EA - within the department and with the government, and that the minister, as well, has lied about funding approved for the Avion Players in Gander, can I ask the minister this: Has the minister briefed the Premier on those developments and, if so, what advice has the minister given to the Premier on how to handle those serious allegations that have been publicly made by his former employee?

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

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, as I have stated before, no funding has been

approved for the Avion Players in Gander. I think I have said that at least twice in the House already. That is a statement of fact.

Secondly, this minister did not lie on any occasion.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
The question was: Has the hon. minister briefed the Premier on those developments and those allegations that have been made publicly by his former EA, and what advice has the minister tendered to the Premier on how those serious allegations should be handled?

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

MR. GULLAGE:
The question is so ludicrous, but I will answer it anyway.

Mr. Speaker, obviously I do not go about briefing the Premier on **The Sunday Express** articles or any other articles. I am sure he can read them for himself. As far as saying that I lied, in that article or whatever, that is obviously untrue. I did not lie on any occasion. And why would I brief the Premier on a newspaper article? It does not make sense. He can read as well as I can.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:
In view of the fact that the former EA to the minister alleges to have contributed thousands of dollars in cash and services to the minister's re-election campaign, and in view of the fact that that same person says that he only made those large contributions because there had been a deal between the now minister and his former Executive Assistant, has the minister informed the Premier of the details of that so-called deal? And what advice has he given to the Premier on how those allegations should be handled?

MR. SIMMS:
That is ludicrous, too, I suppose!

MR. RIDEOUT:
That is ludicrous, too, I suppose, is it?

MR. GULLAGE:
Yes, it is.

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

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, there was no deal, as was implied. The allegations made by my former assistant that he contributed the amounts stated, and so on and so forth, is in fact incorrect. So why would I brief the Premier on an untruth?

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The minister is quoted to have said he did not know anything about contributions. Now for some reason they are wrong. Is not the minister aware, Mr. Speaker, that such a deal could not be tolerated under those new standards that the Premier preaches about in this House every day? And if he is aware of that, has the minister yet gone to the Premier and said, Look, I made a mistake and I will tender my resignation?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, come on now!

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

MR. GULLAGE:
Surely heavens the Leader of the Opposition is not serious. Is this a serious question, surely heavens?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Sure, it is serious!

MR. MATTHEWS:
You were bought!

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, let me repeat once again: There was absolutely no deal, so anything that is said concerning a deal, it did not exist. Do I need to say anything else? What else do you want me to do?

MR. SIMMS:
Are you saying that allegations that you were bought -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Resign!

MR. SIMMS:

- is not a serious allegation?

MR. GULLAGE:
When it is not true it is not serious.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General (Mr. Dicks). And I refer the Minister of Justice to Schedule C Section 5 of The Conflict of Interest Act, 108. 'Everyone who has been a holder of a judicial office or has been a member of Parliament or a Legislature corruptly accepts or obtains, agrees to accept or obtain or agrees to obtain' - a whole range of things including goods and services, promises for employment and so on - 'is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment of fourteen years.' Now let me ask the Minister of Justice is there going to be an investigation? Because a former employee of the minister alleges all those things to have taken place. The minister alleges they did not. We do not know who to believe. The people do not know who to believe. Now, is there going to be an investigation into this or not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DICKS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DICKS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In reply to the question posed by the Leader of the Opposition, as the Leader well knows the Ministry of Justice acts on complaints, and to my knowledge no complaint had been received. And if one is made we will then determine whether or not an investigation should be carried out. Prior to that time, any comment on a matter that may be the subject of judicial proceedings would be, of course, premature.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, I have other questions for the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. Mr. Speaker, there are glaring discrepancies between what this minister has said in this House and what has been said outside the House by the former Executive Assistant, Mr. Baird, by Mr. Baker, as reported by CBC radio and The Sunday Express. Now, Mr. Speaker, these discrepancies raise serious doubts about this minister's credibility. Item 1: Last Thursday in this House I asked the minister three times early in the afternoon, late in the afternoon, and again in the evening, about his knowledge of a departmental grant to an amateur theatre company in Gander. Mr. Speaker, the minister replied, and I quote from Hansard, 'I have no knowledge of it right now'. Yet

we find out from The Sunday Express that Mr. Baird said, 'It was the straw that broke the camel's back.' It was the incident that precipitated his resignation. We hear the group in Gander, based on what the member for Gander -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The member is rather long in getting at the question, and I ask the member to please get at the question.

MS VERGE:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

We hear the member for Gander made assurances to the group in Gander. Mr. Speaker, will the minister clarify now whether he told the truth in the House on Thursday in answer to my questions? Did he tell the truth when he said that he had consulted artists? Did he tell the truth about what he authorized Jim Baird to do as his Executive Assistant, or can he revise his answers and tell us the full and true story now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, they are really grasping for questions on the other side. Now, all these urgent and important questions that are coming from the other side -

MR. RIDEOUT:
It is not up to you to decide what is urgent. It is up to you to answer the questions.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I just want to recognize the minister.

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Baird knew quite correctly what his duties were. His duties were to simply be an assistant. Developing policies -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Answer the question.

MR. GULLAGE:

I am answering the question. She asked me to describe what Mr. Baird's duties were. They were those of an assistant, nothing else.

What was your other question? Whether the grant was approved?

MS VERGE:

Yes.

MR. GULLAGE:

It was not approved. I have told you now at least six times. Do you want me to say it six more times?

MR. SIMMS:

But did you know about it on Friday?

MS VERGE:

On Thursday.

MR. SIMMS:

No, he would not answer that.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

So Jim Baird is lying!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber Valley.

MS VERGE:

I am from Humber East, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am sorry! Humber East.

MS VERGE:

I would like the minister to tell us whether on Thursday of last week he knew about the application from the Avion Players in Gander, whether he knew that his staff was acting to approve it, whether he knew the member for Gander was pushing for it, and whether he knew that Mr. Baird was extremely upset about it because it violated the principle of arm's length funding for the arts which the minister and his assistant had assured artists this new government was committed to?

MR. SIMMS:

Did you know on Thursday? That is the question.

MR. WARREN:

No answer.

MR. SIMMS:

No, because he cannot answer it. He would be lying if he did.

MS VERGE:

No answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, with the member's silence we can only assume that he did not tell the truth here on Thursday.

MR. GULLAGE:

I answered it six times. What do you want me to do?

MS VERGE:

My final question is about

patronage in awarding funding to the arts in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday, after I asked the question -

MR. GULLAGE:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order.

MR. GULLAGE:

Repeat that line again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the member up on a point of order?

MR. GULLAGE:

Yes.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order, it is a point of foolishness.

MR. GULLAGE:

A point of order. I would like to have repeated what you just said.

MR. SIMMS:

That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I was beginning to ask about the minister's statement on Friday in Question Period in answer to my fourth asking of the question, that his department had received an application from the Avion Players but no decision had been made. I would like to ask the minister now, what process he is going to use to adjudicate that application, and is he going to refer the application to the Arts Council, where it should have been sent in the first place?

MR. SIMMS:

Or Treasury Board.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, we do, in fact, have an application before my department. That application could be considered by the Arts Council. Unfortunately, it is of a nature where it is travelling for an amateur group. The present policy in the department only allows for travel of professional groups or groups that, in fact, have received a federal - provincial joint grant. So there is some difficulty with the application on whether or not it can be even dealt with by the Arts Council. The only way we could deal with it is to develop a policy to allow that sort of application - not just that one, but others like it - to be approved.

Now, in the sense that it ties in directly to the Fortieth Anniversary of Confederation, it does have a status which other applications could very well hold that could be forthcoming throughout the balance of this year. So one way we could deal with it is on the basis of a criterion which would establish approval, if you like, or possible approval by the Arts Council of applications that would deal with travel or other expenses dealing with the Fortieth Anniversary.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The amateur?

MR. GULLAGE:

Amateur, that is right.

The present criteria of the Arts Council -

MR. SIMMS:

If they do not meet the criteria now they are out of luck.

MR. GULLAGE:

I am explaining that the present criteria does not allow approval of this particular grant.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister whether he, as the new Minister of Culture, is indulging in improvisational policy-making to cover his tracks?

MR. SIMMS:

Good question!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

No, Mr. Speaker. I have just finished explaining - it takes a long while to get it through - that the present criteria within the policy does not permit approval of this application. That is not to say that policy could not be developed to grant approval of applications, this one and others like it. Right now, we do not have policy to allow approval, whether by government or the Arts Council. Now, is that clear?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the hon. the Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice, as a lawyer, would know that a very fundamental premise of our legal system is that all citizens are equal under the law. Certainly, the Minister of Justice, as a lawyer, would know, as well, that one cannot allege ignorance of the law. Whether one knows or does not know is not a defense. And, since the Minister of Justice, by his own admission, has clearly violated The Conflict of Interest Act, Section 4, where he has admitted now that he did not disclose interest in land and buildings in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador - the minister has admitted that; he has filed an amendment but, of course, you only need file an amendment if something new comes by that you did not disclose in the last statement - can the minister tell the House whether or not we can expect to see charges laid against him because of the fact that he has now admitted to violating The Conflict of Interest Act?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In reply to the questions raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to say several things. He says, first of all, that there is an admission that the act was clearly violated. Now, with all due respect to his submission, I do

not think it is that clear, and I would suspect that the section that deals with listing, in addition to your shares, all assets held by a company is, in the words of Hamlet, 'a custom more honoured in the breach than the observance', and I suspect, quite frankly, that an examination of all the records filed by these members of the House and other in previous years would probably bear that out.

I would just like to add two things, to give a full answer to the question. As he knows, the penalty section under The Conflict of Interest Act, Section 12, includes the word 'knowingly', which means that there must be deliberate intent, on the part of a person who makes the statement or makes an error, that they knowingly intended to mislead.

Now, without commenting further, I think that speaks for itself as to whether or not charges should be laid, but I would also point out that as we are dealing with conflict of interest, it would probably be a little conflicting for me, as Minister of Justice, to comment to the hon. member as to whether or not I am guilty of charges. I think there is an apparent conflict, so I will defer from answering that part of the question.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister is the person I am quoting as having admitted publicly that he failed under Section 4 of this act, to

disclose what he should have disclosed under Section 4 of the act.

The minister has already said publicly, Mr. Speaker, that he had the advice of all of the lawyers down in Justice on this matter, which is something no member of this House has, as far as I know. We have to sit down and read the act ourselves or get a bit of legal advice from outside. The Minister of Forestry or nobody else had that kind of advice.

My question to the Minister of Justice is: How can the Minister of Justice, as a minister in this government, expect the ordinary Newfoundlander and Labradorian to believe that we are all equal before the law, when a minister, who clearly broke the law, is now saying that he is immune to the law? How can that be?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. DICKS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just several observations. It was not all of the members. Upon assuming the office of Minister, one of my first things was go and try to get this matter handled in the proper fashion. It was not, for reasons I will not go into. Essentially what happened was the day we were sworn in to the House, it had not been filed at that time. It was discovered by my department that it should be filed before we were sworn in. It was done in a rush and several errors were made.

Now, the point about that, Mr.

Speaker, as to whether or not charges should be laid, is that, as I said, the member is quoting from the section which establishes requirement and what should be in the conflict of interest legislation and the disclosure statements that are filed. That is in there, and I clearly indicated to the member of the press, who examined me on that and asked me questions, that I overlooked that, that in looking at this form, I did not realize at the time that probably to strictly comply with the act I should have included, in addition to disclosing my corporate holdings, which I did do, I would also and should have probably included the land that was owned by the company, being at 96 West Street.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member knows, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition, is that all the holdings of that company are a matter of public knowledge anyway. It is well known in Corner Brook that I am the owner of that building through this company, and I would have to be Houdini to try to hide that, even if I wanted to. There was no deliberate or other intent on my part to try to withhold that information.

