



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 45

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Thursday

21 May 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased today, to inform hon. members of the activities of the Farm Development Loan Board over the past year.

One hundred and nineteen applications were approved totalling \$1,970,579 as compared to 58 approved totalling \$802,0245 for the fiscal year 1985-86, Mr. Speaker, an increase of almost 100 per cent. This dramatic increase is attributed to the maximum loan limit being increased from \$30,000 to \$75,000, as well as lower interest rates which have been fixed at 6.75 per cent as of October 1, 1986. As of April, Mr. Speaker, these rates are down to 5.75 per cent which will be of benefit to farmers again this year.

The increase in the loan limit provided farmers the opportunity to access funds at a preferred rate of interest. As a result, Mr. Speaker, many farmers became involved in capital expansion and renovations that had been deferred due to the high cost of borrowing. This increased activity resulted in a significant number of persons obtaining

part-time employment over the past year. From the records received by the board, Mr. Speaker, this number is in the area of thirty to thirty-five jobs.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
Thanks to the minister for the copy of the statement.

I applaud any initiative, Mr. Speaker, that increases assistance, increases employment in our Province and allows people to take advantage of lower interest rates. I would like, as an individual representing one of the seats in Labrador, to see an increased promotional activity in assistance to the Labrador area which, by the way, Mr. Minister, has considerably more sunshine than Mount Pearl does. I am sure you noted that.

It is significant, too, Mr. Speaker, to say that the amount of assistance indicated in the minister's statement is representative of only about 10 per cent or 11 per cent of what the government is spending on the Mount Pearl greenhouse project, and history may show that to be reprehensible.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Just a few comments with regard to the financial situation of the agricultural industry, more specifically the dairy industry. In relation to the situation the farmers are in and which this of course refers to, we would like to suggest to the minister that perhaps it is now time for a full investigation of the dairy industry, and the way in which it is set up, in order to see whether or not the minimum rates being set for milk at the retail level are needed or appropriate, or whether they are just protecting the dairies.

The other comments I would have about it, as well, is that it is obvious that the Appeals Tribunal which has been established to review the Milk Marketing Board decisions, allegedly to protect the farmers whom we see being protected by this particular statement, it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that this board has completely violated the rules which it has operated under - the Supreme Court has said so - and we are calling upon the minister now to dismiss that Appeals Tribunal and put a new one in place so that we can get a valid decision which will protect all the consumers of this Province as well as the farmers.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Financial institutions and

insurance matters have been the subject of much debate and action in recent months throughout Canada, especially in the wake of a number of recent bank and insurance company failures in Canada that have plagued both consumers and governments. Similarly, the proposed reorganization or diversification of financial institutions, coupled with the current insurance premium costs and availability problems, have created much interest in this important segment of the marketplace which affects all consumers.

I wish to inform the House of the action being taken by my department to meet these new developments in the marketplace.

The Commercial Relations Division of the Department of Consumer Affairs and Communications has primary responsibility for the regulation of the insurance industry and the trust and loan companies in the Province. In addition, the Director of Commercial Relations also has further responsibility as Director of Trade Practices.

The workload associated with insurance and trust and loan regulations, coupled with responsibility for trade practices, has been increasing steadily to the extent that an evaluation of the duties and responsibilities of the Director of Commercial Relations was needed. As a result of an extensive review undertaken by the Organization and Management Division of Treasury Board, it was determined that the trade practices function should be separated from the insurance and trust and loan regulatory responsibilities. Accordingly,

two positions have been created where there was only one in the past. The Director of Commercial Relations will have responsibility as Superintendent of Insurance and will administer provincial trust and loan legislation. An additional position of Director of Trade Practices will focus on consumer protection in the commercial/retail fields as well as providing advice on the many and varied pieces of legislation for which the department is responsible.

It is my pleasure today to announce the appointment of Mr. Paul Tapper, B. Comm., C.A., as Director of Commercial Relations and Superintendent of Insurance on the recommendation of the Public Service Commission. Mr. Tapper has been Acting Director and Acting Superintendent since September 1986 and is a professional accountant with extensive experience in the area of financial institution regulation. Mr. Tapper has been employed with the department since 1982 in the position of Assistant Director of Commercial Relations and Deputy Superintendent of Insurance with primary responsibility for monitoring the financial stability of insurance, loan and trust companies operating in the Province. Prior to joining the department, Mr. Tapper worked with a major chartered accounting firm in the Province and in Bermuda. Mr. Tapper is a native Newfoundlander and currently resides in St. John's.

I am confident that Mr. Tapper, in his new role, will endeavour to monitor key developments in the financial industry and insurance field to ensure the Province's interests in these areas are safeguarded.

The position of Director of Trade Practices is currently being advertised and it is my hope that a suitable candidate will be recruited very shortly.

These organizational changes within my department and the appointment of Mr. Tapper as Director of Commercial Relations and Superintendent of Insurance, with a Director of Trade Practices to be appointed shortly, will certainly improve the ability of my department to respond to consumer problems and should afford a greater consumer protection capability.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, the minister in his opening paragraph alludes to the fact that there is extensive debate going on in Canada today regarding financial institutions and insurance matters, but I want to assure him that the matter addressed here today does not reach the level of sophistication, complexity or perplexity of the matters being suggested nationally. This measure today is just merely a separation of functions, a matter for administrative convenience. Albeit it may be very, very necessary, but it certainly does not address the matters addressed by the national debate which is talking about refining and fine tuning regulations and rules under which these financial institutions operate, specifying what kind of

rules will apply, whether they are federal or provincial, and specifying what kind of financial investments each of these institutions will be permitted to engage in, whether they will deal in international, national or provincial. None of these issues are dealt with.

And, finally, at the national level they are dealing with controlling and regulating the cost of insurance premiums to the consumer. Now, I do not know whether this administrative convenience, this breaking up of functions, making two divisions, two directors, or one superintendent and one director, one of the insurance industry and one of The Trade Practices Act, will indeed result in regulating the cost of insurance to the people of this Province, and that is what is important, Mr. Speaker. If this measure today will result in a reduction in the cost of insurance to the people of this Province, the premium rates, well, then, it certainly will be a good measure, although I doubt that is what will happen.

My concluding remarks and some suggestion to the minister is that I would hope he will follow the lead taken by the Ontario government where they have proposed a freeze on insurance premiums for a certain period of time.

That is what will concern the consumer of this Province, the high and continually escalating cost of insurance premiums to all the people in this Province.

I conclude by saying that I certainly do not object to the measures that the minister has taken today. Obviously it is done

for a purpose, for fine tuning and refining the administrative function. But I hope, Mr. Speaker, that it will achieve more than that, I hope it will result in premium reductions to the people of this Province with respect to insurance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, we are quite pleased to see the minister strengthening the officers in his department. I think it is long overdue. I think, given the problems that his department has, or the problems in our society which his department is responsible for, it is appropriate that there be a considerable strengthening here.

Just to mention a couple of the problems: The one on insurance premiums, I think, is one that is becoming wider and wider known. We know that high-risk people, for example the ambulance operators with whom I think everybody here is familiar, are now facing extremely heavy increases in their insurance rates as a result of arbitrary actions being taken by the insurance industry. I hope Mr. Tapper addresses that problem as quickly as possible to see if something cannot be done, because, of course, with their costs rising it puts them in a further financial bind in terms of what they are doing.

The other area I think we should mention is the situation in Corner Brook where a financial advisor,

and I use the word advisedly, hung out his shingle and was able to accumulate vast sums of money, in trust, and basically ended up with those funds being frittered away in such a way that widows and orphans, in a large denomination in our Province, are very much at a disadvantage as a result of the actions of this individual, and this individual, Mr. Speaker, is not regulated one iota by any of our legislation.

So I remind the minister again that we are long overdue on having regulations and legislation that will cover financial advisors so that we will not have widows and orphans, who have worked all their lives, ending up with all their life savings being squandered away by unscrupulous individuals. So I am hoping that the appointment of these individuals will strengthen the minister's department and we will be able to attack these major problems.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

At this stage I would like to welcome to the galleries twenty-eight Grade VIII students with two teachers, Wanda Butler and James Dinn, from St. Joseph's School in Ferryland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. It relates to the report that was tabled yesterday by the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), from the Canadian Public Health Association, relating, if one would pay attention to the title, to the health effects of increased flying activity in the Labrador area, and that is the brunt of my question to the Premier. I note that in announcing the study in the House of Assembly a year or so ago the minister said, in part, and I quote, 'The government will be contracting with the Canadian Public Health Association to undertake an independent and objective study in the Labrador area of potential and actual effects of low level flying activity on the health of residents of Labrador.'

The report, as the Premier will be aware, goes far beyond health matters. Am I to assume, first of all, that the Canadian Public Health Association was contracted to do this study because of its expertise in health matters and, therefore, does the Premier have some concerns that this Association has addressed a whole range of issues which are, first, outside its mandate, and, I would submit, outside its particular area of expertise? And I guess my real question is: In reviewing the recommendations in this report, as the Premier undertook to do yesterday I believe, will he assure the House that he will not pay particular attention to recommendations that are not within either the Association's mandate or expertise?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, the Cabinet has not had an opportunity to go through the report. We will be doing that in the next several days and assessing what the report has to say. I think it is fair to say, however, in line with the Leader of the Opposition's question, and I have not read through and seen whether there is any ambiguity in the terms of reference, but it would seem that what the organization has come in with goes beyond what we intended. I do not know if the exact wording of some of the terms of reference could be interpreted a number of ways or not, but the report does go beyond just the issue of the impact upon the health of the people of Labrador and does enter into other areas which were not the primary, at least, consideration of the government when we asked this organization to do this work. Undoubtedly I think it would be fair to say, even if in fact there may be some ambiguity in the terms of reference, I think their primary responsibility was one in the health field to start with, more particularly in their area of expertise, especially as it relates to Native land claims and the ongoing problems between, for example, the Government of Newfoundland and the Innu versus how we are co-operating with the Inuit and the tripartite negotiations that have to occur in any case between the Government of Canada, the Government of Newfoundland and the Native peoples, and in that they have gone beyond their expertise. So we will have to take that into

consideration in examining the report.

It is one of those things that seems to happen more and more these days, that when a government, with all good intent and on behalf of all of the people of the Province, engage people with an independent and objective view point to do certain pieces of work to help government make policy, that far too often these days it seems as if many of these organizations and so on give themselves license to make editorial comment or otherwise upon other issues which were not the primary focus for which the whole report was intended in the beginning. So I do have some real concerns about that and obviously we will be taking those kinds of factors into consideration as we examine that. Our primary responsibility, in the first instance, will be to respond to the recommendations on health, and we will obviously have our own viewpoints to make as it relates to the other recommendations which were outside, obviously, the expertise of the organization, if not outside their terms of reference.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, it is passing strange that a document is so filled with political statements, posturing on cultural issues and land claim issues. It is preposterous.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the Premier was implied in my first question. Will he assure

the House that the government will at least consider ignoring completely any recommendations which are outside the mandate of this particular study group?