I just say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that what the member is quoting from is the wording, not the penalty section of the Act. The penalty section of the act includes provision that you must knowingly make that error, if you will. As to whether or not charges will follow, like I say, that question should probably be directed to someone other than myself.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, a kindergarten student could look through the Conflict of Interest form that each of us had to fill out, as members of this House, and fill it out properly, let alone a lawyer and a Minister of Justice. A kindergarten student could do that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me refer the hon. minister to Section 12 of the Act: Every person who fails to comply with or otherwise contravenes any provision of that Act, or knowingly. He hangs it all on knowingly. It is more than just that. It is 'fails', contravenes a section of the Act or knowingly does certain things, 'is liable on conviction, to a fine of not more than \$1,000.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister trying to tell the people of this Province that that Act is not meant for him. That it is meant for everybody else who is covered in there but it is not meant for him? So there is a double standard here again now with this six-week-old administration. Is that what the minister is trying to tell the Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. DICKS:
No, of course not, Mr. Speaker. I just want to indicate to the Leader of the Opposition that he is oversimplifying. The Section has to be read whether or not an offence would lie under it is

something for a person other than myself to determine, quite frankly. I think that question would have to be directed elsewhere if you want an answer to that. If you are accusing me of conflict of interest, on the one hand I think I can hardly be expected to objectively sit on whether or not I have done something wrong, or otherwise, myself. So that is all.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, how can the Minister of Justice be so naive as to think there is one soul in Newfoundland and Labrador could believe that he was receiving remuneration for space from a Crown corporation and that he did not have to report it on his conflict of interest statement? Who would believe that? There is not a person in Ming's Bight who would believe that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:
To the rescue, the Lone Ranger.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There has been a lot of rhetoric and a lot of comments made and I would like to attempt to answer the Leader of the Opposition in this way.

The instructions as to how to fill out the Conflict of Interest Statement, the specific wording, are in printed form for everybody to see. I would simply like to point out to hon. members that whereas there may be some doubt as to the meaning of some of the instructions, that to follow the line of questioning of members opposite, I would suggest that all members of the House look back over their own personal situation, and I am serious about this now -

MR. SIMMS:
Has it something to do with the question?

MR. BAKER:
Yes. It is very relevant to the question.

- to see if a company that you have an interest in, that you have declared, that you have specifically mentioned the land that that company sits on. Now this is the bone of contention here. It has nothing to do with a failure to disclose the ownership of that business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No. no!

MR. BAKER:
Nothing whatsoever. But I would simply like to say to members on both sides - members on both sides and I stress that now - that over the next short while they go back and check their own Conflict of Interest declarations to make sure that everything there is within the strictest interpretation of the directions.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Mine is already filed.

MR. BAKER:
And so is mine, but I intend to go

back and check.

The answer to the question is that there has been disclosure on the Conflict of Interest Statements, there has been complete disclosure, and both situations that you have referred to have been dealt with properly; in one case, the lease of a little bit of office space to a regional director, or something, and in the other case a liquor store, and in both cases attempts are being made to solve the situation so that there is no conflict, so that there is no chance of an individual gaining from his or her position. Now, that is being done. That is the simple truth of the matter. There is no conflict. The hon. member jumps from one thing to another and there is a very large gap between there.

MR. SIMMS:
A point of order.

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

MR. SIMMS:
I am very reluctant to raise a point of order during Question Period, but it is obvious what the President of the Council is trying to do. He is trying to delay time so that Question Period runs out and members here on this side cannot ask questions. The Leader of the Opposition asked a very short and precise question and the Government House Leader gets up and answers for two minutes, trailing on, talking about nothing as he did on Friday. He is trying to cover the rear end of the member behind him.

MR. BAKER:
To that point of order, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:
What I am trying to do, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the Opposition House Leader, is to simply explain the situation.

MR. SIMMS:
You are wasting the time of Question Period.

MR. BAKER:
If we are going to be subject to question, after question, after question, that says the same thing and does not really mean anything, then, Mr. Speaker, I felt that I had the right to explain the situation as it existed. Now, that is all I attempted to do, Mr. Speaker. There may have been a point of order in the sense that I may have been a little too long, and I agree to that point.

MR. SPEAKER:
To the point of order, there was in substance no point of order, but I believe that the minister, as he himself acknowledged, was getting rather long. It is hard for the Chair to instantly make a judgement on whether the minister is being too long, particularly when the questions have been repetitious and we are trying to delve into what is a very difficult subject. The Chair will continue to keep monitoring the situation; if ministers are long, we will ensure that they are reminded, and the same with questions when they are long.

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, it appears the only one missing over there is Patricia Starr and I wonder if she really is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Development regarding the Marystown Shipyard and the shrimp trawler for FPI. The minister stated last week that there will be no new funds made available in terms of providing a subsidy to the Marystown Shipyard to construct the trawler for FPI, and that the only consideration is whether or not to use the subsidies that were put in place by this government, negotiated by the present Leader of the Opposition, for the Marystown Shipyard to be able to construct vessels for FPI. I say to the minister, Mr. Speaker, that that should be done automatically, if he is not going to put in any new funds, and I wonder if he can tell me if any decision has been made up to now as to whether or not the Shipyard will be given that contract through the subsidies put in place by us?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the member's preamble is correct when he says that I said there was no new money available to subsidize the Marystown Shipyard. Mr. Speaker, if I had a magic wand and I could turn cucumbers into ships, I could subsidize five -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

- vessels tomorrow, but I cannot. There is no new money.

With respect to the current \$9 million that sits there, yes indeed, we are assessing that situation and we are getting very close to making a decision. It was brought before the Resource Policy Committee, it was brought before Treasury Board, and it was brought before the full Cabinet. I mentioned last week, and I will mention again, that one has to review this matter in terms of whether it makes economic sense and they weigh and factor into it the social ramifications. When you mix both into the mix you have to make a decision. I tell you that the Cabinet instructed me, as the Minister responsible for this Crown Corporation, to approach the various parties involved: Fishery Products International, Marystown Shipyard management, the Canadian government, who will be putting up 50 per cent of this subsidy, and the union involved. I have worked since Friday through the weekend.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Meanwhile, all the work will be gone to Halifax.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I said on Friday, I say today, and I will keep saying that the Chair can only entertain one question. Hon members are reminded, please, not to put other questions to a minister while he is answering a question, otherwise the minister can get answering the question and we are going to get the complaint that the minister is too long. So please only answer the main questioner.

I would ask the minister to

proceed and finish up.

MR. FUREY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for protecting me from these vicious interjections.

So I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the Cabinet instructed me, as one of the entire Cabinet, to speak to the four various parties involved: The Canadian Government, because they are a 50 per cent partner in this subsidy, to speak to them with respect to the extension of the Canadianization of the shrimp fishery; to discuss with Fishery Products International their bid versus the bid from Marystown Shipyard; to talk to the Marystown Shipyards about the state of their bid and whether it could be reduced; essentially to speak to all of the participants involved in this program to determine whether or not this would be the absolute minimum subsidy required. I can report to the House that my discussions did take place over the long weekend, that this minister did work diligently, he does have answers for Planning and Priorities, and he will give them tonight at that meeting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Let me ask the minister if he could give the House some information as to what the discussions were about, and is he asking any of the participants to make any concessions?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

That is possible, Mr. Speaker.

I cannot tell the hon. member when I have spoken to these various parties in confidence, and I stress confidence, Mr. Speaker. When I spoke with FPI, I said to them, 'I speak to you in confidence.' When I spoke to the Marystown Shipyard management, Mr. Speaker, I said to them, 'I speak to you in confidence.' When I spoke to the Canadian Government, I said to them, 'I speak to you in confidence.' And when I spoke to the union, I said, 'I speak to you in confidence.' I will not breach that confidence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the minister spoke about when he spoke in confidence to these individuals. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what he had to say to them either, but I would suspect it is something not too good from the way he has reacted here today.

Let me ask the minister, Mr. Speaker: Will he do the honourable thing, let the people of Marystown on the Burin Peninsula stay home and work instead of having to leave now and go to Ontario or St. John, New Brunswick or all of these other places? First of all, he should

be saying, 'Yes, there is new money.' But the fact that they decided not to do that, will he say to the Marystown Shipyard, 'Yes, there is a \$9 million subsidy available, negotiated by the previous administration. You can have that to build your shrimp trawler.' That is the least the minister can do, stop the anxiety that is taking place.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, yet again the hon. member shows us the infantile workings of his mind. This is not an over-simplistic problem. It is a very complex problem, Mr. Speaker. It is a problem that government has to deal with with respect to all taxpayers. It is not just for the Marystown people. It is asking the people of Hawke's Bay, 'Will you put your taxes on the table for the people of Marystown?' It is asking the people of Labrador West, 'Will you put your taxes on the table for the people of Marystown?'

MR. TOBIN:

We put the money there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

The money is there.

MR. FUREY:

So what we are saying, to the simplistic heckles of the opposite side, is that this is a very complex issue. Let me tell you why, Mr. Speaker. What we are saying is that Marystown Shipyard can build this ship for price X, and the European shipyards can build it for price Y. The differential, Mr. Speaker, is not a gap, it is not a gulf, it is an ocean of difference, between what

we can build it for in Newfoundland.

The hon. the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) can laugh. He has done his pork-barrelling for seventeen years. He has shamefully done his pork-barrelling in Grand Falls to the detriment of everybody else in the Province. Mr. Speaker, we will deal with him shortly.

When we come back to this matter of being complex, Mr. Speaker, there is an ocean of difference between what this vessel can be constructed for in the European shipyards versus the Marystown Shipyard.

So you put the economics on the table, Mr. Speaker. If you were just making a business decision, if anybody was just making a business decision, you would have to say no. But this is a government, Mr. Speaker, that listens to the heartbeat of the people. It is a Liberal Government and it is taking in the social ramifications of this problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

And, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to enter into this situation in an absolutely mental, knee-jerk situation like the Sprung fiasco. We do not want that. We want to be able to say to the people of this Province, we are putting \$4.5 million on the table for Marystown and here is why, here is what we are saying, here is why we are doing it, here are all of the ramifications, and here is the justification because, Mr. Speaker, unlike Sprung, we want to be able to justify this

expenditure to the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Question Period has expired.

On behalf of hon. members, before proceeding to the next item, I would like to welcome to the galleries some members from the council in Milltown in the persons of Mayor Roy Simms and Councillors Bob Small and Doug Kendall. Also in the galleries is the Mayor of Kippins, Mr. Cater Best. On behalf of all hon. members we welcome them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Also we have in the galleries today seventeen year old Dean North from Australia, and he is visiting with Mr. and Mrs. William Prichett from Bonavista. Dean is studying high school in Clarendville, and he has a tremendous interest in Canadian parliamentary law. So I am sure all hon. members would like to welcome Dean North to the galleries today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

And, finally, we would like to welcome to the galleries the Principal of the Stephenville Campus, Western Community College, Mr. Pat Power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. RAMSAY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RAMSAY:

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Social Services Committee I wish to report to the hon. House of Assembly that the Committee has considered the Estimates of the Department of Education, the Department of Health, the Department of Justice and the Department of Social Services. I am pleased to report that after considerable deliberations the Committee has passed all expenditure estimates for the 1989-1990 fiscal year without amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Notices of Motion

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the raising of loans by the Province.

MR. DICKS:

Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DICKS:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law."

Thank you.

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:
I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the member would not ask that question because he would know the answer he would get from here.

Today I have some answers to questions, one that was put forward by the hon. the member for Green Bay and he wanted to know about the new reduced rate structure for the ferry system for Little Bay Islands and Long Islands in the district of Green Bay. I have written him already with the answer, but I will read it now. As indicated in the budget document of June 6, 1989, Government will be lowering Provincial ferry rates to approximately 50 per cent of the currently levels over a three year period, commencing October 1, 1989. The initiative will include the lowering of ferry rates for the ferry systems for Little Bay

Islands and Long Island in the district of Green Bay, as well as all other ferries operating in the Province.

Now that is an election promise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:
I have an answer to a question by the hon. the member for Grand Falls, and he wanted, "An itemized list of expenditures for any office equipment, personal equipment, furnishings and photographs purchased for the Minister's Office since May 5, 1989".

MR. EFFORD:
Did you find the TV?

MR. GILBERT:
The list is there, and I might say that most of it, as I understand it, is for replacing equipment that was there but disappeared somewhere in the changeover, in the transition. There is \$3,271.41: Photofinishing \$25.72; office supplies \$399.47, that is miscellaneous; dictation machines, one for me and one for my executive assistant, \$442 and \$446.88; cassette transcribing machine for \$672.00.

MR. EFFORD:
What happened to the ones that were there?

MR. GILBERT:
That is what we would like to know.