Mr. Speaker, if I may, just a word of explanation, and perhaps I can put it in the form of question. Is it not an improper use of public money to have a group of people pontificating at public expense on matters in which they do not have any particular expertise?

To return to my supplementary: Would the Premier consider ignoring all those recommendations which are outside the mandate of that group insofar as this study is concerned, and certainly outside their stated expertise, i.e., health matters?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we will consider it. We will read the whole report and all the recommendations that the organization has made and we will consider what the Leader of the Opposition has said. The one area that really bothers me is in the whole area of Native land claims. There are many others which are very, very complex. As I said, in answer to the original question, it is of some concern to us, and I am sure to other governments and other people in the country, as well as the Province, that various organizations from time to time seem to take it upon themselves to make editorial comment, or whatever phrase you want to put on it, on matters which were not really the major focus and primary focus of what they were hired to do. So we will take what the Leader of the Opposition has to

say into consideration in our examination of the report. Let me just go on to say, at this point in time our policies relative to Labrador and to military training in Labrador remain today as what they were yesterday and the day before, and there has been no departure from our initiatives to try to attract additional activity in the Labrador area. That would only be changed after we had reconsidered it all in Cabinet. Of course, we will reconsider the recommendations of this report, but obviously we have some deep concerns, as the Leader of the Opposition has outlined.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

The Premier touches on my concern, too, that this uninformed comment on matters outside the expertise of the group could be peddled to support causes other than the cause that I and my colleagues in the Opposition support and the government supports, and that is the establishment of a NATO base in Labrador. The sadness of all this is that on the issue this group was asked to address it is very definitive, because it knows what it is talking about, and its finding was one that we can take some encouragement from.

Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary, then, is twofold, if I may. First of all, will the Premier assure the House that if there is a particular need to study areas related to land claims, a particular need to study areas related to cultural matters and so on as they affect the

Native people of Labrador, that he will undertake to engage groups competent to do those studies to advise the government on those matters? Secondly, would he indicate to the House whether this contract was for a fixed amount in terms of dollars or was it open-ended? If the latter - when I say 'open-ended' I mean based on the amount of work done, etcetera - will he assure the House that this association will be reimbursed only to the extent that it was working on the mandate given it by the Minister of Health on behalf of the government? In other words, to say it differently, will he assure the House that this association will not be funded, will not be reimbursed for providing the government with matters it never asked for advice on in the first place, matters outside its mandate, matters outside its area of expertise?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the second part of the question first. I would suspect, and I will check this out for the House that there was a certain price, a certain contract in that it was not open-ended. But I just suspect that and I will have to get the information for the House during the rest of this day or for tomorrow, but no later than tomorrow. So I will undertake to do that. I would suspect that it was for a fixed price but I do not know for sure.

On the first issue, I want to make it very clear, I want to make it abundantly clear to this House and to anybody who wishes to report this, that when the Leader of the Opposition talks about they were

outside of their area of expertise, and if more work has to be done in Native land claims or in cultural matters we get somebody else who is expert in that, the great danger is that you will get somebody who is an expert, if in fact we needed to do some work on cultural things or on Native land claims, who will then also make editorial comment on health things in the same way as this organization has done it in reverse.

So I am not so sure that we would be well done by to continue the process in the first instance, even in fact if it could be legitimately established that some work needed to be done. Let me go on to say I doubt very much, as a matter of fact I am pretty sure that there is very little need, if any at all can be established, to continue to go outside in the sense of going to another organization. I do not mean going outside as it relates to government departments, and ministers and officials in consultation with local groups and so on - I do not mean that - but going outside to ask for a certain particular "objective" view of what constitutes and should continue to enhance culture in Labrador in light of military activity or in absence of it, or in the same way as it relates to Native land claims.

Governments, members and so on are elected to do certain things under the Constitution of Canada, and I think that with an ongoing, outward approach to Native land claims and the whole question of culture that we should be able to establish policies and programmes which are reflective of what the people want without having to go every second day to somebody else

to get another opinion.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews). I would say to the minister that I am holding here a discussion paper, initiated by the government, on commercial hunting and fishing camps. This paper is riddled with suggestions and ideas that if implemented would deny Newfoundlanders and Labradorians their traditional and historic rights to hunt and fish. And my question, Mr. Speaker, is: Does the minister support, or is he prepared to introduce policy in this Province that would in any way deny or restrict the rights of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to hunt and fish in this Province, a right that they have always enjoyed?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Not at all, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Well, would the minister take this opportunity to assure

Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that regardless of anything contained in this discussion paper that he or his government will not entertain any discussions or recommendations that would in any way deny or restrict Newfoundlanders' and Labradorians' traditional rights to hunt and fish anywhere in this Province?

MR. MATTHEWS:
You forgot to turn over the page.

MR. FLIGHT:
That is alright, boy. Do not worry.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What the hon. gentleman is now trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is continuing with a line that has been put forward by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) in trying to raise false concerns in the Province about what in essence this paper is doing. Really, we are going out around the Province to ask for public opinion and feedback on hunting and fishing, and particularly the outfitting industry as it pertains to the Province. So, Mr. Speaker, no, this government does not have any intention of limiting or restricting the access of people to the Province's rivers or hunting. What we are trying to do is get public opinion, feedback, from the people of this Province so that the people, in essence, have some input into the decision making of government, which I think is very healthy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the minister's statement that he is making it possible for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to have input into discussion and have some influence on any policy that might arise from this policy paper, let me ask him this question and let me get a commitment from him for people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Will the minister make a commitment that before any action is taken on this discussion paper that full public hearings will be held in a way that guarantees every interested Newfoundlander and Labradorian the right and the opportunity to express their views on the ideas, concerns, recommendations and thoughts that are expressed in this discussion paper? Will he guarantee that?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. FLIGHT:
Why has this not happened before?

MR. BAIRD:
Shut up, sit down and wait.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know what better way there is to get feedback from residents of this Province than to allow each and every one of them to respond to a paper published by the government. I must correct the hon. gentleman because all that is

contained in the report, in the paper is a number of suggested options, proposals. It is not government policy that is outlined in the paper but a number of options so that people can look at these options to give them some ideas, and to have them think about them, Mr. Speaker. It is not that government is dictating. We are looking to the people of the Province, and I think it is the most effective way -

MR. FLIGHT:
How many copies have you distributed to interested people?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. gentleman has been drinking some of the spray that he was talking about yesterday, but he seems to be in an awful titter today. I would just like to go on record, Mr. Speaker, as saying that we are asking the people of the Province for input and feedback and we expect thousands of responses. If we went the public hearing route we would not get quite as many people to respond, so every Newfoundlander now has an opportunity to respond to this paper. If they want copies sent out they can contact either the office of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands or mine and we will gladly mail them out.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A short, final supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT:
I ask the minister if he would inform the House of how many

copies of this discussion paper has been distributed in Newfoundland to date? How many copies have been distributed?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, it changes on a daily rate, and, of course, having left my office about fifty minutes ago I do not know the exact number.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier and it concerns the issue, and more specifically the victims of family violence in the Province. I was appalled, to be quite frank, to learn from correspondence and a brief received from the Provincial Association of Family Violence that over the last four to six years approximately some 2,500 women and children have sought shelter from physical and mental abuse in the three transition houses in the Province, in Corner Brook, Happy Valley and St. John's. I say to the Premier these are the only victims we know about. I was particularly taken aback, if I can, to the Premier, by one other assertion in that brief, and that is that the police, who are compelled by law to press charges, according to this brief are shirking that responsibility. I would ask has the Premier and the government responded to the concerns that this Association has raised and what was the nature of his response? What action has he

taken on the whole affair of the police in this Province?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the transition houses that the hon. member refers to are three that we, this administration, have established. There were none a few years ago. We have now provided funds and support to establish these transition houses. Many, many more are needed. We could have many more, I am sure, and more support services than we have right now. But we are taking the concerns very, very seriously and the Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Ms. Verge), the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) and the Minister of Health all their departments are involved in ongoing discussions with these groups to try to alleviate some of the problems. Family violence is a very, very serious social concern not only in this Province but throughout Canada and throughout North America. So we are trying to respond as positively, with as much support as we can to this growing - it may not be growing, but at least more identified problem than we realized before existed. You know, these various briefs that have come in and the new statistics that have been revealed show that there is this serious problem there. And we are going to do all we can, Mr. Speaker, to respond in as positive and reassuring a way as we can as a government, as we have done in the past with the establishment of the transition houses.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Perhaps the Premier did not get the gist of the question that I asked him. In the brief, and I say this for his benefit, the Association are claiming that the police are shirking their responsibility in regards to the response time in the laying of charges, that is their contention. I ask the Premier has he studied that situation? Has he responded to it? Just what is the response? Because it seems to me that we have passed I think a law and a regulation in this House - I believe it was in 1985 - that indeed they had to look into these matters promptly and with great care, and this Association is now making the charge that this is not being done. I would ask the Premier what action is being taken in this regard, what monitoring is going on and so forth?

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address these questions. These are questions of critical importance that I and my officials have been addressing. For the benefit of all members, recently I met with a Committee comprising representatives of the Provincial Association Against Family Violence, who corresponded with the member, the St. John's Transition House, the Gander Status of Women Council, who have

been active in the Central Newfoundland area in assisting members of family violence, and the Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women Solicitor General's project on family violence.

As an aside, of course, the Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women was established by this government, another initiative, in addition to funding the three transition houses, taken by this administration.

I met with representatives of all these groups and senior officers of our two police forces recently to review the situation in the Province now. What representatives of these groups said is that in many instances the police, both the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, are responding efficiently, appropriately, and sensitively. They are very pleased with the response in some instances. However, they said there is not consistency and there is room for improvement. That was acknowledged by me and the representatives of the police departments. We pledged to work very hard to improve the service. To effect improvements we have a long list of practical pointed suggestions, and we also have a commitment to in-service education programmes for police officers. We will be working on mounting seminars for the police, as well as for other professionals, since we feel that a team approach to problems of family violence is most appropriate. Police have to work side by side with social workers, and in some cases with teachers and with transition house workers.