A lateral filing cabinet for \$694.40; stenographer's chair for \$219.50; plants from Pippy Park \$271.04 - they even disappeared from the offices, Mr. Speaker. And a chair mat for the Secretary to the Minister, for a total of

\$3,271.40.

Another question from the hon. the member for Grand Falls, who wanted, "An itemized list of travel expenditure 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." The Minister's Executive Assistant has standing travel advance of \$500, which he has taken. There is an air fare of \$270, June 13 - 15, from St. John's to Gander. I might add there was \$5000 spent by the previous administration from April 1 until May 5.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

The member very subtly said something that should not be allowed to stand on the record. He said things disappeared during the transition, as if to infer that someone who left, or something like that. I can say to the hon. minister that I happen to have been minister before him, and when I left there I left there without anything belong to the department. I was not there long enough to know what was there anyway, to be honest with you.

MR. SPEAKER:

There was no point of order. The hon. gentleman just took advantage of an opportunity to clarify a matter.

Continuing Answers to Questions.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, Question No. 11 on the Order Paper by the hon. member for Grand Falls. To ask the minister to lay upon the Table the following information: "An itemized list of expenditures for office equipment, personal equipment, furnishings and photographs purchased for the Minister's Office since May 5", Mr. Speaker, framing of certificates, \$56.00.

I just could not get by without a radio. I want to hear the news. I am there at six in the morning and I want to hear what is going on, so a radio for \$100.00, Photo prints for \$112.00. The biggest single item was for \$597.51. That was for framing pictures and certificates. I assume that was as reasonably as could be done. The only problem was that was done by the hon. John Collins the day before he left, on May 5. The day before he left he spent \$597.51.

AN HON. MEMBER:

On what?

MR. DECKER:

On framing pictures and certificates. I will table that one, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

It is a lot cheaper than bringing a constituent in to a dance.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I just remind hon. members, again, that it is very difficult to listen when there are two or three conversations going on. The Chair is trying to listen to the answers being given, and it is very

difficult when somebody is shouting across the floor. So please, out of courtesy, refrain from that. Secondly, I want to remind ministers that we are supposed to answer questions, and questions that are on the Order Paper are supposed to be as relevant as questions answered orally. Please, there should be no references to what other expenditures should be. The question is asking the ministers their expenditures and that is what should be said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The question also referred to furniture. There has been no furniture bought. The sofa and chairs were bought when Harold Collins was Minister, and I am sitting at the desk that was used by both Sir John Puddester and Sir Richard Squires.

The hon. the member for Grand Falls also asked to lay on the Table the following information, "An itemized list of travel expenditures."

Mr. Speaker, we have a trip to Gander, attending the 25th anniversary celebration of the James Paton Memorial Hospital, \$270.20.

Addressing the annual meeting of NMA in Grand Falls, \$146.00.

Addressing ARNN in Gander, \$259.00.

The official opening of Brookfield Hospital, \$249. Total: \$924.98.

I should say to hon. members that I am still waiting for the bill to

come in for the helicopter flight down to the Burin Peninsula. As soon as that arrives I will have it given in.

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a petition signed by ninety-seven residents of the Community of Makkovik in Labrador. I advised the hon. Minister of Development a few days ago that the petition was enroute. The petition basically says, Mr. Speaker, that there was a new policy instituted under my short term as Minister of Labrador Affairs. When an individual government bureaucrat arrived in Labrador ten years ago, he decided that dry goods in the government stores would be discontinued. Subsequently, about a year and a half ago, I began to put the wheels in motion again to bring dry goods back into the government stores. This was done on a trail basis, Mr. Speaker, through the stores from Makkovik to Postville, Hopedale, Nain, and Davis Inlet. I might add that a delegation from the department bypassed the wholesalers here in the Province, went directly to the wholesalers in Montreal, and the people living in those communities presently are receiving dry goods roughly 15 per cent to 30 per cent cheaper than they would have purchased it here in Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it was the customers who were uppermost in my mind and it was the customers who

are benefiting from this dry goods being in the government stores.

Now, recently, I believe the minister - I know he has two ears and is trying to listen to me - said that he was looking at all possibilities of retaining the dry goods in those stores. But, at the same time, I would like to suggest to the minister that he advise Director of Operations and others not to carry out the recommendations of the ADM in Goose Bay, who has asked them not to purchase any more dry goods.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I pass that along to the minister. I know he looks astonished, yes, but this a fact. His ADM has advised his officials not to purchase any more dry goods, or put any more dry goods in the government stores. Now this petition is asking for dry goods to be in those stores because it is dry goods of the best quality, not inferior dry goods which have been purchased through government purchasing agencies in the past. These are good, modern, up-to-date goods, dry goods in particular, lady's wear, men's wear and so on, whereas before you would get dry goods going into those stores that were outdated probably eight or ten years ago.

So I ask the minister to hold on to his commitment, that he did say that he would evaluate it in the most positive manner, and make sure that those stores will be used for the purpose that government bought them from the Hudson Bay Company for in the 1950s, and that was to provide a service to the people in those communities. As far as I am concerned, the services should be everything from dry goods to grocery provision, hardware and

everything else.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to those people. We have the means and the wherewithal to do it, and I would strongly suggest to the minister, on behalf of those ninety-seven residents, and on behalf of five other petitions that are enroute to me from people concerning the same thing, they want to see dry goods in those government operated stores, so that customers will not have it socked to them, as they have had for the past number of years, by businessmen here in St. John's and elsewhere in the Province who are sending up goods that are not necessarily the goods they require.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his petition. I should say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that when I was named to the Department of Development, which had two departments rolled into it, the Department of Northern Affairs and the Department of Rural, Agricultural Development, one of the first things that was drawn to my attention as the new minister was the fact that was \$200,000 worth of dry goods sitting in a warehouse in Goose Bay. I said to my officials at the time, Mr. Speaker, how long have these been here and why are they sitting here? They said to me that this was goods that was purchased by the previous Minister of Northern Affairs, destined for the coastline of Labrador, to the government owned stores there. I asked why they were stocked and they said they were not quite sure. But, I would venture to

guess, Mr. Speaker, that it had something to do with the election call.

MR. WARREN:

That is right.

MR. FUREY:

So, we had \$200,000 worth of dry goods sitting in a store and warehouse in Goose Bay that the citizens apparently wanted, but there was pressure coming from the private sector of the privately owned businesses along the coastline, which just happened to be in the district of Torngat Mountains. There was the pressure coming from businesses that we ought not to compete, and pressure coming from the private citizens that we need a bigger selection. The goods were frozen, as I understand, for a period of time to get us by the election. I congratulate the former minister on his win. I released the goods when I became minister and sent them to their destination, as ought to have been done. The hon. member knows, he came to my office and met with a group from Hopedale - Mr. Flowers and Mr. Flowers, I believe - and we sat and chatted. There is a divergence of opinion up and down the coastline on whether or not the government ought to be involved in dry goods in these stores. Indeed, there is a divergence of opinion on whether or not the government ought to be involved in the stores at all. As I told the hon. member, privately and in a meeting, and I tell him here again publicly today, this is a subject that I am having examined from top to bottom. I have asked my officials to look at the whole idea to see whether or not expenditure of further monies, in a deficit position of some quarter of a million dollars a year in losses, whether we cannot

correct that. If moving toward privatization in consultation with the local groups, the LIA and MNIA, and with local people and councils in the consultative process, if it means that people are in agreement to move toward privatization, we would certainly entertain that idea. But I do not send that out as an alarming signal, that government will walk away from their social responsibility, because indeed we will not. However, when we look at the dry goods issue, the then hon. Minister of Northern Affairs, in his capacity as minister, decided - and he had a good point in some respects - that certain elements of society wanted a larger variety of goods brought in, so that they could pick and choose and determine what they wanted to wear and use in terms of dry goods, but then he had that other problem of the businesses that were putting on pressure, so he did not want to walk into the middle of the mine field. I told him that we are examining his experiment, and it is his experiment and he deserves a certain amount of credit for that experiment. Notwithstanding the subject of end-running the election, he deserves a certain amount of credit for trying to bring in a different and new variety of these goods. We are looking at that experiment and we are looking at the costs. Some \$200,000, I believe, was spent in Montreal to purchase those goods. Is that correct?

MR. WARREN:

Thirty-three hundred thousand dollars.

MR. FUREY:

Well, maybe higher than that. So \$350,000 to buy boots, bikinis, and all kinds of wonderful things,

as I remember looking at the list. Is that correct?

MR. WARREN:

I have not seen any bikinis.

MR. FUREY:

Oh, is that right? You have not seen the bikinis. Let me just have a look at the list. Socks and work dress, sports anklets, underwear, briefs, boxers, panties, brassieres, pantyhose, T-shirts, summer tops, jeans, sweats, sneakers, pyjamas, T-shirts, summer jackets, terry bib shorts, swimwear and bikinis.

MR. EFFORD:

How many bikinis?

MR. FUREY:

I think there was a case of bikinis heading for Nain. Now, whether that is intrepid, insipid or inane, i-n-a-n-e, is another question.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Is Nain not allowed to have bikinis?

MR. FUREY:

Sure, absolutely. No question about it. But the question it comes down to is, Should government be involved in this? That is the real issue.

MR. WARREN:

Why not? Why not?

MR. FUREY:

The hon. member, in his interjections, is pre-determining the outcome. I am not pre-determining the outcome. I am saying this is what I have inherited. This is where it is. We will examine, assess, review it, and do what we believe is the right thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

I just want to clarify one thing that the Minister of Development mentioned in consultation with the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, during the election campaign if I had taken the opportunity to make sure that all those goods were put into the various stores, then I would have beaten my two opponents so drastically it would not even be funny. So I decided that no way would anybody be able to say that I was using something for political gain.

MR. FUREY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

We cannot let that pass without saying, very simply, it should be known then by the Province that the hon. member did not have the courage to beat his opponent more drastically.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

I think the Chair has reminded hon. members about rising on frivolous points of order. Today there have been two or three. Hon. members ought to know what is a point of order and they ought not to be rising on frivolous points of order. To clarify a point is not a point of order.

Because somebody might indicate that somebody said or did something, these things are not points of orders. So please would we refrain from using them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

It is an effective parliamentary practice nevertheless, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of some 222 residents of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Signatories have come from a number of electoral districts: The electoral district of Windsor - Buchans; the electoral district of Grand Falls; the electoral district of Exploits; the electoral district of Lewisporte; the electoral district of Labrador West; the electoral district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir; and one of the electoral districts in St. John's. Signatures have been obtained from residents from the communities of Badger, Bishop's Falls, Botwood, Grand Falls, Windsor, St. John's, Port Anson, Wabush, Norris Arm, and St. Alban's. The 222 people, Mr. Speaker, have all signed a petition calling on the government, and the Minister of Health in particular, to assist women of this Province in getting access to modern screening mammography so that breast cancer could be detected early, and any resulting deaths and radical surgery might be minimized.

It is a very serious petition. I might point out, in fact, Mr. Speaker, just to prove how non-partisan this petition is, that a couple of the signatories in this petition are sisters-in-law of the member for Exploits, sisters-in-law, therefore, I believe of the member for St. John's South, and indeed a niece of the member for Exploits.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What brings that up?

MR. SIMMS:

Well, the minister has been getting up on occasion and kind of implying that these petitions are politically motivated, so I just want to make that point so that the minister, if he does stand to respond to the petition, will address it in a serious manner and not attempt to make it a political thing as he has tried to do on a number of occasions in the past. Again I emphasize the fact that the petition contains 222 names, which is a fairly large petition.

Mr. Speaker, I want him to consider this matter seriously. I am no expert on this matter, nor is the Minister of Health. But from everything I understand about the issue it would not require a large expenditure to be able to provide some of the devices required to assist women in early detection of breast cancer. When you consider the fact that the number is somewhere around 160 women in the Province who are expected - I guess that is the projection - to develop breast cancer this year - that is the number, I think, they throw for any year - and when you see that is the estimation, and then it is indicated that a couple of pieces of this equipment were available in certain areas around the

Province then, in fact, lives may be saved, it is a very serious matter and a very serious issue.

I know that the minister has talked about not being perfectly sure and not being perfectly certain as to whether or not there would be any affects from radiation and this kind of thing, I remember him making those kinds of comments, I am not sure whether it was here in the House or publicly, but I remind him that there was a federal study on this matter completely just last December. This study looked at all of these concerns and their conclusion was, as I understand it, that the benefits of screening would far outweigh any risks that might be associated with it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What age group are we talking about?

MR. SIMMS:

Over fifty and the high risk ones.

The other thing is, I am also told from a medical expert, the cost of one of these units -

MR. DOYLE:

About \$300,000.

MR. SIMMS:

No, about \$110,000 I am told you can get one from \$110,000 to \$140,000.

MR. DECKER:

(Inaudible) you guys left in Corner Brook.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, I do not understand that to be necessarily accurate, now, what the minister is saying. There are two things here and I do not want to be too confused. One is the larger issue. The other one is

what they call the screening units, as I understand it. And I understand they can be purchased -

MR. DECKER:

(Inaudible) understand it.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, I do understand it, as much as the minister probably. But I understand that you can get one for \$110,000. I am told that by a medical expert. You can get a more expensive one, up to \$170,000, as my colleague says, but that is probably the best that you can possibly get under the circumstances. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, the point is it is up to the minister, who is a minister in the government. It is up to them to determine which is the best possible unit to purchase. But the point is, as I am told, that if you had a couple of these units, at least for an expenditure of \$200,000 or \$300,000 maximum you could provide some of this equipment and that it could indeed possibly save lives.

MR. DOYLE:

Not could, would.

MR. SIMMS:

It would. But if that is to be the case and that is a fact, and I believe it to be a fact from what I understand of the issue, then surely the government should review this matter. It is a most serious matter and a most serious issue. It is not being treated lightly by people around the Province, I can assure the hon. minister. This petition here today with 222 names is an indication, from people representing seven or eight electoral districts, I think as I said, and a dozen communities is an indication that there is a widespread feeling that the

government should do something about this problem and should do something fairly quickly about it, not sit there with a smirk on their faces, and not treat it lightly and not treat it politically. Do not get up and say, You were there for seventeen years, why did you not do anything about it? You can attack us all you want on that score, but that is sort of avoiding the issue. And I would urge the minister, if he does address the issue to address the issue and stick with the issue, and perhaps give us some indication as to whether or not the government is prepared to give some consideration to this very serious request.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise and support the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms). And, as he indicated, this petition comes from approximately 222 people, from four or five different districts all across the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Again, it is not an issue, Mr. Speaker, that only affects the female population in Newfoundland; this is an issue that affects both men and women and children all across Newfoundland because it affects families when a member of a family is hit with something as serious as breast cancer. And what the people of the Province, what the men, women and children

are asking the Minister of Health to do is that a very, very small amount of money be made available out of his budget this year to purchase this very vital equipment, this mammography screening equipment, which is very, very important. And the minister, as we are all aware, is projecting this year a surplus in his budget of approximately \$5 million, and as the member for Grand Falls already indicated, and the member for St. John's East has indicated as well, the purchase of this type of screening equipment is not a great big investment that the minister should be really, really concerned about. They are not asking that a hospital be built, they are asking that mammography screening equipment for a nominal sum be made available to the people of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health, when he rose in his place last week said, 'Well, you were there seventeen years. Why did you not get it?' The minister knows full well that it was only last December that Health and Welfare Canada, in its report, stated that this equipment could very well be instrumental in providing early detection. It was not seventeen years ago that that information was made available. It was made available last December, that to have this equipment, providing early detection could very well be instrumental in saving a lot of lives. I think the key here is early detection.

I am just wondering, when the minister stands in his place to support the petition, if he would indicate to us if he knows yet what the exact cost of that equipment is. Is he examining the possibility of making that

equipment available, or is it on the back burner?

The member for Grand Falls indicated, as well, Mr. Speaker, that approximately 160 women per year in Newfoundland will develop breast cancer. Now, how can the minister sit there and accept responsibility for that in the face of this information that is being made available to him? This is the fourth or fifth, maybe the sixth petition that has been presented to the House and, as yet, we do not have any indication from the minister if he is putting it on the back burner, if he is going to make that equipment available, when he is going to have it made available. We have not heard any of that from the minister.

So I am looking forward to his standing here today and indicating that he is not going to have to accept responsibility for quite a number of women, probably, in the Province, being mutilated because this early detection equipment is not made available to them. The minister has a chance now to really make his mark upon the Department of Health and upon the ministry and to come forward and make this equipment available to the people of the Province.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

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

I am very pleased to stand in support of this petition. The Minister of Health has stood in his place on at least four

different occasions to respond to the same petition, so I asked if I could today respond to the petition to make my position clear.

I say at the outset that I support the prayer of the petition.

In answer to the question asked by the member for Harbour Main (Mr. Doyle) about the cost of the units, and so on, to provide one screening unit and to operate it for a year would cost in the vicinity of \$700,000. So you are talking about a total cost of the equipment plus operation per year of \$700,000.

AN HON. MEMBER:
A mobile unit?

MR. BAKER:
Mobile unit, yes.

Well, this is what you are asking. You are asking about the screening process. There are units in place around the Province, as the minister has explained, but what you are talking about is a mobile unit that can go and provide that screening service around the Province. Am I right that this is the kind of thing members opposite are talking about?

I think it is a good idea; however, let me hurry to add that -

MR. SIMMS:
Could the minister elaborate what makes up the \$700,000 cost?

MR. BAKER:
Well, I cannot go into detail. But, let me tell the member for Grand Falls, the cost of the machine, plus the cost for radiologists, transportation, everything included, the total cost per year is about \$700,000.

But I do not want to dwell on the cost, I was just about to point out to the member, because it really surprises me that one of the key points coming from members opposite is the cost of this particular piece of equipment and the cost of service. When you are talking about cancer and cancer detection, if this is a desirable thing to do, then the cost should not really matter, and I hope everybody agrees with that. I think it is totally irrelevant: \$100,000, or \$700,00 or \$5 million, the cost is totally irrelevant. I only provided that because it was asked.

I support the prayer of the petition because I think we should do everything within our power to provide for earlier the detection of cancer. The facts show that the early detection the better the chance of not as much disfigurement and not as many deaths. It is pretty obvious. I would also like, in relation to this, to point out to members opposite that there is another problem in the Province in this connection that we have to be aware of and address ourselves to, and that is the tremendous backlog that arise at times in terms of the analyses of pap smears. We do not have the cytologists on staff at the present time to provide a proper service in terms of the pap smears. We insist that people in the danger area have yearly pap smear tests done, yet we sit back and make them wait three months before they can even get somebody to look at the slides and tell whether there are any abnormalities there or not. And I think that is a situation that also must be handled. And I am not going to try and wrap it around your ears again, but what I am going to say is this has been a

longstanding problem. One of the solutions, of course, used in years past has been to, every now and then, take a few hundred or a few thousand of these slides and ship them off to the Mainland and get them analyzed and get them all shipped back again, so that the backlog can be caught up on, but the real solution has never been undertaken, and that is to somehow try to provide the cytological services that are needed to handle that properly.

I support action in that area, I support action in the mammography screening program, but I want to assure members opposite that the Minister of Health is in the process of looking at the whole idea of the screening, how it can best be done, listening to comments from a lot of medical people in terms of the merits of self-examination, plus the standard equipment that is around, as opposed to a full screening program, or is a partial screening program a better solution in terms of effectiveness and so on. So I can assure members opposite that government is looking at that. And we have not jumped immediately. I understand that, and members opposite understand that. And they are making their position clear, very well, I might add, they have pointed out their support for the program, and I am sure that the Minister of Health is taking all of this into consideration and we will make a decision on it. Unfortunately, we could not have had it yesterday or the day before or last week and, unfortunately, there are people who get caught between the cracks, the same thing there are a lot of people get caught with the inefficiencies in the pap smear program. And I am sure that the Minister of Health is trying to

solve both problems and will in due course.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:
Order 3, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order 3. Concurrence Motion
(Government Services Committee).

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I want to have a few words to say in this debate today. There are a few items I would like to take the opportunity of raising. I do not have them in any particular order, but some of them relate to Municipal and Provincial Affairs. I have a few questions for the minister, and he might take the occasion to respond to them when he rises to speak in the debate.

I have a question for the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations (Ms Cowan) who is not in her seat now, but is down cozying up in the gallery to a good friend of the labour movement, I suppose. At least he is trying to give the impression that he is a good friend of the labour movement and nobody over on this side is a good friend of the labour movement, according to the article I read in the weekend paper. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the NDP Party tore strips off both the Opposition and the Government, mind you -

he did that fairly - and he had the gall to say that we, the Opposition, had no feeling for the labour movement. That was what he implied. He says that and then he has the gall to walk into the Opposition common room and ask us for a cup of coffee. I mean, you cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker.

I wish the Leader of the Opposition were here, because I know he was riled at the comments in the paper by the Leader of the NDP and wanted to make a few comments on it. Perhaps he will before the day is out. I do not know how long the Leader of the NDP is going to continue to sit in the gallery all day long. I really admire him for his tenacity and his patience, to sit here all afternoon. I do not think the Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition and before he sat in the House, sat in the gallery for the whole afternoon every day. I know he was certainly here during Question Period and then for a portion of the afternoon, but I think he would often go into the common room and talk to his caucus colleagues, or whatever. You really have to have a lot of patience and perseverance to sit in the gallery and listen to most of the things that are coming from the other side, in particular.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be sidetracked by what the Leader of the NDP says. He gets a little bit of coverage every blue moon and, I suppose, rightly so. It is a democratic society and we live in it.

Anyway, I want to address a couple of other items that have been on my mind a bit, particularly as it pertains to municipal and provincial affairs. I want to ask

a question of the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, by the way, dealing with the environment issue that occurred in Grand Falls last week, the soot problem. I cannot exactly ask the Minister of Environment, because we are not dealing with the estimates of the Department of Environment today. However, there was another aspect of that issue I wanted to dwell on a little bit, and I hope the minister might comment on it, and that has to do with the health and safety factor associated with that kind of an environmental incident.

In fact, just late last night I had calls from two constituents out there who were wondering what I had done about it as a member. I told them I had raised it in the House and I had asked the Minister of Environment, the Minister of Health and the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations to use whatever authority they have to get the appropriate officials to do follow-ups. One of the things, I believe, that came out in the press yesterday, for the benefit of the Minister of Environment, quoting one of his officials, I believe somebody from the West Coast, who, when asked whether or not there was going to be any follow-up to see how this could ever occur and what had happened, said - I am repeating it, I agree, secondhand - that it was up to the company to determine what had gone wrong and whether anything had, in fact, gone wrong and so on. I said I certainly did not think the Minister of Environment indicated that to me when I asked him if he would have his officials pursue the matter. I thought he said he would certainly be pursuing the matter and trying to get more information and get a full report as to what

actually occurred and what transpired.

In the case of the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, of course, the important thing for her to do is to make sure that her officials properly investigate the situation, as well, to not only try to determine what transpired but to ensure that the proper precautions are put in place so that nothing like it ever occurs again in the future. There is something wrong with the situation, because I understand the equipment was only two or three years old. So something has gone wrong. I suspect the professional people in her department would be able, perhaps, to determine what went wrong, if a proper and thorough investigation was undertaken.

So I ask again in the House under these estimates, and maybe the minister could make a phone call to one of her officials to find out what they have done, if anything, and perhaps she could comment a little later on in the debate as to whether or not they are, in fact, following it up, and if they are going to pursue it.

The same request is made of the Minister of Health for obvious reasons, whether or not there were any health problems associated with that particular situation. It is a serious situation and one that certainly should be followed through on. I would hope that maybe the Minister of Environment, before this House closes, whenever that might be, might be able to give a Ministerial Statement in the House to give us an update on what has transpired: the clean-up operations, the responsibility aspect of it, whether the company has fulfilled its commitment to

assist residents in dealing with any problems they might have, compensation claims they might have, that kind of thing. I would certainly like to see it before the House closes and I think the people of the Grand Falls area would like to as well. I will leave that at the moment with the appropriate ministers, but I repeat my request.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did want to comment a little bit on some of the issues relating to municipal affairs and recreation, in particular, during this debate, in the hope that the minister might be around. He is not in his seat. I am not sure if he is within -

MR. BAKER:
I will answer it.

MR. SIMMS:
The President of Treasury Board says he will answer it. Mr. Speaker, I want a good answer, so maybe somebody can see if the minister is around. Maybe he can give me a good answer. The President of Treasury Board is answering everything these days.