We have made a lot of progress. Three years ago our Justice Department issued a policy directive to the police departments and the Crown Attorneys indicating that family violence has to be addressed the same as assaults between strangers. That policy directive is being enforced vigorously. With the education programme that we are mounting now we can expect to see further improvements in police response to problems of family violence.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Justice, as the Premier has passed the question to her, just what guidelines the police are under to ensure that they are carrying out a responsibility which this Association says that they have not carried out? Let me in my supplementary also put another question to her which I want to get answer to. Is she aware - and she is aware, I have no doubt - but what is she doing about the Association's contention that, especially in the more rural parts of this Province, the educational system is not in place, the type of educational personnel and resources are not in place, and the kind of shelters are not in place for those people to receive the kind of education, and indeed for our whole society to receive the kind of education, and the kind of shelters for those women and children that are needed? What is the department doing about that? This group is saying that there is not enough attention

being paid to that particular aspect.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, there was a written policy directive issued three years ago by the Associate Deputy Attorney General of the Department of Justice to the Chief Superintendent of the RCMP and the Chief of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary as well as Crown Attorneys, and that policy directive remains in force and has been incorporated into policy manuals of the two police forces.

MR. TULK:

Are you monitoring that?

MS VERGE:

We are monitoring that. We just implemented an improved system of record keeping so that police will as a matter of course record every complaint about family violence, the response to that complaint, whether a charge was laid, what happened in court and, if the charge was withdrawn or dismissed in court, why. The committee that I outlined will be meeting with me again in the Fall. We have set a definite date, and we have agreed to meet regularly, at least twice a year. We will monitor these statistics and they will be broken down by geographic region. There is no reason to think that the police by region vary. Each force is provincial and each force has policy direction from the top throughout the Province. The education programmes that are planned will be held for police officers throughout the Province, in every detachment in the Province.

As for education to the general

public, the Justice Department, the police forces and the Crown Attorneys will be working cooperatively with these groups, through the Committee and through ad hoc projects, and through the Interdepartmental Committee on Family Violence, which comprises several government departments, to improve our public education campaign on the subject of family violence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications, and it is concerning his appointment last year of his labour buddy to the House Commission, and at that time it was indicated that it was not a full-time position. I ask the minister was Mr. Wells, then or has he since been appointed full-time to the Public Utilities Board?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. the member for Port de Grave, does not get his Wells mixed up.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of

Mr. Andy Wells to the Public Utilities Board was a part-time appointment. The jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Board is not with my department so I have no jurisdiction to appoint Mr. Wells full-time. Maybe the question is better posed to the Minister of Justice, who has authority over the Public Utilities Board.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

I will ask the Minister of Justice, if the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications cannot answer the question, has Mr. Wells been appointed to the Public Utilities Board on a full-time basis?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, yes, he has been. Initially he was appointed on a part-time basis because, if my memory serves me correctly, at the time he was a member of the Royal Commission on Unemployment and Employment. But once his work on the royal commission was over, then he became a full-time member of the Public Utilities Board and he is now serving as a full-time member of the PUB.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:

I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, is it a fact that Mr.

Wells is receiving, up until age seventy, a salary of \$60,000 a year, which will amount to \$1,800,000 over the next thirty years?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the salaries of members of the Public Utilities Board are public knowledge. I do not have the figures at my fingertips but they are available in public documents.

MR. EFFORD:

It is not.

MS VERGE:

I can certainly get the information and provide it to members later.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is just time for one question.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My question is for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. TOBIN:

No wonder you are not saying much about Come By Chance not hiring union people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!
Order, please!

There is one member on my left who persists in interrupting right through the Question Period, and I

would ask him to please keep quiet.

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My question for the minister is this: He has repeatedly said in the House that the Sprung Organization is putting \$3.5 million in cash into the joint venture being operated with the provincial government. At the same time, we are seeing the Sprung organization dismantling their greenhouses in Calgary and bringing them here, presumably. Is it \$3.5 million we are getting from the Sprung organization, or are they donating a used greenhouse to us, which, according to the research that we have done, sells on the commercial scale for \$4.7 million?

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the question I have for the minister is: Is the Sprung Group actually putting no real cash into this project, and in fact is selling -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

- a used greenhouse structure to the provincial government and

getting approximately \$1.2 million on top of it, considering the cost of the operation is \$4.7 million in order to buy an 8.4 acre greenhouse structure from the Sprung Group?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member must be the only one in the Province who does not know that the Sprung Corporation is putting in \$3.5 million cash to this facility. They are also taking on loan commitments for \$7 million, Mr. Speaker. The government is putting in \$2.5 million cash with \$1 million worth of land. So, technically what the government has done for \$2.5 million cash and \$1 million worth of land is acquire 50 per cent of an \$18 million project. That is not a bad deal, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

At this stage I would like to welcome to the gallery seventeen students from Little Bay Elementary School, Green Bay, accompanied by their principal Mr. Everett Pitts, and also, twenty students and their principal Mr. Jim Starkes from South Brook Elementary School, Green Bay, along with their chaperones.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome teacher Gertrude McDonald with fifteen students from St. Judes High School, St. Fintan's in the district of St. George's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Petitions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here which I would like to present on behalf of more than 400 residents of Bell Island.

The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) was in the House a moment ago, I hope that he is now in the precincts and can listen to what I am saying, because I have to say I was very disappointed when listening to the minister on the radio this morning taking a very negative attitude before he had the full facts and information on this matter. Taking his usual arrogant and high-handed approach, Mr. Speaker, that we have seen in so many cases and so many times the minister has ended up having to back water like a squid when the real facts of the situation come out.

Mr. Speaker, this is a minister, who I will not say does not care. I will say he is a minister whose initial reaction when a problem is raised about matters relating to his department, his initial reaction is to pretend that there

is no problem and to hope that it goes away.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when I receive a petition from 400 of my constituents, when I go to a public meeting and I have more than 200 of those constituents out, confirming, Mr. Speaker, confirming the contents of the petition, then I say to the minister that he would do well to get off his high-horse and start paying attention to the taxpayers of this Province, to the people of this Province who he is supposed to be representing and looking after.

Mr. Speaker, one thing I will say, and I will thank and compliment the minister for it, I will compliment him for agreeing to meet with a delegation. Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully submit to the minister that that should have been the extent of his response, initially, apart from, well, I had hoped that he would, and I know the minister has a busy schedule and that is why when I invited the minister to the public meeting, I said himself or his representative. I would have hoped that there could have been a representative at that meeting of the minister's department. That would have shown a responsible approach to this problem. That, and agreeing to meet with a delegation, Mr. Speaker, is the reasonable response and not to start saying, 'No, there is no problem, no, this sort of thing goes on all over the Province.' I will tell the minister if this sort of things goes on all over the Province, there is a problem all over the Province. It does not mean there is no problem at all.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a

petition which alleges, and it is a serious allegation, it alleges unfairness and an inequality of treatment of social service recipients. It alleges favoritism. It alleges that some people can get jobs, for example, on projects sponsored by the Department of Social Services year, after year, after year and other families cannot, other people cannot. It alleges that more that one member of a particular family can get a job and nobody from another family year, after year, after year, cannot.

MR. TOBIN:

Are all of them on social assistance?

MR. BARRY:

Many of them are on social assistance but there are projects, as the member knows, where employees from the community who are unemployed -

MR. TOBIN:

Only a few.

MR. BARRY:

Okay, there may not be as many, but, yes, many of these people are on social assistance. In case the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) does not know, the unemployment rate fostered by the government or administration of which he is a part has not done very much in terms of providing jobs on Bell Island. As a result, we have a large rate of unemployment and we have a large number of people who have to rely upon the Department of Social Services. Mr. Speaker, I cannot go through all of the items in detail, but I will supply the minister with these items of examples of alleged unfairness.

Mr. Speaker, I almost went through the radio this morning when I heard the minister say that he cannot do a thing and he will not do a thing, and he will ignore it unless names are alleged. Mr. Speaker, I deliberately, in order to save employees of the minister's department from embarrassment, in order to treat people fairly and not to have their names thrown out in a public meeting before these individuals have a chance to explain their side of things, I asked the sponsors of the petition to have the names removed. I asked the people at the public meeting to stay away from naming particular names, but we have the names, Mr. Speaker. My letter to the minister, and I wrote the minister and sent him a copy of this petition before this, my letter said that we were prepared to supply particulars and names and we will do that.

But when the minister gets up in this House time after time and makes allegations about members on this side of the House being irresponsible because they raised names of people, he says, 'It is the height of irresponsibility,' and then he tries to shirk his duty and ignore a problem by saying he is not going to do anything about it until he is supplied with names.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, what I would ask the minister to do, I would ask the minister to confirm what he has already done on the radio. I would ask him to continue to accept the principle of meeting with the delegation from Bell Island. I had a committee

appointed at this public meeting. There were four individuals who were present at that meeting who have the support of the 200 people at the meeting, they have been appointed a committee. I would ask the minister to let me arrange an appointment with him, with or without myself as their M.H.A., to have them come in, have them lay out the problems that they see the way in which the system is running on Bell Island.

I do not know, as I have told the minister, for sure, Mr. Speaker, whether all these allegations are well founded or not. But I say to the minister, in all sincerity, they deserve to be investigated fairly. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be tabled and that it be presented to the Department of Social Services and to the minister for action.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that if a member rises to speak on a petition that has been presented by an hon. member, then that person is suppose to support the petition. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the petition as such, but with leave of the House, I would like to make a few comments.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. BRETT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon.

member will acknowledge that it would be ludicrous for the Minister of Social Services, whoever he might be, to attend a public meeting in any community in this Province with respect to complaints against the department or against the staff. Because at any given time, Mr. Speaker, any day of the year in this Province we have approximately 20,000 people who are in receipt of assistance. The hon. member knows and this House knows it is physically impossible, it is a physical impossibility to please all of these people all of the time. A lot of these people are frustrated people. We are dealing with them on a one on one basis. They have physical needs, they have mental needs. Very often they do not understand the system. They become frustrated with the bureaucracy that is necessary in a large department.

I would suggest that anybody in this House can go to any community in Newfoundland tomorrow and come up with a petition exactly like the one the hon. member has presented in the House today. The petition came to my office. I saw it and I asked the senior staff to interview the staff on Bell Island

MR. BARRY:

You did not respond to my letter.

MR. BRETT:

- to let me know what the result was and they did that.

In my opinion, from the information that I was given I felt, number one, for reasons which I have already outlined, that I should not attend a public meeting on Bell Island, and secondly, unless the information contained in the petition could be

substantiated with actual names, then I saw no reason for any further investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I would assume that the jobs that the petition talks about are jobs through the Community Development Programme. The only criteria to work on a Community Development Programme is that you either be a recipient of social assistance or I suppose even if you qualified, if you were about to go on, then you could be given a job. So I do not know where the favoritism comes in. I cannot see how it can because in order to be eligible for the job then you have to be on social assistance or, as I indicated, eligible for it. So I do not know where the favoritism can come in there.