I want to touch on the issue of amalgamation in Grand Falls and Windsor. I am just going to touch on it briefly at this stage. I would rather wait and see what the government is going to do, or try to do, to pursue the matter.

Here comes the minister now. Perhaps he can elaborate when he gets up. I understand that out in the Central Newfoundland area there is some confusion over this regional taxation authority the Premier talked about in the by-election, and the regional services authority which the minister is about to set up.

AN HON. MEMBER:
There is no connection at all.

MR. SIMMS:
No connection at all. What I am saying to the Premier is that there is some confusion out there about it. I asked some questions of the minister in the House last week, you will recall, and the responses led to the confusion.

You will remember when the Premier interjected and made some reference to 'if we need to, we will' in implementing the taxation authority. Apparently the minister had done an interview with some of the people out in Central Newfoundland just before that and they had the impression that the minister was talking about one and the same thing. I assured the media people I spoke to that it was my understanding that they were not related. The Regional Services Authority is basically legislating a body that is in existence now, almost, to deal with issues of a regional nature: the water treatment plant, the incinerator, planned services; the government was intending to legislate it to give it some teeth so that when they had to raise funding to do projects, and so on, it could be done. The Regional Taxation Authority was this madcap scheme of the Premier's to take money from one community and give it to another, taxation.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
What about that regional industrial park?

MR. SIMMS:
The minister, I understand, has said now what he said in the House, 'that is an option, but it is not one that we will likely have to use.' That was the impression I got in the House, and

that is what the minister said to the press last week - I have the paper here, in fact, that quotes him saying it.

I understand a little further now that if they can get amalgamation to work, there would be no Regional Taxation Authority. If they can get the communities to agree on amalgamation, there would be certainly no intent of implementing a Regional Taxation Authority, that is what I understand. It would not be necessary, obviously.

If they cannot get amalgamation to work, or if they cannot get the communities to agree on amalgamation, then, obviously, it would be the intent of the government to implement this taxation authority the Premier talked about as far back as a couple of years ago.

I want to ask the minister for a progress report. How far along has he gotten with the communities in question with respect to the amalgamation of Grand Falls and Windsor? I do not believe that Bishop's Falls is included in those discussions.

MR. DOYLE:

Also, ask him when is he going to table that list (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

I think the minister indicated he saw no problem with tabling the list of 140 communities he had identified with common boundaries, prime objects for amalgamation. We have not seen the list yet, so I was wondering if the minister might be able to get on his horse and move a little faster on that. I think he indicated he would do it.

In any event, not to be sidetracked from my own particular issue right now of Grand Falls and Windsor, I would like the minister to tell me what kind of progress he is making with the two communities in question on that issue. Secondly, I want him to confirm what he told me in the House last week - I believe the Premier did as well - that an indication of the funding required to improve infrastructure in the case of the town of Windsor would be well known and publicly known, if I read through Hansard correctly, before any decision on amalgamation was made. The minister is getting my comments I hope.

Finally, I ask if the minister would be prepared to give the people of the area an opportunity to have a say before any decision on amalgamation is made. Now, I read Hansard and I must say, quite frankly, the minister was very, very evasive in answering that question. I asked him succinctly would he consult, would he give the people of the area an opportunity to have a say, either through a vote of some sort, a plebiscite or something of that nature, before a decision was made to amalgamate those two well-known Newfoundland communities, and the minister avoided answering the question directly. Maybe he will do it today, but I think he said he would consult with the councils and take whatever opinion he could get from the people, that kind of thing. But I was asking him pointedly would he undertake to give the people of the areas an opportunity to have a say in whether or not amalgamation should proceed, after all the information and facts are known, that is information with respect to the funding for infrastructure.

Also, I believe the minister has been touting loudly the regional recreation program which was instituted a couple of years ago by the previous administration. I think he has been touting it and says it is a good idea, it certainly fits in with his thinking on amalgamation and all the rest of it. I want to ask him about the regional recreation program specifically. I would like him to tell me, and tell the House - he is not going to be able to hear what I have to say, I am sure. It is important that I get his attention, because I do not want him to avoid answering the question by saying he did not hear the question, Mr. Speaker. I would like the minister to tell me which proposal, under the regional recreation complex proposals, went through the feasibility study process, followed all of the criteria, followed all the aspects of this regional recreation program, which of all these proposals was recommended by his officials, the experts, as the best proposal, the number one proposal for funding under the regional recreation facilities program. I would like him to answer that question when he rises. We are aware of the issues that relate to the Fogo Island arena, the Bonavista North arena and the Connaigre Peninsula. We know all those. I would like him to tell us which one was recommended number one by the professionals, the experts in his department under that particular program when he has a chance to stand and speak in this debate. Are my ten minutes up, Mr. Speaker? I am not quite sure. People are telling me to sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your time is up.

MR. SIMMS:

My time is up. I will get at it again shortly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, it is good to have the opportunity to speak about some of the matters raised by the hon. member. So far we have had considerable discussion in this House about many of the issues he raised, so I would be very happy to comment on them.

He mentioned the issue of regional services versus a regional government. Indeed, there is a distinct difference, in that regional servicing authorities are set up to look after and be responsible for services such as water and sewer, recreation, waste disposal, fire fighting services in the main, although in essence, I suppose, it could involve anything that the councils represented on that authority wish to do on a regional basis and per capita cost-share, whereas a regional government, of which we do not have any in the Province, but certainly a lot of them across Canada, is another layer of government responsible for and directly on top of, if you like, another layer of government responsible for and with authority over a group of councils.

I do not envision ever having a need for that in Newfoundland, in that we just do not have the population base. In fact, in provinces such as Ontario they are very busy trying to get rid of that layer of government because they have, indeed, too much government per se, which has evolved over the years. So there

is a distinct difference.

And regional servicing authorities, in the absence of, I suppose, one large entity, which is an option in not too many locations in Newfoundland but it certainly is an option in several locations, if you do not go the route of having just one government and then you amalgamate all communities into that new council, then you are really left with a proposition of having to have a regional servicing authority. Because whether it be two or five or ten communities in a given area, there is generally a need to have some means of doing things on a co-operative basis.

I think we have gone too long in this Province, in a lot of locations, where we have communities being unco-operative, in some cases. Not necessarily being willingly unco-operative and willingly so, but just the fact that they are apart, they tend to want to set up their own water supply and run their own water lines and sewer lines. And, indeed, whether it be infrastructure such as water and sewer or roads or recreation or fire fighting, they tend to do it thinking of their own needs rather than the needs of the region. So it is very difficult, unless they are willing to get together. In fact, as Bishop's Falls, Grand Falls and Windsor have already started to put in place the thought of having a regional servicing authority, where the three councils will per capita share in the cost of servicing, that is the answer in a lot of areas, rather than the option of doing things separately with the expense of doing it that way.

The duplication that we see

throughout the Province right now, and I will use the simple example of fire fighting because it comes to mind, having just spoken to the Fire Chiefs and Firefighters Association last evening, we have many locations throughout the Province, many communities side-by-side, where we have four and five fire halls, and a duplication of fire equipment and fire trucks. And even they admit that we can do a better job if we can regionalize or have these communities co-operate and share the services as long as the response times are maintained. As long as we have good, adequate response times and there is no danger of not being able to access a fire quick enough, then they agree. And, of course, it is natural that they would, common sense that they would. The Province and the people of the Province, Province-wide, can be better served and these communities can be better served if we can provide fire-fighting equipment and other services, such as fire halls and other buildings, on the basis of serving several communities, keeping in mind the response times, as I mentioned, being the most crucial factor of all. As long as we have adequate response time, share the fire-fighting services in the region rather than having a great duplication.

MR. SIMMS:

Would the minister permit a question?

MR. GULLAGE:

Yes.

MR. SIMMS:

What he is explaining here now about regional services and so on, how does that differ with what is in existence? You are talking

about creating a regional services authority. What is the primary difference between what you are proposing and what they already have in existence?

MR. GULLAGE:

Well, the difference is that we need the proper statutory regulations, legislation in place so that whether it be Windsor/Grand Falls/Bishop's Falls, or whether it be the St. John's/Northeast Avalon region, or whether it be Corner Brook or any other part of the Province, we are then able, with the proper legislative authority put in place for these regional servicing agencies, to tie the communities into these servicing authorities and have them share, on a per capita basis, not only the services and the cost of those services but the debt that might be incumbent on them on a per capita basis rather than having one community obligated as we would have to see right now.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) as is the case (inaudible).

MR. GULLAGE:

The member talked about amalgamation and, of course, I talked about it a lot over the last few weeks. Indeed, the first step in trying to deal with the problems of our 470 communities is, in fact, amalgamation. Rather than trying to attack the problem from looking at servicing, water and sewer problems, roads, and so on, on a separate community by community basis, the first thought was to amalgamate as many communities as we could with common boundaries so that we could then properly plan these communities as new entities rather than, as we are doing now, looking

at plans for four, five or six communities in a given area, isolated plans, that really have no basis in reality when you think of proper planning, where communities are, in fact, growing away from each other rather than towards each other. We would like to see as many communities as possible throughout the Province, and I have mentioned in the House that the department has identified 170 communities that have common boundaries in the Province right now, the majority of which - we have to refine the list further - could be amalgamated down to about one-third of that number.

Now we realize that problems go with that. We have to look at the debt structures of the various communities, we have to look at their tax base. We have some communities that have an adequate mil rate, residential and business, and we have other communities, in the other extreme, which, in some cases, have hardly any taxes at all. There are other communities in between where they have a tax, three or four mils perhaps, a poll tax and a service tax, but are probably are not raising as much tax as a neighbouring community. That has to be sorted out, and we have to present these communities with facts and figures showing that they are far better off together, sharing services, sharing with government on cost-sharing arrangements. When capital works is brought down each year, water and sewer and roads, we can help better and provide a better use of our dollars, and of their dollars, if they are together versus being apart, and asking for funding from the Province to try to provide services for their people and asking the Province for help on an isolated basis, disregarding the

fact that they have two, three and four communities adjoining them that could very well be part of an overall plan rather than doing things in isolation to their neighbours.

The member mentioned the regional recreation facilities and the fact that we were re-examining that program and, I believe, asked me to name the first-rated recreational committee and submission. I do not think it would be fair to do that. In fact, they were ranked, obviously, one, two, three for funding, and three facilities were being considered prior to this government taking office. The member will know, given the fact that we decided to re-examine the whole question of regional recreation facilities and establish new criteria and new policies based on this government's mandate, I think it would be entirely unfair to name the communities that were ranked based on the old criteria and the old policies of the previous government.

I would much rather that we establish and announce the policy that this government wishes to follow, and then ask for submissions once again - some may not be changed at all - from the group of some ten submissions we had before. We will make it fifteen or twenty next time, but certainly we would rank them then, based on the new policy.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. GULLAGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before I recognize the member I

would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of all hon. members of the House, to welcome to the gallery an Anglican Church group; twenty-five of the group are from Fogo and twenty-five from the St. John's area, and they are accompanied by Reverend Wayne Short of St. Mary's Church.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have some questions and comments to make about culture. The questions I will address to the minister responsible, the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. Today in Question Period the minister surprised many of us with his statement that he is considering setting up some kind of a special cultural projects fund. I would like him to elaborate on that now. Artists throughout the Province are extremely interested in any prospects of funding. Would he explain his reasoning for mentioning this idea? And since we are here looking at the budget estimates for his department, would he tell the House where the money to fund such a special projects fund would come from? Is there money in the estimates for the cultural division of his department that is not already earmarked that could be used for this new, special purpose, or is it possible that he would dedicate a portion of the \$383,000 thousand for the Art Council to this special fund? How would the minister envisage administering a special projects fund? Would he

have the Arts Council administer the fund?

Given the government's promise to be fair and to be balanced and not make decisions based on patronage, what other way could there be to administer funds for the arts? I do not know, I am asking the minister to explain and to tell the House the options for administering a special projects fund for the arts.

Now he mentioned the idea of a special projects fund after the Opposition Leader and I had questioned him about discrepancies between what he has been saying about funding from his department for the Avion Players in Gander and what his former Executive Assistant has said. Is there a connection between the Avion Players application and his proposal of a new, special projects fund? If so, how does the Avion Players application tie into this new idea? It is my understanding that the Avion Players are substituting for the Stephenville Amateur Theatre Group in attending some kind of a National Amateur Theatre Festival in Gander.

In answering questions directed to him in Question Period today, the minister indicated a belief that the Arts Council's mandate is restricted to funding professional artists and arts groups. I hope the minister can hear me. I see he is in the corridor, outside the House. But trusting that the minister can hear me, I will continue. I would like to point out to the minister that the legislation creating the Arts Council and giving it its terms of reference certainly allows the Arts Council to deal with both amateur and professional artists

and arts groups.

So there is no reason to think that the Arts Council cannot deal with and, depending on the judgement of the Arts Council, cannot approve an application from the Avion Players, or any other amateur group for that matter. However, the fact that the budget of the Arts Council is only \$383,000 is a severe restricting factor in what the Arts Council can do and, in fact, does.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this new idea for a special cultural projects fund, does the minister intend to consult the Artists Coalition or the Arts Council, which after all is a creature of the government itself, appointed by the Cabinet, or has the minister, in fact, already consulted artists about this idea? I have noted the minister's several references in the House over the last couple of weeks to extensive dialogue with the arts community so, perhaps, unknown to me he has already discussed this idea for a special cultural projects fund with artists. If so, I would appreciate his enlightening me and other members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, when the Committee was considering the estimates for the minister's department, he assured me that he is committed to continuing the committee which has been appointed to study the Province's cultural economy and the status of the artists. He said that there is not now a chairperson, avoiding dealing with the question of whether Mr. Jim Baird, his former executive assistant, had been appointed to that position. At any rate, he said there is not now a chairperson; he said he would be

designating one soon. He said he would be enlarging the committee by appointing two more working artists. I am wondering if the minister can tell the House if he will be consulting the Artists Coalition about the choice of these members of the Study Committee. He indicated to the Committee that the mandate of the Study Committee is wide open, and I was glad to hear that, and he said that he would expect to receive from the committee an interim report by the Fall and that he would welcome recommendations at any time. Again, I welcomed that news.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister about his intentions to fill the now vacant position of Director of Cultural Affairs, which is a key position in the Province. It is a position which has tremendous potential to do good for the arts in the Province. The minister told me that he would be using the Public Service Commission to recruit applicants and to rank applicants, which is the normal procedure, but he said that before referring the recruitment to the Public Service Commission, he would consult both the Artists Coalition and the Arts Council about the job description for the director's position. Again, I was pleased to hear the minister give me that assurance, because I think that consultation is extremely important. Before the advertising is carried out, it is very, very important to ensure that the job description reflects what is in the best interests of the arts of the Province. Can the minister tell the House now whether he has, since our Committee meeting, initiated any consultation with the Artists Coalition or the Arts Council about the job description for the

director's position?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, would the minister elaborate on the kind of consultation and dialogue he has had already with the Arts community in the Province? As I mentioned, he said to the House on a number of occasions that he has had consultation with Artists and I would like him to cite instances and to tell us what plans he has for future dialogue with the Arts community about the three key issues I have mentioned: Number one, the thinking about setting up a special Arts project fund, number two, the continuation of the Study Committee and, number three, the advertising to fill the vacant position of Director of Cultural Affairs.

So would the minister tell us more about the kind of consultation he has had with artists and go on to lay out his plans for future dialogue?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Firstly, to respond to the question concerning the fund I mentioned, or the allocation, if you like, whichever way you want to put it, of dollars that could be made available to the arts community to fund travel out of Province, because that is, in essence, what we are talking about right now, the expense of an arts group or a theatre group to travel out of Province. Indeed, that could be added to the present policy, the present mandate of the Arts Council.

MS VERGE:

It is already covered in the legislation.

MR. GULLAGE:

It is not covered by our interpretation and, in fact, it could be added to the present mandate of the Arts Council. It could, in fact, be left separate, outside the mandate of the Arts Council, which is not my intention. It could be at the discretion of the department or the discretion of the minister, but I would agree with the hon. member that the right way to do it if, in fact, such a fund was set up, is to do it within the parameters and the mandate of the Arts Council. Because I think it would be wise to have their input and their opinion, and their recommendation as to whether a given group should be funded if, in fact, we took that course. The reason I explained that is because it is an option. It is not necessarily what we are going to do, but it is an option. If we continue to have applications such as the Avion Players' over the next few months, applications that are tied directly into the Fortieth Anniversary of Confederation, we have a choice of ignoring those applications and not dealing with them, or we have the option of deciding whether or not such situations are worthy of consideration for funding because of the very nature of them and the fact they tie in directly to and represent this Province in its anniversary celebrations, by travelling to the mainland to represent a given area of the Province - in this case, it happens to be Gander, but it could be anywhere in the Province - travel to some location, some city, some town in another province to represent us from an arts standpoint, in that province.

MS VERGE:

Well, what is the connection between (inaudible)?

MR. GULLAGE:

The connection is that we presently have no criteria in place to approve such an application by the Avion Players. I think I am now into about my eighth time of saying that I did not approve the application from the Avion Players. I suppose I should say it once again. Maybe I will say it four or five more times and it might sink in. We did not approve that application. There is nothing in place in our present policy to approve that application, and the point I have made several times now, and, I guess, eventually it will sink in, is that the only way we can approve it is to have a policy in place that would permit it to be approved. We do not presently have such a policy.

The member mentioned the Arts Council chairmanship and the Director of Cultural Affairs. We do, in fact, have vacancies on both, and, again, I have said in the House on at least one occasion, and I will repeat it again, that we do want to fill both those vacancies as quickly as possible. In the case of the arts and culture centres, we do not want to leave these important centres without a director responsible for them for too long and we will be following the correct procedure, also consulting with groups in the arts community to make sure they have input into the qualifications that might be necessary for such a director, given the kind of mandate we want carried out in the future by these arts and culture centres. In the case of the Arts Council, of course we want to appoint a

chairman as quickly as we can.

And I did say that we want that group to report any recommendations they would like to make as quickly as possible on an interim basis, as frequently as they want, because we do want their advice and, ultimately, we would like a final report, hopefully by the Fall. So that is repeating what I said before and, in fact, what the hon. member has already said.

MS VERGE:

What about consultation that you have already had with the arts community?

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, consultation I have already had in the arts community is just something in the past. I do not understand the member's question. I would think consultation in the future would be more pertinent. You have lost me.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

I would appreciate the minister answering the questions I asked about prior consultation he has had with the arts community.

MR. GULLAGE:

Ask me something pertinent.

MS VERGE:

He has said on a number of occasions in this House that he has had dialogue with the arts community, and I would like him to cite instances and give us a bit more information about the artists he consulted with and whether any of these subjects, the Study Committee, the Director's job, or

his idea of a new, special projects fund, were dealt with in those earlier consultations.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, as the member knows full well, I cannot go back and recite to her all the people I have spoken to, all the people I have asked for advice, all the people I have asked for input on possible chairmen. I would not divulge comments they have made to me. For her to expect me to divulge in this House all the people who have been recommended to me as potential chairmen and potential directors of cultural affairs is unfair, and I will not do that.

I have had considerable dialogue with the arts community. I do not think I am going to go back over all my agendas and bring into this House a list of everybody I have spoken to. I can assure her the dialogue has been carried out. I have had input on possible chairmen for the Study Committee. I have also had recommendations on possible directors of cultural affairs. But until those positions are filled, I think it only fair that the conversations I have had regarding potential people for these positions be kept private and confidential, as I am sure the people who are making the recommendations would want them to be.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, in this Province there is an artists coalition

which embraces all the working artists in the Province. Can the minister say whether he has had dialogue with the Artists Coalition? I certainly do not want him to divulge any confidences or tell me the names of people being considered for appointment, what I am getting at is the nature of the consultation he has had with the arts community in the Province and the general issues which he has discussed with artists. I would like to know specifically, for one thing, whether this minister has had dialogue with the Provincial Artists Coalition which, after all, represents all the working artists in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I have had dialogue with a lot of people in the arts community. Now, whether or not all those people are the people you are referring to, I would have to check and see; you will have to give me a list of those and I will respond to the list. I assume that is what you are talking about. For me to know everybody in this Province involved with the arts community and whether or not I have met with all those you have in mind is impossible for me to answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is quite clear. There is an organization in this Province called the Newfoundland and Labrador Artists Coalition. It is an umbrella group that embraces all the

working artists in the Province. Now, I would think if a minister were serious about getting input from artists in the Province, a minister would begin his job by dialoguing with the Artists Coalition. I am asking the minister has he had any dialogue with the Artists Coalition, and when he talks about the extensive consultation he has had, is he including consultation with this organization called the Newfoundland and Labrador Artists Coalition?

MR. GULLAGE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, would the minister explain the nature of the consultation he has had with the Artists Coalition? Has he met with their executive or their president or any of their representatives? Has he corresponded with them? Has he had telephone conversations with them? Just what form has his consultation with the artist coalition taken?

MR. HOGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. HOGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of members of the hon. House the incident that took place in Fair Haven last week, and which a number of hon. members are asking about today in light of the coverage it was given by some of the media over the weekend. The plant, indeed, was closed by

federal authorities on Thursday last, and it was after Fisheries officers spent the entire day on the site without speaking to anyone.

MR. TOBIN:
(Inaudible).

MR. HOGAN:
I am just talking about justice, my pudgy friend, about justice.

The Fisheries officers stayed on the site all day Wednesday without giving any notice to the fishermen or to the plant owner, and on Wednesday evening last, in true Rambo fashion, parked their vehicles elsewhere in the community and kept the plant under surveillance and waited until the fishermen had left early Thursday morning to go to their traps and their nets.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the fish was only taken into the plant, as one fisherman described it to me, because they were stuck, they had nowhere else to go with their fish. Incidentally, when addressing the coverage given by some people, one of them quoted a Seventeenth Century English poet, Alexander Pope - believe it or not, in Fair Haven, and I had to ask him to do it twice so I could write it down. He said, 'Some truth there was but dashed and brude with lies, To please the fools and puzzle the wise.' Right from one of the people in Fair Haven who was talking about this particular incident. Attempts by the fishermen in that community to mediate the dispute between the Federal officers and the fish plant operator failed. The officers would not address the fishermen, would not tell them what was going on or anything. As a matter of fact, I do not think

the RCMP knew what they were doing there, except to protect the Fisheries officer from a 120 pound fisherman who dared tell them if they took the fish, they were going to have to do something about it.

I just want to point out to hon. members, Mr. Speaker, the incredulous conduct of the Federal Fisheries officers in this instance who persecuted these fishermen, persecuted the plant owner, and some of the discrepancies that were noted in the inspection report and enumerated by my friend, the House Leader, the member for Grand Falls, and myself last week. They were so ludicrous. For example, I found out that the shape of the building and the condition of the building and the cleanliness of the building is the best that it ever was, according to the people there, and that the walls they spoke of which were the wrong colour, they, as a matter of fact, were all white except for the bottom section, which was painted grey. The exposed pipes that caused risk to the fish, if the plant owner, or plant operator or workers had to move the fish three feet out from beneath the pipe, the pipe would have passed inspection. So this was the kind of silliness they were getting on with.

I just want to assure hon. members opposite, particularly the member for Grand Falls and others who spoke in support of the fishermen of Fair Haven, that indeed the fishermen in Fair Haven are the ones who are suffering. They are the ones without the \$40,000 or \$50,000 in their pockets or in their banks or wherever they put it, probably to pay for expenses for the coming week. They are the

ones without the money.

MR. WARREN:
Little Harbour.

MR. HOGAN:
Little Harbour and Southern Harbour fishermen were also involved. And if, in fact, the plant operator failed, which was his big failure, to come and pick up his licence, then he would have been registered, maybe, because I detect and smell some vindictiveness in this inspection, then maybe this thing would not have happened. But as it was, he failed. He is not lily white in this either. He should have done certain things that had to be done to meet the criteria of the Province. I just wanted to assure hon. members, because of news reports to the contrary, that it was federal officers, not provincial people, who shut the plant down. In fact, the provincial people did not go on this site until after the fact, and then it was to assist the operators and the fishermen to upgrade the facility. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HEARN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In discussing the estimates of the various departments, when we were dealing with the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, one of the topics raised was funding for the High School Athletic Federation which has been a bone of contention for quite sometime, and a number of

initiatives have been taken to allay some of the concerns. However, even the latest announcement of some funding to keep them going certainly is not adequate. Now, I am not sure whether the minister said that when he made his statement or not, but I am sure he is aware that it is not, it is something to keep them going in the interim. But an organization that is so important needs some kind of solid, long-term commitment. I am not sure how many members realize what the High School Athletic Federation really does. We look to the schools, perhaps, and we say, Well, we have physical education teachers from the schools there on the programs, what is this outside body and why are they tied in with the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth, as it was, now under the Minister's multifaceted department?