Nobody has told me the names of this family where eight were on - and that is not impossible I suppose - but I do not see how there can be anything really wrong about it if they were eligible to go on the jobs. Mr. Speaker, I indicated on the radio, not in the House, but on CBC Radio this morning that I would not, I did not give any thought whatsoever, not one second's thought to attending that public meeting. I did not then nor will I ever because nothing can be accomplished. I said on the radio that I would be happy to meet with a delegation or a committee and the hon. member has done that.

By the way, the hon. member has always been very, very cooperative with my department and he has a district where there are problems. I must say he has always been very patient and very understanding and I would like to think that he will be in this as well. I will be happy to see a

committee.

I do not think that this was necessarily the right way to do it. I know they had a right to do it this way but I do not think it is necessarily the right way. If there were some very serious complaints about the staff on Bell Island, then I think that if two or three people had come into me, given me some names and some facts - and as the hon. member knows there was another case in his district, we do not have to say, do we, what community - there was a problem, it was brought to my attention and it took a long time, but we got it straightened out and the hon. member was right and the staff was wrong and it was straightened out.

MR. BARRY:

And I gave the Minister credit at a public meeting for doing that.

MR. BRETT:

If there is a problem here and if it comes to me in the proper way, with facts and names, it will be dealt with and if somebody is doing something wrong it will be stopped.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this petition that the hon. member for Mount Scio - Bell Island so ably presented to the House because, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that these problems have not only started on Bell Island but are Province-wide.

The minister made a statement in the beginning of his speech to the fact referring to those kinds of people. What the minister should recognize is his government and his administration have created the large number of people in this Province who are depending on social assistance. So while the numbers are growing from year to year, the problems are going to grow from year to year.

I can assure the minister of one thing. What he is not doing in his department and what his officials are not doing in his department is not working with the regional and district offices. He is not aware of any problems at any time that is taking place in these district and regional offices because the minister, nor any of his officials, ever take the time to go out and visit on any occasion.

The minister stated very clearly that he would not attend a public meeting. His explanation for not attending a public meeting is very, very weak. If the minister once in a while took the time - we do not expect him to attend every public meeting - but if he had the interest, if he has as sincere as he says he is about those people, he would be aware of some of the problems that they are encountering.

A headline in the local paper from Carbonear, The Compass, this week reads: The Beautification Programme: Harbour Grace Gets The Greater Proportion.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not true!

MR. EFFORD:

Well, you better call up your editor. The Tory editor down in

Carbonear printed this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

The minister is saying very clearly that is not taking place, but it is taking place with the placement of jobs, it is taking place with the placement of foremen on those projects, and it is taking place even in the projects that the minister, himself, and his Tory ministers, are advocating around the Province. It is very clear, Mr. Speaker, that if you are a Tory, it certainly helps.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that it has got to be reduced to the level of our Social Services sector, where those people are depending on a few, I should say, lousy dollars, a few measly dollars, that they have to scrape and scratch for a ten week period, and then it has got to be reduced to political favoritism whether you get the job or not.

I would suggest to the minister, if he cannot get the time or if he does not have the interest, that he instruct his assistants and his officials once in a while to make a visit and listen to a few of those people who have really sincere concerns. Because they are in the social sector, you or your department do not take them seriously.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was hoping to get the opportunity to present my petition before the Minister responsible for Housing left the House. I am glad he stayed. I mentioned this to him yesterday. We did not have the opportunity yesterday because it was Private Members' Day.

I have a petition that I would like to read and present to the House:

"To the hon. House of Assembly and Parliament assembled: The petition of the undersigned residents of Happy Valley - Goose Bay hereby sheweth that the scheduled rent increase from fifty to sixty dollars per month, scheduled for federal Crown-owned housing in Goose Bay on August 1, 1987, is unreasonable; and that the scheduled rent increases being preceived to encourage the tenants, other than national defence and allied forces, to vacate Crown housing; and that the House of Assembly raise this issue with the appropriate government agencies and/or federal government departments."

This particular petition bears some twenty-odd original signatures. By way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, I might add that, in effect, the twenty signatures are representative of some 150 plus signatories on an original petition sent to the Member of Parliament for the same district and to myself, but was not considered by me to be in the proper format to be accepted in the House of Assembly. I will attach the copies of that original document along with other correspondence and support documentation for this petition

which does bear original signatures.

The issue is quite a complex one.

MR. DINN:

How many units are there?

MR. KELLAND:

That they are talking of?

MR. DINN:

Yes.

MR. KELLAND:

There are about 150 signatories there, Mr. Minister, so I have to assume it would represent that number of units.

Where it is a federal matter, these petitioners are appealing to us, as the House of Assembly, the minister and all of us, to make some representation to the federal level to see if something cannot be done about this. It is more complex than the very brief prayer of the petition states, and it is directly related and indirectly related also to housing being provided through the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, especially the availability or the inadequacy of the present level of supply to meet a quite large demand.

Just by way of support of what is being said I would like to read a portion of a press release issued by Mr. Mike Barnes, the President of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Area Council of the Public Service Alliance of Canada, and the President of Public Works, Local 90021.

In talking about the \$50 to \$60 per month increase, which is around 15 per cent to 20 per cent of their present rate, he says, "The justification given for the

increase by departmental representatives is the apparent change in the local market rental rates due to the opening of a small apartment complex in the Happy Valley portion of the town."

"Apparently the rates being charged in this newly opened apartment complex are considerably higher than federal rates at the airport." What he is referring to is there is one apartment complex holding eight one-bedroom apartments. He believes, and the petitioners believe, this is an unjustifiable reason to increase rentals as substantially as they are being increased in the federal housing.

He goes on to say in his press release, "Federal employees renting Crown housing feel that it is an unreasonable position for the federal government to take because local entrepreneurs rent units to realize a profit and there lies a difference because the federal government, under its national joint council housing policy, provides housing to its employees for a number of different reasons, one of which is that no suitable living accommodations are available in the vicinity."

I know that the Minister responsible for Housing will confirm that indeed that is a fact, that there is no housing anywhere near the level required to meet the demand we are now getting and the pressure we are now getting.

There are other indications that the pressure will come off housing in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area by virtue of the recent sale of building lots in the town. Fifty-three lots were up for sale

and there was a line-up that started sometime Tuesday evening of last week until the sale finally concluded at 1:00 p.m. on that Saturday the same week. That gives you some indication of what the situation is and the problem is up there.

What the petitioner refers to, as the national joint council's housing policy and the federal government's housing policy is also clearly outlined in the living accommodation charges and the purpose and scope of the provision of housing to federal employees. Just a couple of excerpts, I will also include this as a support document to the petition.

It says and confirms that, "The Government of Canada must be able to house employees in all parts of the country. Accommodation is only provided where," and under the various subsections, the one that is important I think is that, "where no suitable living accommodation is available in the vicinity." He states that in his press release and it is confirmed by the actual policy manual on that subject. "And further that charges levied for Crown owned living accommodations must be fair and equitable and be based on the following principles," and the one that we refer to specifically, "They should reflect any factors which affect the quiet enjoyment or the privacy of the occupant and thus the value of the accommodation."

So, they are rationalizing the rental increase based on one small apartment building being opened in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. They seem to be drifting away from the actual federal government policy as to why they supplied the

housing.

Now, it gets even more complex than that because both the government and the Official Liberal Opposition support the idea of the establishment of a NATO Tactical Weapons Training Centre in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, and certainly supports the continued bilateral agreements between Canada and our NATO allies.

Having said that and having taken that position, both the government and the official Opposition, we also are saying that we do need increased infrastructure, among which would be housing. So, if there is a certain set number of housing units in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, as there is, and the demand is coming from the civilian residents and continues to be that way, and is coming quite strongly now also from the federal people and our allies in NATO, that the NATO military also require housing, at the moment, it is still the same housing.

So, the feeling amongst federal government employees who occupy Crown-owned housing and agencies who rent from the Crown is that the rent increases are not justified. They believe that to be the case, that the rent increases are not justified for the reasons given by the government, but are, in effect - and they believe this - a method by which the government, by continual substantial increases in rental on these units, can force the present civilian residents into making a decision to seek alternate accommodations, none of which are available at the moment. In other words, they are trying to force them out of the Crown-owned housing. That is what

they believe to be the case. There may be some justification for that belief.

It should be discussed and should be entered into as a very, very serious problem. I know the minister recognizes that. We have had a lot of correspondence on housing shortages and so on in my districts. But we must, as member of the House of Assembly, and as responsible parties, the government and the official Opposition, find ways and means, through our own resources, of increasing the number of housing units that are available to civilians and, as the same time, make sure that the right information is getting out to the people most affected.

In other words, if there is a hidden reason to increase rents other than what might be justified under the policy guidelines, the people who occupy the Crown-owned housing must be made aware that that is the case. In other words, we have to be very, very careful of what we do here. We need more housing, but we also need the economic and defence benefits of having NATO and bilateral agreements in place in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

So I would ask the House of Assembly, the government and the official Opposition, to make every effort and expend every effort to make sure that the civilian population is not wrongly done by and not deprived of their housing before adequate alternative arrangements can be made, jointly or singly, by the two senior levels of government.

I would like, perhaps, to hear -

MR. TOBIN:

His time is up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KELLAND:

It is an important matter, I would like to suggest to Mr. Speaker and the members, to all of us. I am not expending time to hear myself speak. By your leave, I would like to just wrap up my last couple of remarks.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, go ahead.

MR. KELLAND:

Why, thank you!

So I would like to hear the minister's comments, because I do seriously mean that it is very important to all of us in this House and the people we represent, that an even flow and an even transition period takes place if we do indeed experience the economic and defence benefits of having an increased military presence in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you. I had leave for that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am sorry. Carry on.

MR. KELLAND:

I would like to get the minister's assurance that he will promote that cause with his colleagues in government and with the federal government, where it can be shown that we can derive a benefit for the people that I represent and we collectively represent in our Province.

MR. SPEAKER:
Orders of the Day.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) petitions.

DR. COLLINS:
The hon. minister wishes to respond.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, I have just a couple of comments on the petition presented by the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland).

I am not sure what he wants, whether he wants the House of Assembly to accept his petition or if he is sending it to me as Minister of Housing and for me take action.

MR. KELLAND:
It is to the House, but it is a copy to you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:
If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to have a look at the petition, investigate what is really going on in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and if there is something needs to be done from the point of view of the provincial government and on behalf of the residents up there, we would be happy to do it.