Many, many of the high school athletic programs which take place in our schools, take place after hours, in the evenings, on weekends - during the holiday periods quite often. It is not strange at all to see teachers on the road late in the evening, particularly on weekends, all over the Province, several hundred miles from home in some cases, and quite often outside the Province, chaperoning and coaching teams that participate in a number of sports. The involvement in athletics goes a little beyond something for the kids to do in their spare time. From my own involvement in the classroom not only as a teacher but coaching a number of teams over the years, and involved outside the classroom work in coaching and involved in athletics, I have seen more good coming out of the athletic

programs in relation to the development of young people than, perhaps, many of the other programs we have in our system.

I remember telling the story of the school principal we had at home one time, when I was coaching the senior hockey team. We had two high school boys on the team. We played Sunday nights, and Monday morning they were usually asleep in class. So this one Monday she came out, she was really upset, and she called me out and said, 'I am not happy about those two boys being on the team. They are in there now, and they are falling asleep.' So instead of responding I called her over to the picture of the last year's championship team on the wall - we had won the championship the year before - and with the exception of the two who were in high school still, one was Grade X and one was Grade XI, all the others were at least high school graduates, many of them university graduates, some of them had fairly ranking positions, and all were good solid people. So I said to her, "Look at the people who were on the team and tell me where all the others are who came up through the system with us and did not participate in sports." I think that sort of drew a comparison. You will find that many of the young people who are involved in athletics are also involved in the community, they are community leaders. Athletics is certainly a good character builder.

The High School Athletic Federation is made up of volunteers and the teachers who participate and coach, as I say, after hours and on weekends, give their time freely to provide for our young people a well-organized, well-chaperoned sporting event or

events. The bottom started to fall out of it last year when the Executive Director moved to another position, one in which he seems to be doing quite well, also, Mr. Glen Stanford, known by many for his basketball prowess - Newfoundland's answer to Bob Cousery. In trying to replace him, they found it was extremely hard to get a qualified person with the salary that was offered. Because instead of offering a teacher's salary, in fact, perhaps, a co-ordinator's salary, because you are really dealing with physical education teachers across the Province, the department under which that position came, Culture, Recreation and Youth, had it classified along the lines of the Civil Service and his salary was several thousand dollars less than it would be if he were in the classroom teaching. So in order to get a highly qualified, proficient person to go in there and stay and do the job, it was impossible to entice anybody, certainly from the schools and certainly from the program area, from where you would expect them to draw. If we are looking for a co-ordinator in the Department of Education, for instance, you are probably going to draw from a superintendent or an assistant superintendent in the field, somebody who has moved up through the stream, or at least a highly qualified principal or teacher. But in a case like this, where you would be looking for somewhat the same type of person, the salary certainly is commensurate with the position.

Several attempts have been made to reclassify it but was always blocked by Treasury Board. So hopefully the President of Treasury Board, who is here listening, will think about that,

being a former teacher himself. Now, with the department changing around and a different focus being put on it, it might be a good time to reclassify that position in the proper way so that if you are bringing somebody in to deal with teachers, in a teaching situation as such, the person should undoubtedly come from the field so as to know the teaching aspects as well as the athletic side. Unless, as I say, the salary is going to be put there, then you will only get somebody to come in to fill in while he or she is looking for something else. So hopefully that will be looked at.

The whole program itself, I think, has tremendous merit, particularly in this day and age, and where we should be paying more attention to it, I think we are starting to pay less attention to it. I am saying that in retrospect, also, because in the last year or so the attention the High School Athletic Federation should have gotten it certainly did not get, because it was basically constantly pushing for reclassification and more attention. So I think it is time to zero in and put something concrete there or we are going to lose the benefits of, perhaps, the best bargain we get in school programming; that is all the free time and effort we get from people who are quite willing to do it. But they are getting so frustrated at this present time that they are just about ready to throw in the towel.

Hopefully the latest move the minister has made will give some encouragement to keep going, but I think that will only be so if a longer term plan can be put in place. Hopefully his department will look at two things: Number one, a steadier line of funding

for the High School Athletic Association, and I think, more particularly, the reclassification of the position of Executive Director so there is some good leadership in the program.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MURPHY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY:

As a new member in the House, I guess I was led to believe that once the Government Services Estimates Committee was in place the special meetings outside the House, with both sides present, would have enough time and make enough time to ask all the pertinent questions associated with the estimates as presented by each department. I was very impressed, in reality, to watch the members opposite and hear their questions. Obviously they had their homework well done. They sat for an average of two and-a-half to three hours, putting questions to the ministers and their staff. I felt quite confident that when these particular sessions were adjourned the members opposite and the government members - we did not sit in our place without questions. We asked, I think, adequate questions that were just as direct, just as seeking as our friends opposite.

I would have thought that basically the hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations answered what I felt were all the important and pertinent questions related to her department, as did the Minister for Municipal and Provincial Affairs and the Minister of Finance. And, really,

the member for Humber East surprises me, realizing that she has a vested interest in the arts group as I have a vested interest in occupational health and safety and sports and high school funding. I think we all have vested interests, but the hon. the member for Humber East spent a great deal of time dealing with arts questions that were obvious. As a matter of fact, I think somewhere in the vicinity of close to an hour. We sit in the House today and it is just one continuous and constant barrage of questions to the hon. Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. I compliment him again not only for his informative answers but certainly for his patience and tolerance. I think he has walked up both sides and across the middle of the arts in this Province, and I really, I suppose as a new member, feel that sometimes it is like whipping a dead horse, if you keep on whipping it it certainly is not going to get up, and I think the minister was more than tolerant and patient.

I, Sir, was more than impressed, as I said already, with the questions that were put forward in session and I think, as we must realize, they are new ministers trying to familiarize themselves with their particular estimates in a very, very short time. I was proud. I can honestly say to you, Mr. Speaker, I was proud of our ministers, I was proud of their responses, I was proud of how they handled their senior staff. You would feel that these ministers were nothing less than people who had been in their place a lot longer than they were. I do not think the Opposition should be muzzled. As a matter of fact, I am sure they will not be and that

is what they are there for. I concur that it is seek and find, but to over accentuate, to constantly barrage hon. ministers with meaningless questions, trivial questions, I mean, it is beyond me. I really, as a new member, was startled to see how political people can be sometimes.

Now just as a point of interest the member for St. Mary's - The Capes, who just rose in his place to discuss the High School Federation funding, if memory serves me right, and I was not in the hon. House at that time, I think, and I stand to be corrected of course, but I would ask my hon. colleague, the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), I think it was he who actually last year, when the sense of that funding was laid down with the feeling of political mind to the distribution of funds, who brought forward the document in Opposition that actually forced the government of the day to bring forward their policy in retrospect to the high school sports funding. Now I said I stand to be corrected. I see the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes shaking his head. Well, I suppose what goes around comes around, Mr. Speaker. I think that all of our ministers, without question, have been more than patient, more than tolerant, and have answered questions beyond, when you consider the amount of time logistically they had to prepare themselves. You know, this government intends to open this hon. House in the Fall. I think we all very much realize that to do the business of the people of this Province, or to conduct the business of the people of this Province, this House needs to sit and answer the questions. The hon. members opposite are in such

a flurry to make points, for whatever reason, sometimes I look around and see people associated with the questions in the gallery. I have no problem with that, as such, but as a new member it is beyond tolerance to have to sit here and listen constantly to the same questions versed in a different phrase.

AN HON. MEMBER:

But there are no answers.

MR. MURPHY:

There are thousands of answers. I do not think hon. members opposite are happy with the answers, but the answers are coming across loud and clear. They are coming across loud and clear, Mr. Speaker, without question. I just want to, number one, again support the Chair of our Committee who I think did a very, very admirable job. And I think, and I say this honestly, that members of the Opposition who attended the sessions on Government Services asked good, meaningful, solid questions. The sad part of this is that other members have now come into the House and, to my mind, ask meaningless questions, political questions, questions to make strikes. In saying that, Mr. Speaker, again I think it is time that hon. members opposite sit down and rather than just in a sense of quick response - I saw it this afternoon with the member for Humber East. The minister answered one question, then she was biting at the bit to jump up and ask something else. I see now that the audience from the Arts Council has gone. These are the kinds of things that prolong the agony of this House. So, Mr. Speaker, again it was very, very meaningful for me as a new member to observe the specific committee meetings, but to have to come to

the House and listen to this frivolous whatever, is certainly not what I would consider doing justice on behalf of the people from a sense of opposition. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

The member for Humber East, thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of taking orders from the member for St. John's South. If we want to ask questions of the ministers, we are going to ask them. And, for a young - not a young man, but a new member -

MR. SIMMS:

An old man, boy.

MR. WARREN:

- a two-vote-majority member to come into this House and tell us that we are not allowed to ask the ministers questions, I would suggest to the hon. member -

MR. MURPHY:

Meaningful questions.

MR. WARREN:

Meaningful questions, yes, Mr. Speaker.

Let us go back over the questions the member for Humber East asked today. We have been asking questions continuously but we are getting no answers. In fact, we are not getting the correct answers. If the ministers would answer the questions, then we would get correct answers. On Friday past I asked a question in this House concerning the hon. the member for Placentia as it pertains to the Kevin Wadman

episode out in Fairhaven and the Minister of Fisheries has not answered this question yet: 'Was a processors licence issued to that company or were there stipulations addressed to that licence that this particular company had to have its facilities up to standard in order to carry out the processing of fish? I think the hon. gentleman came into this House and put all the blame on the federal officials.

AN HON. MEMBER:
So, what is new?

MR. WARREN:
What is new? Furthermore, I think the hon. gentleman should also realize that there are political connections with the hon. gentleman from Arnold's Cove who is operating in Fairhaven. And, I think it is time for the hon. gentleman to realize the political connections, too, to that party. Mr. Speaker, let the hon. gentleman find out for himself. He knows how to get the answers. So, I would strongly suggest to the hon. gentleman, and to the Minister of Fisheries do not favour any one fish processor in this Province over another processor. I suggest to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries that he treat all processors alike.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs was very accommodating to get up and answer questions asked by the member for Humber East, but he was not answering them correctly. Now, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs say if he is considering increasing the grant to **Them Days** magazine. For the past number of years, **Them Days** magazine has been requesting an increase, and for the past number

of years the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth has been addressing the issue of culture in this Province. In fact, Mr. Speaker, two years ago **Them Days** magazine was taken from one department and put into northern division, and last year, I think, if we look back, there was a substantial increase given. But it was not enough for them to carry out the very valuable work they have been doing in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, during the estimates, there has been some debate back and forth, not necessarily on the same estimates we are debating - the hon. gentleman has crisscrossed into other estimates, such as Resource or Government Services. So I apologize to you, Sir, if I wander back and forth on these estimates, because it is very, very important that we address the real issues concerning what government is attempting to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have a speech here that is thirty minutes long, and I cannot do it in ten minutes, so I just want to set myself up for tomorrow or the next day when the budget speech begins again in earnest, and then I will have a full thirty minutes. I do have some fine complimentary remarks to make about the hon. member for Eagle River, so I just want to advise him that I will be real nice to him.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to the censorship of the Minister of Education, I am sure the minister will be very co-operative in addressing the concerns in the right and proper manner.

To the Minister of Social Services - you know, I am not finished with the hon. the Minister of Social

Services by a long shot yet!

The Minister of Health is supposed to lay on the Table the aircraft logs dated May 29 to June 5. He has not done that. And does he consider a casual, part-time employee of the Grenfell Regional Health Services Board to be a person who should get perks like travel? Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of things the hon. gentleman should answer.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, the 'Labrador Flag' has spoken again, and I say to the hon. gentleman, I am glad he is back this week from his trip to Labrador, because I am anxiously waiting to hear what he has to say about his fantastic trip to Black Tickle, where he met a particular individual who was very, very upset with him.

MR. SIMMS:
Ah, ha!

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, I am wondering what the hon. gentleman is going to say about individuals he met in Black Tickle who showed a very deep concern about his performance in this House in the past month. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. An individual said they thought they were electing adults to this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:
I respect the hon. gentleman as an adult, and I hope he will act like an adult.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get back

to the Minister of Development for a second, if the minister will allow me. You know, I say this with all due respect: Of the fifteen ministers over there, I would say the Minister of Development (Mr. Furey) has the best potential. I will give the minister credit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:
Yes, top minister.

MR. WARREN:
Yes, by all means.

Mr. Speaker, he is the only one over there who shows a real common-sense approach to the way government should work.

MR. SIMMS:
He is not arrogant.

MR. WARREN:
No, Mr. Speaker. In fact, the Minister of Health is so arrogant, it is unreal. The position he has taken on as Minister of Health has gone completely to his head.

But let me say to the Minister of Development I am quite pleased that, as he said today, he is very, very serious about dry goods in those stores. I think, Mr. Minister, it is a really serious issue that you should address. It is a concern of the people. The petition will show that it has to be done. The people on April 20 decided they wanted a change in government, but I can tell you, Sir, that the goods coming in there from Montreal had just started. The dry goods that were coming in from Montreal were good, cheap, dry goods, and were what the people wanted in those stores. Those stores were going

to be stocked to capacity with what the people wanted. It was done by a survey of the people, asking what they wanted.

So, Mr. Speaker, I must say it was most interesting that during the election the minister did not want to get involved in the possibility of using his power as a minister to get re-elected. So, Mr. Speaker, immediately the election was called, I decided those dry goods would stay in storage until after the election, because I did not want my opponent to come out and say I put dry goods in the stores during election time to get votes. Mr. Speaker, my opponent won his nomination by only one vote, so just imagine what would have happened if I had put the dry goods in the stores, where 90 per cent of the people wanted them. But I waited until the election was over, and hopefully, now, the new Minister of Development will concur and carry out those wishes.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say this to the hon. minister. Now the former government, I think, supported a request by the Assistant Deputy Minister in Goose Bay to go back to school, or to go to do some kind of military course in Ontario. I think it is long overdue. I really think it is long overdue, and I would seriously say to the minister, it was something that was done ten years ago, but we do not need an Assistant Deputy Minister of a particular department in Labrador, we need a person in Labrador as a co-ordinator of all departments. That is what is needed in Labrador, not an Assistant Deputy Minister of one particular department.

MR. FUREY:
(Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is my opinion, and the way it is now, I do not believe it is not working satisfactorily. It has not worked satisfactorily. We have a person in Labrador, and I think if you read MacLean's Magazine of four or five years ago there was an article in there which referred to him as the King of Labrador.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I have to say this: The hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) is agreeing with me. It is not very often we agree, but he agrees with what I am saying. And these are his thoughts over the last number of years, that he really believes there was too much authority given this particular Assistant Deputy Minister in Labrador, and it was not the wishes of the people.

I should say, in all fairness, I have heard it said time and time again - I want to be careful how I say it, Mr. Speaker - 'that there is more to Labrador than military.' There is more to Labrador than military. You have to have a co-ordinator of government services in Labrador who will look at all aspects of Labrador, not just the military. Whether NATO comes to Labrador or not, the people of Labrador will still be there, and let us remember that.

As I said to the Minister of Health this morning, the hospital in Lake Melville has to go ahead as soon as possible, with or without NATO.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I remind the hon. gentleman his time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take the opportunity to invite all hon. members to the Festival on July 14th which is coming up.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible).

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I remember, Mr. Speaker, being an Opposition member when the big government was the administration only a couple of years ago, and I used to go the opening, the little, lone Opposition member for Stephenville, and about seven or eight minister would fly in and they would surround me at the opening. But, of course, Mr. Speaker, I always said then that seven to one was equal odds at the time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

As I always say, Mr. Speaker, they treated me fairly and squarely then and to this day I always say I appreciate their contribution to the Festival and so on. I can see that we are going to continue that in our new government, Mr. Speaker.

I also want to commend the Government Services Committee and its Chairperson, Mr. Speaker, on doing a fine job, seeing the good debate that has been going back and forth.

I am very interested in this recreation capital grants program, Mr. Speaker. Just to clarify, members opposite, when they were

the government, commissioned a report and that report was done by some of their own people. It was done in 1986 - 1987. It took us about a year and-a-half to get a copy of the report, and when we finally got it we asked the minister of the day to release that report and he would not do so. Now, Mr. Speaker, we could not understand that, because it was a report commissioned by that government of the day to talk about how recreation money was spent in the Province. We had a very difficult time understanding why they would not release that report. But once we saw what the report said, then we could understand their reasoning, Mr. Speaker.

So when I hear members opposite talking about recreation capital grants and how the money is going to be spent for arts and culture and so on, I remind members opposite, those who were there in the previous administration, that even their own reports that they commissioned themselves said the money they spent was done on a political, partisan basis, Mr. Speaker. That was indicated in that report of 1987.

So we do not mind getting criticism, but we do like to get constructive criticism, Mr. Speaker. I think the questions that are being asked are quite good in many cases, but in other cases, Mr. Speaker, I think they are probably just trying to make political points. It is most unfortunate, but that is all you can do, Mr. Speaker.

I can see my time is waning, Mr. Speaker. I will adjourn debate on that note. Mr. Speaker, if anybody else wants to speak, they can go ahead. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the minute I have, I would like to comment on the remarks of my friend from St. John's South. I am sure he is expecting this. He congratulated government for the ministers patiently answering questions posed by estimates committees. I say to that, Mr. Speaker, that that is what the ministers are getting paid for. That is their job.

He went on to fault me because as an Opposition member I have asked a lot of questions about the arts and, to his ears, the questions were repetitious and he insinuated that they were trivial. Mr. Speaker, that shows his lack of appreciation of the significance of the arts to the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I did repeat a number of questions and it was because the Minister responsible for Culture had not fully answered them in some cases and, in other instances, it was because the minister's answers were at variance to what people outside the House, who are knowledgeable, have been saying.

So, Mr. Speaker, my questions have to do with the fundamental issues of the credibility of the minister and the government, and about the way in which they are going to dispense public funds, since it appears they are indulging in patronage when it comes to funding for the arts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

I wonder if members are ready to pass this particular Concurrence Motion before the day ends?

On motion, Concurrence Motion (Government Services Committee) carried.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The next item of business, of course, to be called will be the Concurrence Debates on the Department of Social Services. There have been some discussions with members opposite concerning Private Member's Day, which happens to be tomorrow. A topic has not been announced since Monday was a holiday. We were wondering if we could make some attempts to get through legislation, and so on, in the next few days to finish off the budget process as quickly as possible and, if necessary, forego this Wednesday and if necessary come back the Wednesday after and have our Private Member's Day then, if the House is still open?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

First we should stop the clock, I guess, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Stop the clock.

MR. SIMMS:

With respect to the requests from the Government House Leader, we have had some general discussions. Tomorrow is Private Member's Day, as I understand it, which would have been the Government's Private Member's Day. They would like to get on with some business, so we are, as usual, extremely cooperative and are prepared to do that. And, of course, it really does not matter, we are likely to be here for weeks on end anyway, especially if ministers do not be a little bit more forthcoming in answers. So we would agree with that, Mr. Speaker, for this week at least, then we will get on to the rest of the matters.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, can I invite everybody to the Exploits Valley Salmon Festival? Everyone has a brochure. We have Tommy Hunter, Anna McGoldrick and Gordon Pinsent. The Leader of the Opposition, in fact, was the patron of this Salmon Festival last year, and he smashed all of the attendance records in the history of the festival. We would expect to see several people out there, including the Premier. I am sure he will be there. But we agree with postponing Private Member's Day tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, that being the case, the Order of Business will be the third and final Concurrence Debate, the Social Services Committee, which includes four departments.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until

tomorrow, Wednesday, at 2:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

I say to the Opposition House Leader that I am looking forward to the next two or three weeks, I am sure we will have fun.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before putting the motion to hon. members, since a lot of displays are getting around I should remind hon. members that displays should be discretely placed on the desks. Today we had some flags around, and they are being displayed. I just want to read Beauchesne for you, 501 Re exhibits: 'Speakers have consistently ruled that it is improper to produce exhibits of any sort in the Chamber.' Hon. members should take note of that. Today it was a good flag, but tomorrow it might not be such a good flag. So I would like remind hon. gentlemen about that.

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

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

June 27, 1989

*Tabled by Hon. the
Minister of Works, Services
& Transp. 27 June '89*

QUESTION

Mr. Alvin Hewlett (Green Bay) - to ask the Honourable Minister of Works, Services and Transportation to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

The new reduced rate structure for the ferry system for Little Bay Islands and Long Island in the District of Green Bay.

ANSWER

As indicated in the Budget document of June 6th, 1989, Government will be lowering Provincial ferry rates to approximately 50 percent of current levels over a three year period, commencing October 1st, 1989. This initiative will include the lowering of ferry rates for the ferry systems for Little Bay Islands and Long Island in the District of Green Bay.

Tabled by the Honourable David S. Gilbert, Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, June 27th, 1989

QUESTION NO. 28

*Tabled by the Hon. the
Minister of Health,
27 June, 1989.*

QUESTION: Mr. Len Simms (Grand Falls) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

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

RESPONSE:

Particulars

<u>DATE</u>	<u>TRIP</u>	<u>ACCOMODATION</u>	<u>PER DIEM</u>	<u>TRANSPORTATION</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1989 05 25	attending 25th anniversary celebration James Paton Memorial Hospital	-	-	\$ 270.20	\$ 270.20
1989 06 03	addressing annual meeting of N.M.A., Grand Falls	\$ 49.20	\$ 97.00	-	\$ 146.20
1989 06 05	addressing A.R.N.N. Convention, Gander	-	-	\$ 259.20	\$ 259.20
1989 06 09	official opening extension to Brookfield Hospital	\$ 49.28	\$ 63.00	\$ 137.10	\$ 249.38
	TOTAL EXPENSES				<u>\$ 924.98</u>

QUESTION NO. 11

*Tabled by Hon. the
Minister of Health, 27
June, 1989.*

QUESTION: Mr. Len Simms (Grand Falls) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

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

RESPONSE:

<u>Particulars</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Framing of certificate (Honourable Chris Decker)	\$ 56.00
Purchase of radio (Honourable Chris Decker)	\$ 100.74
Photo prints (Honourable Chris Decker)	\$ 112.00
Printing of business cards	\$ 120.00
Framing - pictures and certificates (Dr. John Collins)	<u>\$ 597.51</u>
	<u>\$ 986.25</u>

*Tabled by Hon. the Min,
of Works, Services &
Transp. 27 June '89.*

QUESTION

9. Mr. Len Simms (Grand Falls) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Works, Services and Transportatio to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

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

ANSWER

Attached is the information as requested.

Tabled by the Honourable David S. Gilbert, Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, June 27th, 1989.

EXPENDITURES INCURRED BY MINISTERS OFFICE
SINCE MAY 5, 1989

<u>ITEMS PURCHASED</u>	<u>COST</u>
PHOTOFINISHING	\$ 25.72
OFFICE SUPPLIES	399.45
PORTABLE MICRO DICTATION MACHINE	446.88
MICRO CASSETTE TRANSCRIBING MACHINE	672.00
PORTABLE MICRO DITCTATION MACHINE	442.40
LATERAL FILING CABINET	694.40
STENOGRAPHERS CHAIRS	219.52
PLANTS FROM P.A. PIPPY PARK	271.04
CHAIR MAT FOR SECRETARY TO MINISTER	80.00
 TOTAL:	 \$3271.41

*Tabled by Hon. the Min.
of Works, Services & Transp.
27 June '89.*

QUESTION

35. Mr. Len Simms (Grand Falls) - to ask the Honourable Minister of Works, Services and Transportation to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

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

ANSWER

1. Minister's Assistant, Mr. Walter Milley - Standing Travel Advance - \$500
2. Minister's Assistant - June 13-15, St. John's to Gander - TO 943152 - \$270.20 airfare

Total from May 5th, 1989 - \$770.20

Tabled by the Honourable David S. Gilbert, Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, June 27th, 1989