I might remind the hon. member that he talked about the requirement for more housing in his district, Happy Valley - Goose Bay in particular. We are currently doing a housing needs survey in the Province. We have a

firm that will be going from the main centers or any place where there is a high demand for input. They will be going throughout the Province during the Summer and hopefully will get a report back to me by the Fall on the social housing needs, as well as other housing needs, because we will be looking at it not only from the point of view of just social housing, but from the point of view of what we will be doing in land assembly, etcetera, in the Province. I would urge hon. members and other hon. members in the House to get any concerns they have with respect to housing in their districts into that study group.

With respect to the increase in rent in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, I will certainly have a look at it for the hon. member and, if need be, take the appropriate action by writing the federal minister responsible to see what, if anything, we can do with respect to getting them to hold the rents on the about 150 units in the hon. member's district.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I am very pleased to speak to the petition that the member for Naskaupi has brought up because, quite frankly, the problem of Housing in Happy Valley - Goose Bay is a major problem. As a matter of fact, I think it is one of the few places in the Province that has major pressure on the

housing stock in such a manner that it is extremely difficult for average people to live in reasonable accommodation at a reasonable rent.

I want to mention a personal story, Mr. Speaker. There is a taxi driver in my district who wrote me a couple of months ago. He wrote me from Happy Valley - Goose Bay and he was complaining that he had two jobs in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, because, of course, there is a lot of economic activity there, and he was desperately trying to find accommodations but could find absolutely nothing that was suitable for himself, his wife and his children. As a result, he had to leave Happy Valley - Goose Bay, where he had two jobs, and come to Labrador West. He is now driving a taxi, which I suggest is probably at a much lower income level, but where we have tons of housing, quite frankly, much more than we can possibly use.

The question of housing is one that I think is extremely important for us to attack and to make some moves on. Back in April when I was addressing the Chamber of Commerce, one of the things that was brought up at that time is there are 130 people in housing that is owned by the federal government who are now being told that eventually they will have to leave because these houses are needed for the military and military expansion and so on. That is one of the costs that we pay for that military expansion. I am not saying this in terms of judgements on whether the base should go there or not, it is a cost that we should address because I think it is completely unfair that people working at minimum wage jobs in Happy Valley

- Goose Bay should be paying \$600 or \$700 or \$800 for an apartment that would cost half of that in most other parts of the Province. I think that is an important thing to remember and to look at.

One of the things that annoys me about the minister, however, is that he told me in the Estimates Committee there is only eight subsidized units going into Happy Valley - Goose Bay and I think another eight next year, which is pitiful in comparison to the need. One of the things we should be doing and the Housing Corporation should be doing is putting in substantial numbers of social housing units.

I think that would be a very good first step and one of the available ways to allow the Innu people Sheshatshit to move to Happy Valley - Goose Bay, if they wish to work on the base, because one of the problems we have now is that the Innu have not been integrated into the base employment and one of the major barriers now is the inability to get suitable housing in the area. I believe, by the way, there is one Innu family in Happy Valley - Goose Bay area or at least that is what I was informed.

The other thing I would like to mention is in the Public Health Report that was just released and maligned somewhat by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, there is an indication in there that there are additional 500 civilians living in federal housing right now, all of whom in the course of things will probably be asked to move elsewhere. It does not say that in the report but the implications are clear, if we are talking about 1,500 additional military people there,

and that is what the report seems to suggest would be there if we have a full blown base, then the question is what do we do with those 500 people who will be dispossessed.

So my suggestion to the minister is not only do we need social housing, subsidized ones, but we also need, I think, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation to put up commercial housing in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. I think it is absolutely critical they enter the market and put in a large number of apartment units and other single dwelling units and detached ones in order, Mr. Speaker, to relieve the pressure in Happy Valley - Goose Bay at this time.

At the Chamber of Commerce meeting that I was talking about, the indication was there that maybe some of the entrepreneurs would build apartment buildings. But there was a tremendous reluctance because, as you know, that area is subject to a rapid development perhaps when the military expands and perhaps a rapid deflation when the military leaves, if indeed it does leave. Since in the past it has on a frequent basis, we should assume that that does have the possibility of happening.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I am suggesting to you is that the local entrepreneurs who would build an apartment building and rent it for thirty years and get their money back on it are very apprehensive about going into it because they do not know what the future will bring. I think, given all of the parameters all over the world, that is a reasonable apprehension on their part.

So I think there is a social

responsibility for us responsible for housing in this Province to put as much pressure as possible on the Housing Corporation in order to provide something so that the average people who live in Happy Valley - Goose Bay have a chance to live there if we end up with the kind of expansion that, of course, may occur.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the idea behind the petition. I clearly understand, as I think as all the members do here, that there is a tremendous problem there. I think we have an obligation for our level of government to make all efforts it possibly can in order to make Happy Valley - Goose Bay a liveable place, not only for the businessmen who live there, but for the ordinary working 'Joes' who live there, who have a right to have affordable housing at a reasonable price.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there any more petitions?

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from a considerable number of residents of the Kenmount Road area on the boundary between St. John's North and Mount Scio so I am glad to see the member for Mount Scio-Bell Island (Mr. Barry) in the Chamber. He might like to comment on this petition. I am sure it is a situation with which he is not entirely unfamiliar.

The prayer of the petition reads, "We, the undersigned, residents and business owners on the Kenmount Road, are desirous to have the water and sewerage extended further West on the Kenmount Road. We urge you to take into consideration the important economic impact of this commercial area and the wealth of opportunities that it can bring to the City of St. John's for years to come."

Mr. Speaker, the service lines there run about as far as Penney Autohaus, which is about halfway out the Kenmount Road. A little further out there is fairly extensive housing development and there are, of course, a great many business premises.

Adding insult to injury, the people out there are legally within the City of St. John's and pay full city taxes, less a small percentage because they do not have essential services. The city council argues that since only say something like 6 per cent of their annual budget is spent on water and sewerage, therefore if an area is in the city but does not have these services, it should only get a rebate of about between 6 per cent and 10 per cent on that account.

Now I think this is very unfair. I think it is only natural that people consider that they are not really part of a city if they are not attached to city services. This is a rapidly growing area. It is an area of tremendous commercial and reasonable residential expansion and, of course, being a very desirable commercial area, the residents there quite properly look forward to perhaps selling some of their houses and their properties to

commercial developers and getting a good price for it. But until the services reach that area, of course, their properties are not as saleable as they otherwise would be.

I have been asked on a number of occasions what use this House of Assembly serves. I had to stop and think for a while. I finally concluded that the use that it does serve is, after a long, long period of debate, eventually attitudes change. The member for Mount Scio-Bell Island I think will concur with me that the attitude towards the house for a house legislation, that is any expropriated areas, or any expropriated properties should receive full replacement compensation, I think he will agree with me that over the years this has gradually been absorbed into conventional government thinking, so now it is almost impossible for a person to be expropriated and not receive full replacement value.

Now this has taken a matter of some ten years and the principle I am trying to promote is that I do not believe that, and I am speaking for the whole Island now, not just for St. John's, I do not believe that a municipal boundary should be allowed to expand beyond the boundary of their services.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Now you could have some sort of a quasi no man's land around the edge of the city where partial taxes might be paid, but to expand a city boundary and put full taxes there, and then give a measley rebate and then say this is the way we should do things, I think

is a poor way to run a railroad. I urge the minister and I urge the government to bring in legislation to prevent this.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Mount Scio-Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I rise with pleasure to support the petition so ably presented by the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). I was very pleased when I was in Cabinet to be able to persuade current colleagues of the member to bring in an amendment to the City of St. John's Act which would require the City of St. John's to reduce the level of taxation for residents who did not receive full services.

Now, regrettably I was unable to persuade Cabinet to go further and to set the percentage the reduction should be. Other members of Cabinet were prepared to accept that the City of St. John's, the city council, would act reasonably.

Now, I do not believe that they have acted reasonably in the way in which they are dealing with residents of Airport Heights, Nagles Hill, Groves Road and Kenmount Road, referred to in the member's petition. It is very regrettable that we did not go further and insist that a certain specific reduction take place because it is a very nominal half mill. The minister says it is one half mill.

Well, that is completely inadequate to reflect the significant difference between

what those residents receive from the City of St. John's and what other residents receive. I also believe that the member has made a very accurate point, a very supportable point when he says that municipalities should not be permitted to expand and impose the full burden of property taxation upon residents unless they can, at least within a reasonable period of time, if not immediately, indicate to residents that services will be provided.

The City of St. John's has been taking the position that they are never going to be able to provide services to the Kenmount Road area, Airport Heights or other adjoining areas unless they get financial support from the provincial government. I will not say never but they are talking ten years or something, a very long time down the road.

The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) might be interested in the fact that a colleague of his of the same party, formerly in the Cabinet of the Government of Canada, I will not mention any names, who has represented certain individuals out there as a lawyer on the Kenmount Road, has for years been trying to get his client's land serviced. It is a large piece of land and if it were sold now, it would be at a tremendous disadvantage to the owners because they would not get anywhere near the value that they would receive if services were available. This battle, by this gentleman, has been going on for some six, seven, eight years, or longer. I can remember him contacting me, I think, when I was in Cabinet on the point and he has contacted me since.

That gentleman made a very interesting point. I was reminded of it when we gave our response to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) on the terrible way in which he has been politically motivated in allocating expenditures to municipalities for water and sewer and for paving. That gentleman indicated that as early as the 1930s the point was made, and in fact from my recollection of what he said, he said that the rule was laid down or accepted by the government of the day that they would work out on a per capita basis within the various districts what the district should receive, awarding the same amount per capita to every district.

I am not sure that that is a completely supportable approach to take where you have some districts badly in need of catching up because they have not, in the past, had access to the funding. I think the minister has made that point and it is a point that has to be factored in, there is no question. But, I think when we consider the one person one vote principles that have been adopted, we should also consider the principle of equality of access to government funding with, as I say, factors in there for catch up and so forth.

So I am delighted that the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) has presented this petition. It does affect some of my constituents on the Kenmount Road and in the Groves Road area. I would ask the member to do more than just go through the motions, which is often all that is done when a member gets up and speaks to a petition.

He is a member of a caucus

containing the Minister of Municipal Affairs, containing other Cabinet members, and I would ask that member for St. John's North to do more than just present the petition and start putting pressure on the Premier, on the Minister of Municipal Affairs, on the Planning and Priorities Committee, on other members of Cabinet, and on his caucus colleagues, and let us get something done about this problem, instead of having it come up year after year for debate.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased indeed to rise and support the petition presented by the member for St. John's North.

Mr. Speaker, I guess we can all sympathize a great deal with the people in the Kenmount Road area, the residents and the business people as well, who are very desirous of having services extended into their particular area. I certainly support the people in that area in their efforts to try and get the city to expand water and sewer.

Having said that, of course, it has to be pointed out that this particular matter is in the jurisdiction of the City of St. John's, and I am sure the St. John's City Council is quite concerned about that, especially when you consider the number of businesses that we do have in the Kenmount Road area, the employment that they provide and what have you. So it is a basic necessity

that the people in there are looking for. Hopefully, in the not too distant future, the City of St. John's will be able to address that particular need.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, it is in the jurisdiction of the city and the city simply provides to the department a priority list each year of the monies that they are going to spend and we try, insofar as we can as a government and as a department, to make available to the various councils right across the Province the monies that they need to address problems like the people on Kenmount Road are having. This year it was almost \$2 million to the City of St. John's out of a capital budget of \$25 million.

Having said that as well, Mr. Speaker, this particular area that the hon. gentleman makes reference to is going to be very, very difficult, I suppose, in the near future to make services available to because the sewer system is presently almost at its full capacity. The engineering people in my department, if my memory serves me correctly, when we talked about this a number of months ago, indicated that it is going to be a major, major programme in order to extend the water and sewer services in there, probably in the area of \$90 to \$100 million to service all of the areas. You are going to have to twin the sewer system in on Kenmount Road because it is at full capacity right now.

Another area that comes to mind is the Airport Heights area in which they are looking now to the city for approximately \$20 million to service that area, -

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Kilbride.

MR. DOYLE:
- and parts of Kilbride as well. So I think it goes without saying, if those areas are going to receive the type of services that they need and that they deserve, there is going to have to be some reinstatement of the federal programmes that we had a number of years ago. There is still some involvement by the federal government in projects related to water and sewer but they happen to be project-specific today, instead of a general programme that could be applied.

We, all of the Ministers of Municipal Affairs across Canada, at this point in time as a matter of fact, are making representation to the federal government to have them reinstate some of these programmes so that Airport Heights areas and Kenmount Road areas could take advantage of them. I think it goes without saying that the Province right now and the city does not have the financial means available to them to provide services to all of the areas of the city, and indeed all of the areas of the Province that we would like to see serviced.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I am very supportive indeed of the people in the Kenmount Road area and the business people also who are trying to get services in that area. Hopefully the city will be able to address it in the not too distant future.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
The hon. the member for Stephenville. . Another petition?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me today that I rise to present a petition that was given to me while I was back in Stephenville over the weekend. The petition is addressed to the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador, and the prayer of the petition reads as follows. It is directed to the Department of Social Services.

"The Department of Social Services has recently cut back thirty-five positions around the Province within his department. The Bay St. George Foster Parents Association is very concerned about these lay-offs as it will critically effect the services that are needed for our children and all those whose lives are enriched by the services of social workers.

"Children who usually come to live in our homes are children who have either been abused mentally or physically or sexually. The social worker is the link between the child and the system. The services to the children are vital to the well being of the child.

"As a province, we must have an increase of services by social workers. As citizens we feel that we cannot permit this reduction of services.

"We ask that this petition by presented to the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador and that the Minister of Social Services act upon our request."

Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that we saw the lay-offs announced last week by the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) and

his department. Many people whom I have dealt with over the last two years in the Bay St. George area, in the social science area and who have worked with foster children and in the other areas of concerns of social services, senior citizens, family violence, family abuse, and so on, all of these concerns have been expressed in the last two years to me very strongly by these people. We are not doing enough and we need more services.

There have been a number of moves made over the last number of years to try to address these problems, but there is still a great shortage of adequate and proper service with the problems that are still in existence. I speak specifically for my area because in the Bay St. George - Port au Port Peninsula area there are many social problems and many social agencies. They work very hard and they have worked very hard with the department out there to provide the proper assistance and care relative to the jobs they perform. They have high praise out there for the social workers and the Social Services Department for the work that has been done.

I find it contrary to the philosophy that this government has been preaching to see the laying off of people that the minister says are temporary, but people who have been working, in some cases very hard with specific children and so on. These people are being laid off when there was a definite need.

I think there is more than a definite need to have more than thirty-five hired on. When I see other monies being thrown around for other purposes, I feel disappointed by the administration

because it has taken this course of action and Treasury Board does feel that there are enough positions to deal with the problems out there. We have a high unemployment rate that has been in the high twenties for the last four or five years. We have seen a lot of social problems that need action. The rhetoric is not going to do the job.

The laying off of social workers has created in my area and I think around the Province a real stir with people who have been working hard to address the social problems we have. I would hope that the minister and I know he would like to have more staff, but I would hope that the government would see fit to give and provide the proper people in his department because it is one of the most important departments that we have. It is a department which, if adequately serviced and properly staffed, could see the rehabilitation of people in this Province who, I suppose, have lived with a social services mentality of being on welfare. We could see a rehabilitation of their attitudes.

In order for work to be done in the social services area, the staff is required. I fully support the petition that has been presented to me by the Bay St. George Foster Parents Association.

They held a press conference in Stephenville on Friday and they had groups there from the Status of Women, they had the John Howard Society represented, they had the Single Parents Association represented and a variety of others.

So I would ask the minister to

take the petition under consideration in his deliberations over the next few days and next few weeks and to address the concerns that the people of my area have raised and that people around the Province are raising.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Before recognizing the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), I would like to inform all members of the three questions we have for the Late Show.

The first question reads, 'I am not satisfied with the answers to my question given by the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge)' and that is posed by the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Effort). The second question states, 'I am not satisfied with the answers from the Minister of Justice to my question regarding family violence.' That is posed by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). The third question is, 'I am not satisfied with the answer I received from the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) on the Sprung greenhouse project' and that is from the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick).

The hon. the member for Social Services.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
It was my understanding - I have

to clear this up with him - but it was my understanding from the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) that at approximately 4:30 p.m. he was advised by somebody, either the table or the Chair that there were two questions on the Late Show and that he would be unable to put his on because we had passed the time of 4:30 p.m. I am wondering then where the third question came from and if indeed it came after 4:30 p.m.? If it did, it is out of order. That is my point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the third question did come after 4:30 p.m. You are correct, the Standing Orders do state that questions must be in before 4:30 p.m. Therefore, we will only have two questions for the Late Show.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Which are?

MR. SPEAKER:

I read them in order of one, two and three. Number three will not be on the Late Show and that is the one that was posed by the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, if I could address that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The point that I am trying to make - I am not trying to keep the member for Menihek off the Late Show - but if we are going to go past 4:30 p.m., I have to say in this respect, and that is the reason I stand here, if we are going to go past 4:30 p.m. to say 4:45 p.m., 4:50 p.m. if we are going to keep that up, then the

next thing you know is we will be up to 4:57 p.m. I know the purpose for the rule being there is to give this House time to prepare for both the debate from this side and from that side. Therefore, I made the point that I did make.

MR. SPEAKER:

The point is well taken.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I rise and I have to say, Mr. Speaker, to comment on the petition because, again, I refer to the rules of the House which do not permit me to speak unless I am supporting the petition. So, if I have leave of the House, I would like to comment on the petition.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. BRETT:

I am pointing out to the Speaker that if anybody rises in their place to speak on a petition, they have to speak in support of it. I must tell the House that I do not necessarily agree with the contents of the petition, but I would like the opportunity to comment on it and to get the leave of the House to do so, as I did before on a former petition.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, this seems to be becoming a habit with the Minister of Social Services. He wants leave to speak to petitions which

he does not support again. We are prepared in this particular instance to give leave because we want to hear his explanation of why 35 social service workers are being laid off in this Province when, in fact, there is a need, as I understand it, for the appointment of some 115. On that basis we will give him leave, but I doubt that we are going to continue this for the rest of the session.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Okay, Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member. Somehow or other there seems to be a notion abroad that the Department of Social Services has suddenly become very uncaring. We are staffed by a bunch of ogres and we are wiping out everybody out there in the field.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the department spends \$470,000 a day, every single day of the 365 days of the year, and that is a lot of money. If there is an impression abroad that we are not aware of the problems out there, or that we have not done anything to address the problems of staff and new programmes, I would like to advise the House that in the last seven or eight years we have increased the staff of the Department of Social Services by 52 per cent. That is no indication that we are uncaring or that we are trying to clean out the field staff. We have addressed the problem.

Perhaps in our zeal to do so much, we have done more than we should have done because we had 35 staff over and above the compliment. We

had to make a choice, because even though we are going to spend almost \$180 million this year and because we have a deficit of over \$170 million, we had to make a choice of cutting staff or cutting programmes, a choice to lay off people we had on that we were not really supposed to have on, temporary staff, either do that, or cut back on programmes. So hon. members cannot have their cake and eat it too. You could not have both.

I think we made a very wise decision not to cut any programmes in the Department of Social Services. So we did not cut one, but we are laying off 35 temporary staff, and they are scattered right across the Province from Port aux Basques to St. John's.

I acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of that, those who are left may have to work a little bit harder. I acknowledge that, but I have also said on many occasions, and I repeat, that I do not think anybody will be unduly overburdened. It just means that all of us will have to give a little bit more.

We have been very caring and very concerned. We are going to spend \$470,000 every single day of this fiscal year, every single day we are going to spend that much money, and that is a lot of money. And we have increased our staff by 52 per cent in the last seven or eight years. Now, Mr. Speaker, that does not sound like a government who is uncaring.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my colleague from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) that he should not have given the minister leave to make that speech because he would have done him a tremendous favour had he not given him leave after I listened to his explanation.

Let me say to the minister that I do rise in support of this petition, because it is not only the area of Stephenville that is a recipient of these problems, it is Province-wide again, and again shows the lack of incompetence on the part of the minister, a lack of competence, I should say.

MR. DINN:

A lack of incompetence!

MR. TULK:

Well, there is a lack of anything there.

MR. EFFORD:

When we get to the ability of the Minister of Mines not to make a mistake, then we will all bow down to him as he looks in his mirror every day and wishes that everybody would.

Mr. Speaker, to the point where the minister said they had to make some cutbacks because of the overspending by his department and the overspending by the government, I would ask the minister - now, when the clown is finished, I will sit down and let him get up if he wants to tell a few jokes.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Go out and get some (inaudible), boy. Do something useful.

MR. EFFORD:

Why do you not, when I am finished, come out on the corridor

and tell me that?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why?

MR. EFFORD:

Just to have a chat about it when I am finished, okay?

Mr. Speaker, the minister said very clearly that they did not need the social workers this year. But he also, the other day in the Estimates Committee, stated very clearly that the same amount of people - he was not sure - or possibly even more people are dependant on social assistance this year, 1987, than in 1986. So, how do you explain the fact that in 1986 you needed to hire on thirty-five people and in 1987, when there are as many or even more people dependant on social services, that you have to lay off those people? That does not make sense. You either needed them in 1986 or you need them in 1987. Now, if you did not need them in 1986, then you wasted one awful pile of taxpayers money.

He also said very clearly that rather than cut some of the projects that they have ongoing now, and examples that they just announced last week, he would rather lay off some of the social workers.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Programmes.

MR. EFFORD:

Okay, the Beautification Programme. You have to look at what he did a few months ago when he gave a political appointment to one of his Tory buddies, who now since refused it, so we are still waiting to see who the next appointment is going to be. With the cost of his salary, plus the

cost of his furniture and a secretary, it is going to be approximately \$200,000. How he can justify that amount and, at the same time, tell us that they have to cut back -

MR. BRETT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

The hon. member just uttered a terminological inexactitude, because I told the hon. member and it is in the budget, that that position he is talking about, there is \$100,000 in the budget for it, not \$200,000. The hon. member knows that.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can play with the figures all he wants. He can fool around with them all he wants. The truth of the matter is, what my hon. friend back here is saying is correct. He has cut programmes and, at the same time, engaged in patronage deals with his former Tory buddies. I suppose they are still his Tory buddies, because I understand the hon. gentleman has given up the position now to run. The truth of the matter is that he has cut vital programmes in his department. He can squirm and stand up on all the points of order he likes, the truth of the matter is that he has cut programmes to pay off his

patronage buddies. Until he stands up and admits that in this House, he will not be telling the facts as they are.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, what we have to understand - I am sure the minister is going to listen and admit to his - is that by cutting back those thirty-five people, because we have the same amount of people depending on social services as we did last year, there is going to be a tremendous strain put on the already overworked social workers in the districts offices and the regional offices now.

The minister knows there is no justification. It is just another error, another misjudgement on himself and his department in doing this. I believe that my colleague from Stephenville was correct in what he said. There is a possibility that there may even be some further cutbacks. Already the districts offices are saying that there were some cutbacks in the buying of furniture for those people who need it, because there was too much money spent last year, knowing full well that with the amount of money they receive, \$500 a month, there is no possible way those people can buy any types of services they require, furniture or anything else that they need. It is not even enough, Mr. Speaker, for them to be able to buy the necessities, like groceries and the things they need to survive from day to day. So we ask the minister to take a serious

look at these petitions, instead of saying he cannot support them. He should realize that if he is to do his job the way it should be done, he should be rising in support of these petitions and he should take another look at the decision he made just last week to cut back the number of social workers by thirty-five.

MR. TULK:

How can the Minister of Social Services not support this petition?

MR. EFFORD:

Hopefully, if there is any thought by him or his department to cut any further social workers from the regional and district offices, he will take a very serious look at it and ensure, Mr. Speaker, that it does not happen in this fiscal year, 1987.

Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:

Order 3. Concurrence Motion - Social Services Committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

Concurrence Motion - Social Services Committee.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a few minutes left. I adjourned the debate, my goodness, about a week ago now, and my opening remarks - it was just a few minutes before six o'clock - were to the point that the financial situation this year is no better, in my view, or no worse than it has ever been. The logic for that is that I refuse to

distinguish between capital expense and current expense. Most of the capital expense that is listed in the Budget is for small renovations, for the renewal of vehicles, and, perhaps office furniture and some road work, but all these are yearly expenses. We have road work every year, we have the renovations of offices every year, we have new vehicles for various civil servants every year, so, in my view, they are not capital at all, they are current. And if you abolish what I call artificial distinction between capital and current and look at all the years since 1949, and especially look at the last ten years, you see very little difference in the so-called deficit. Now deficits, in my view, are to be deplored unless they are truly capital, in which case that would be, in my view, for government some enormous but justifiable expenditure like, say, bringing Churchill Falls power to Newfoundland. So that was the point I wanted to make.

The nay-sayers say our situation is very bad. I say it is no worse than it ever was any other year. And the rather large amount that we are borrowing this year is as a result of roll-overs, bonds becoming due, loans becoming due and having to be refinanced.

Now, the various topics covered under the concurrence debate: There were quite a number of topics and I do not intend to cover them all. I have supplied the Vice-Chairman of our Committee, the member for Port de Grave, with a list of topics and I am sure that he will be more than able to cover the ones I omit.

In Education we discussed the problem of small schools and how

difficult it is to provide the facilities in small schools that you can provide in large schools in large centres. This is one of the unfortunate facts of life, and there were no easy solutions. But I do think that with modern teaching techniques and modern equipment some of these disparities can be bridged, and the minister was very hopeful that improvements would occur in the near future.

The Reorganized High School programme came in for some comment. It seems to be working out fairly well. I think there are a number of complaints from students who do not like the idea of four years of high school instead of three. Unfortunately, it is not possible for even a bright student to get through in three years; the course requirement is such, that there is not enough time in the day for him to take the courses that he needs to get through the new high school system in less than four years.

When the reorganized high school programme was being brought in, a number of us were hopeful that the aggressive and highly motivated student, he or she, would be able to get through the programme in the same three years. Unfortunately that is not possible, although perhaps it could be done if you took advantage of Summer school. But I do not think Summer school courses are offered in high school, except for adult education.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. J. CARTER:
Well, the debate is open if members want to debate it. I do not have any strong feelings about

it one way or the other, but I do feel it is unfortunate that an extra year of high school has been added to the students.

The Department of Health came in for a considerable amount of discussion. While I am at it, Mr. Speaker, I think I would like to have a word about the Committee system generally. It has been suggested that it has been a failure. But this year we moved to make it even more convenient for members and for the press. We interpreted the Standing Order that covers that aspect of the budget debate by agreement. The Order says that in fifteen sitting days the Committees are to consider the headings referred to them and to dispose of them. The fifteen sitting days used to be interpreted as fifteen sitting days of the House. This year, by agreement, it was construed to mean fifteen sitting days of Committees. Since by tradition and by agreement Committees do not sit on Fridays, therefore each week was deemed to have only four days in it.

Now, members opposite have raised an objection and it is a reasonable objection, in my view, that on Wednesday mornings there is usually a caucus for both sides and that this precludes any committee meetings, or makes it difficult to have any committee meetings on Wednesday mornings. I would argue, and I think by agreement another year we could say, 'Okay, each week shall be deemed to be three and a half sitting days,' because effectively you only have three and a half sitting days in which to chew over the estimates.

MR. TULK:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Not to engage in any kind of argument with the hon. gentleman at all, Mr. Speaker, but let me say to the hon. gentleman that we agree that on Wednesday it becomes rather awkward. In this debate I intend to have something to say about what I think is happening to the Estimates Committees. But let me say that it is very simple to make a rule change, that for the purposes of Estimates Committees the change that he is talking about, it be considered three and a half sitting days, could very easily be put forward by the Government House Leader and supported by this side.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

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

MR. J. CARTER:

On that very point though, Mr. Speaker, since this year each week was deemed to be four sitting days, it would not be difficult to deem each week to be three and a half sitting days.

MR. TULK:

Or even three days.

MR. J. CARTER:

Well, three and a half certainly, because effectively there are really only three and a half days per week that we can have sittings. This allowed us to have a total of seven or eight sittings per week this year, and it meant that only one Committee needed to

meet at a time.

Unfortunately the press did not attend the meetings any better this year than they did any other year. All I can say is, you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink. You provide the surroundings, you provide the time, you provide the backup and the facilities for these debates, and if people show up, good, and if they do not show up, that is all you can do.

The ministers came in. They came in with their officials. They came in with their documents. They were more than prepared to give all kinds of information. The procedures were informal. People could interpose a question at any time; any member, any minister, any official would take quite kindly to interruption for the point of clarification or elucidation. So I feel it is a good system, but I do not know that it is going to be well attended; it is not as fractious of the House of Assembly and, therefore, there is not as much interest taken in it.

Unfortunately I have been notified that I do not have too much more time left to speak. I do not really have time to go through all the various topics, but from the number of topics that I have in front of me I have to say that I consider the meetings this year to have been an outstanding success and I do not know what more you could ask for.

I will sit down now and let the Vice-Chairman, the member for Port de Grave, continue, and I will be very interested in his comments.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de

Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Can we move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker?

DR. COLLINS:

We have to adjourn at five-thirty for the Late Show. Do you want to start that now?

Let us call it five-thirty.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed to call it five-thirty?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

There are two questions for the Late Show. One is that the hon. the member for Port de Grave is not satisfied with the answer that he was given by the Minister of Justice and he would like to debate it.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon in Question Period I put a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications concerning the appointment last year to the Public Utilities Board of Mr. Wells and he then referred me to the Minister of Justice. On putting the question to the Minister of Justice I was surprised, number one, that the Minister of Justice came back and said that the salary paid to any member of the Public Utilities Board was public knowledge. Before coming into the House of Assembly I checked the reports of the Public Utilities Board, as far

back as 1970, and there is no mention made of the salaries paid to the commissioners on that board, or members of that board, and I would like the minister to state very clearly what makes the salaries being paid to those people public knowledge.

The other thing I want cleared up is the amount of those salaries. I have been told that the amount being paid to those members, and to Mr. Wells, is in the vicinity of \$55,000 a year, possibly as much as \$60,000 a year. Now, for the amount of time a member puts in, even in a full-time position, on that particular board, I find this a very exorbitant amount of money.

The other point I asked the Minister of Justice to clarify had to do with the length of time of these appointments. I think it is up until age seventy. Now, let us, for argument's sake, say that Mr. Wells is approximately forty years old, or forty-one or forty-two years old -

MR. TULK:

Even if he becomes more senile than he is now.

MR. EFFORD:

- and he is going to be on that board until he is seventy years old, that is thirty years at \$55,000 a year which amounts to over \$1.5 million in taxpayer dollars that is going to be paid out. And you can call the job a full-time position, but there is no way that the people serving on the Public Utilities Board work from nine in the morning until five in the afternoon, regular working hours, whatever they may be, five days a week, fifty-two weeks a year. The type of work done by the Public Utilities Board

does not require members of that board to work fifty-two weeks of the year. If there is money in the public treasury to pay out those types of salaries, I would like to see everybody in Newfoundland making that kind of money. I, myself, would like to make that kind of money, but we have heard the Premier, we have heard the Minister of Finance, we have heard all ministers of the government state very clearly that the Province is near bankruptcy; we do not have enough money for education, we do not have enough money for health services, we have to cut back on social services. Today the whole afternoon was taken up with petitions, most of which were presented to the Minister of Social Services because of restraints and cutbacks in the social services sector, and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I see no justification for paying out that kind of money to members of that board.

First, of course, we have to get clarified if that is the amount of money being paid these people and the length of time it is being paid for. Is it paid up until the age of 70? And why would a Cabinet which has the gall to tell us every day about restraints and cutbacks see fit to pay out this amount of money? Is it political patronage? Is it done on a friendship basis? Is it because Mr. Wells served on the House Commission last year? They could not get anybody else from the labour unit to sit on it. So there are a lot of questions to be asked. We are concerned and the public has a right to know. The first part of my question asks the minister to clarify for me where the salaries of those people on the Public Utilities Board is public knowledge, because it

certainly is not in the report they put out each year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, earlier, during Question Period, when I responded to the questions posed by members opposite on salaries paid to members of the Public Utilities Board, I said that that was public knowledge and that while I did not have the figures at my fingertips, I would check and provide the information to the House at the earliest opportunity. Unfortunately, I have not had a chance to do that this afternoon but I will provide the information tomorrow. The Public Utilities Board is established under an act of this Legislature. It is a public body. The salaries for members and other expenses associated with its operations are funded by revenue raised through its activities, revenue raised from corporations and firms regulated by the board. It is a public board. It operates at arms length from the Cabinet, from the Justice Department, but it is a public board and the public are certainly entitled to full disclosure of salaries paid to board members and other aspects of its financial affairs. So I will provide tomorrow to the House of Assembly -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The minister made the statement in

Question Period this afternoon, at about 3:00 p.m. or 4:00 p.m., whenever it was, that it was a matter of public record - a matter of public knowledge, I think are the correct words that she used. Is it a matter of public knowledge? In other words, can any person in this Province go find that, or does it have to come from the minister? Because if it has to be researched and brought forward by the minister, then, I suggest to her, it is not a matter of public knowledge in the usual sense of the word, it depends upon how she feels about passing it out.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

While there was no point of order, a question was posed by the Opposition House Leader to which I will respond. As far as I am concerned, salaries of members of the Public Utilities Board are matters within the public domain to which every citizen of the Province is entitled to be informed.

I would have thought that information could have been obtained from the board itself, but I, as the minister responsible, will be glad to check and provide it, and I will do so tomorrow. I think that is really all I need to say now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The second question is by the hon. the member for Fogo who is not satisfied with the answer to his question on family violence.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, this afternoon when I posed the question to the Premier and he passed it to the minister, she did, I must say to her, answer one specific part of the question and that was the question I asked with regard to the actions of the police in the laying of charges and the response they make to complaints concerning family violence in the Province. She did answer that question fairly well, but in going onto another section of the question, when I was asking her about the number of professional people and whether public education, and I do not mean public education in the sense of schools, I mean whether the resource people are being provided, particularly for the more rural areas of this Province, to deal with curbing family violence and with the effects of family violence on family members and so on, because it is an appalling figure.

I read the letter this morning from the provincial association on family violence and I was shocked to learn from the few statistics at the back of the people who come forward. The statistics they have given us range, but we found that in the last four to six years 2,500 women and children - and that does not say anything about the crisis calls. We are not sure about those, or whether they fit into that category or not - have visited the three transition houses, and that is only the number of people we know about.

The minister knows, every member of this legislature knows and, I suspect, most people in this Province know that the percentage of people who surface, who go to

transition houses, whom we know about is small compared to the number of people who are victims of family violence. And I must say here that the violence usually comes from the male side of the family. I think that is an established fact. But the number of people we know nothing about must be overwhelming. The females of this Province must be driven to desperate circumstances to even report it under the circumstances that exist in the Province at the present time.

It must be of tremendous concern to us in terms of education, in terms of the facilities we provide for those people, and in terms of the support services that we provide to victims of family violence, regardless of whether they be women or children. Now, I ask the minister this afternoon to tell me just what is being done in terms of providing support staff, particularly for those people. I think the report referred to people particularly along the Coast of Labrador, but I would suggest to her that it applies equally as well to people in the more rural parts of the Province. Perhaps we are misleading ourselves by believing that family violence is not heavier, say, in the city of St. John's than it is in rural Newfoundland because of the type of lifestyle that you have in St. John's and the type of lifestyle you may very well have in a rural part of this Province. My question to her was that the support services that those people are saying are not there are not there because government has not provided them. The minister can stand up and talk about all those great things that she has done: the regulations that have been put in place for the police; the police must report, they must act,

and they must lay charges. That was done in 1985 in this legislature and all parties who were in the House at that time approved of that legislation.

MS VERGE:

It is not legislation.

MR. TULK:

It is a regulation.

MS VERGE:

It is a policy directive.

MR. TULK:

It is a policy directive, or whatever. It was debated in this House. It was brought forward, I believe, by the minister.

MS VERGE:

No, not in the House. It is not legislation.

MR. TULK:

It is a regulation.

MS VERGE:

It is a policy directive.

MR. TULK:

It is a policy directive to the police forces in the Province, that they must act. In any case, I recall the thing being brought up in 1985 in this Legislature. It could have been a Ministerial Statement. I do not know.

The truth of the matter is, the police did not act on that. I understand now that the minister is back, and I appreciate her efforts, to trying to get the police to do, if you want to put it quite bluntly, their job. But the educational services that are required in this Province, and the support that is required in this Province, and the facilities that are required in this Province are just not being put in place.

I say to the minister, unless she acts quickly and acts boldly, that she has only scratched the surface of the problem that presently exists in this Province of ours in regard to women and children and family violence.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the record of this administration in addressing problems of family violence, the root causes of violence in the home as well as the symptoms of that violence, is a very good record. In the last eight years, government has taken on all the operating funding, the year in year out salary expenses and overhead costs of the three transition houses that are now operating, the transition house in St. John's, which has two facilities, a second stage house as well as the main transition house; the transition house in Corner Brook; and Libra House in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

That is a lot better than was the case a few short years ago. We have those three transition houses in three centers of the Province. First there was one, then the second one, and now a third one. We hope to add others. These are facilities sheltering victims at time of crisis; giving them support, accompanying them to court when women and children are victims of criminal activity and are required to be witnesses in criminal prosecutions.

In addition to these three facilities, we have the two police forces, the Crown Attorneys with the Justice Department, social workers with the Department of Social Services, teachers and

educational therapists with school boards, funded by the Department of Education, the Women's Policy Office of the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies working co-operatively at improving policies and programmes and initiating community groups to tackle at the community level problems of family violence.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to paraphrase remarks made to me recently by a worker at the St. John's Transition House who has been working in the trenches with victims of family violence, women who have been battered by their husbands, children who have been traumatized by family violence. She says that now we know a lot more about domestic violence, about wife battering than we did a few years ago, and with that greater knowledge we have undertaken with advice from a person such as her and the Provincial Association against domestic violence, who corresponded with all members recently, and the Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women, who now have a Solicitor General's Department funded project to co-ordinate services all across the Province for victims of family violence, with advice from these groups we have undertaken to see that the three year old policy directive from the Associate Deputy Attorney General to police and Crown attorneys is enforced and implemented more thoroughly and more consistently so that the good examples that the woman spoke about are seen more often, so there is more uniformity and more sensitivity of response, so that Crown attorneys consistently are exceptionally good - we already have three or four Crown attorneys specializing in family violence who have shown

themselves to be exceptionally good, and to have served above and beyond the call of duty - and to mount education programmes for people in all these disciplines jointly so that police from each part of the Province, side by side with social workers and with teachers, will hear from experts in the field of family violence and can absorb an analysis of why there is family violence. Because I think as a society we have to come to grips with the underlying causes for men beating their wives inside the walls of the family home before there is going to be any real improvement.

But certainly through all these efforts we are encouraging victims to seek help, to report to the police, police to respond quickly and efficiently and to treat these matters seriously, to treat them as crimes in the full sense, to treat them no differently from assaults perpetrated in bars or taverns or on the streets among strangers.

Additionally, we are supporting current proposals for better judicial education. There is a proposal which has been generated by the Canadian Judicial Council for the establishment of a National Judicial Education and Research Centre. Our Province is supporting that proposal and advocating that it be set up in such a way that all our judges, our Provincial Court judges as well as well as our Superior Court judges, will be able to take advantage of it so that judges in the appropriate setting will get the benefit of the latest research and findings about family violence, about the root causes, and also effective treatments for offenders so that crimes within the home are not repeated and

repeated and repeated.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, this administration has a fine record of funding three transition houses in the Province in eight years. Remembering that there was no such thing as a transition house contemplated for the Province eight years ago, we have transition houses in St. John's, in Corner Brook, in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, and we are hoping to have more. We know that people in Central Newfoundland, in the Gander - Grand Falls area, chiefly the Status of Women Councils there, are working very hard through their womens centers to give help to victims of family violence and those efforts should be supplemented by more government support and probably by the establishment of a transition house for victims of family violence there. So we have three transition houses now provincially funded, we have a three year old policy directive to police and Crown attorneys which is applauded by experts in the field, and we have a committee comprising representatives of the groups working in the area with the Justice Department, which I Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
Time is up.

MS VERGE:
With leave from members, I can elaborate.

That committee has given a balanced commentary on our progress so far, acknowledging the many good accomplishments, acknowledging some of the fine, sensitive work on the part of police and Crown attorneys, but

pointing out some shortcomings and giving some practical suggestions which have been endorsed by the Department. These suggestions are being acted on, and they will lead to improvements. Among those suggestions are better record keeping, better education programmes and, Mr. Speaker, through all these efforts this government, the Department of Justice, the Department of Social Services, the Department of Education, the Department of Career Development's Women's Policy Office will keep up the effort so that we work towards elimination of family violence in the Province.

MR. TULK:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
It is not a point of order about anything the minister is saying, it is a point of order referring to some of her colleagues. I would ask the hon. gentleman over on that side -

MR. EFFORD:
The member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach).

MR. TULK:
I will not name anybody at this point, any particular district, since we have given leave for what we consider to be a very important issue, and I believe the minister is addressing it very well, which is unusual for that side of the House, I would ask him to take the matter which she is talking about in the serious vein in which it deserves to be taken.

DR. COLLINS:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
I think the hon. member misunderstood. I distinctly heard members over here wondering if the minister was going to go into some details on what she was talking about. I think the hon. member misunderstood.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. minister's time has elapsed unless she has leave of the House.

MR. TULK:
By leave, for a couple of more minutes. It is 5:50. By leave. It is a very important issue. Do you want to go on?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 a.m.

MS VERGE:
I had finished.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
The hon. minister had finished. She does not need as much time as hon. people opposite to make a point -

MR. TULK:
She is doing a good job. Unusual.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
- she makes it succinctly, to the point without a whole lot of gab.

MR. TULK:
Unusual! Unusual! She was doing a good job, Gerry.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Succinct and to the point.

MR. TULK:

Yes, that is for sure.

On motion, the House at its rising
adjourned until tomorrow, Friday,
May 22, 1987, at 10:00 a.m.