



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 22

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas

Friday

22 April 1988

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to the hon. House today a list of twenty-six projects valued at \$14.35 million to be publicly tendered by my department over the next few weeks for highway upgrading and paving throughout the Province. Mr. Speaker, these transportation improvement projects, which will be carried out during the 1988 construction season, will be funded entirely by the Province under my department's Road and Bridge Rehabilitation Programme and the Improvement and Construction Programme and is part of government's ongoing commitment to the early tender of capital projects.

The projects to be tendered are as follows:

1. Resurface the 1.6 kilometers of Route 440, from the end of the present resurfacing to Cox's Cove.
2. Pave a 1 kilometer section of Route 450 between Frenchman's Cove and Lark Harbour, referred to as the Bluff, and the resurfacing of Little Port Road.
3. The paving of 12 kilometers of Leading Tickles Road.

4. Paving 12 kilometers of Cottrell's Cove Road.

5. Upgrading a 2 kilometer section of main road between Roddickton and Englee.

6. Construction of a new road from Black Tickle to Domino on the Labrador Coast.

7. Paving the East Access to Botwood.

8. Upgrading and paving of roads in the Town of Bay Bulls.

9. Upgrading and paving of roads in the Town of Witless Bay.

10. Upgrade 3.5 kilometer Section of Route 362 from Mose Ambrose towards Coombs Cove.

11. Continue the construction of the Grand Falls East End Arterial Road begun back in 1987.

12. Paving a 5 kilometer section of Harry's Harbour Road.

13. Resurfacing various sections of road between Kelligrews and Conception Harbour.

14. Paving 2.5 kilometers of Route 331 from the end of the present pavement to the Stoneville Intersection.

15. Pave 3.5 kilometers of the Access to Stoneville from Route 331.

16. Pave the 3.1 kilometer section of Route 331 from Stoneville intersection to Horwood Intersection.

17. Paving 13.5 kilometers of Point au Mal Road

18. Complete the resurfacing of

Route 460 from Kippens to Port au Port East.

19. Upgrade and pave the present 3 kilometer gravel section of Indian Meal Line.

20. Complete upgrading and paving of roads in the Outer Cove area transferred to Council.

21. Paving of various roads in Torbay and Shoe Cove.

MR. DINN:
What a member!

MR. DOYLE:
22. Upgrading and widening of the Goose Cove Road.

23. Complete upgrading of the road from Eastport to Burnside.

24. Paving of 4 kilometers of New Harbour Barrrens Road.

25. Resurfacing of roads through the town of Bay de Verde and through the community of Grates Cove.

26. Paving of 5 kilometers of Cottlesville Road.

MR. DINN:
Hear, hear! - Where is that?

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker the above named projects represent approximately 35 percent of my department's provincially funded roads programme of the \$40 million.

The projects to be carried out with the remaining \$25.65 million will be announced in the very near future. The additional projects when announced will also be carried out during the 1988 construction season.

Mr. Speaker, the process of early tendering transportation projects has worked extremely well, resulting in most projects being completed within the same construction season. This procedure permits the industry lead time to make plans and to lay groundwork for the upcoming construction season.

I would like to remind the hon. House that with our rugged terrain, it is difficult to address all of our transportation requirements on an immediate basis, but I feel much progress has been made. Many significant improvements have been made to the transportation infrastructure in practically every region of Newfoundland and Labrador which will benefit our people well into the future.

The \$14.35 million in transportation improvement projects I have announced today combined with the \$25.65 million to be announced in the near future and the \$29.4 million worth of projects announced under the Federal/Provincial ERDA Agreement will address several of the problem areas in the Province's transportation network during the 1988 construction season. These construction projects will allow us to continue the steady progress we have made in creating a safer and more efficient highway transportation system in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I will thank the minister for giving me a copy of the statement. It was very kind of him. The only thing about it, Mr. Speaker, is if members opposite had taken the advice we have given them over the last three years and listened to the report of the auditor-general, we would have been quite happy to be here this morning to debate the list that was brought in, a priority list which had been established by the civil servants to allow the minister and his colleagues in Cabinet to decide which roads they were going to pave.

Since we are going to spend the people's money to do this paving, why would you not bring in this list and say, here are the ones we think should be paved, and here is the reason why. As one of my colleagues said when this list was announced this morning, it was the right thing for the wrong reason. And that is what has happened. In this whole list of twenty-six projects announced, there is the usual tokenism there. There were three or four Liberal districts put in and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

Let the peanut gallery, in the back row, be quiet for a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there is the usual tokenism. They throw in a couple of Liberal districts to go through the charade that they are doing

something. There are Liberal districts here, you know - a couple of kilometers here in a Liberal district - but there is nothing like the twelve kilometers that are in Tory districts and stuff like that. It is tokenism. Pure tokenism! I notice here the 2.5 kilometers of Route 331, from the present pavement to the Stoneville intersection. It is interesting that that happens to be where the Lewisporte district ends and the Fogo district begins.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Now, cheer! Let the member for Lewisporte (Mr. Russell) cheer and let him laugh, but the children from Gander Bay who are being hauled over that dirt road in buses to go to school, they are not laughing, Mr. Speaker.

This is the problem, and they can see the hypocrisy in this announcement made here this morning, this pavement ends at the Lewisporte district, so they are going to be punished because they are living in the Fogo district. That is where the problem is, Mr. Speaker and that is what is wrong with this list.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is all right for members on the government side. They are going to use the Newfoundland people's money to try to buy their votes, but, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is not going to work. Let them call an election and they will

find out where they are going.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

As the minister indicates, we are only talking about 35 per cent of it here and, I think, it is appropriate that we have the other 65 per cent before making the kind of judgement the hon. member is making.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling that once we see 100 per cent of it the member will be entirely right in his accusations.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) Port au Port.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about Port au Port because I think it is important; it is a classic example of the way the government uses road spending in order to manipulate process and to try and influence members to cross the floor of the House, and so on. Port au Port is an interesting district because it was a PC district from 1971-72 up until 1975. At that time, the PC member left. There was a lot of road work done in Port au Port in that time period. From 1975 up until 1985, when the current member for Port au Port was a Liberal, there

was virtually nothing whatsoever done in the district - well, not absolutely nothing, but very, very little. I think if you look at the figures you will find it is a minimal amount. Since the member crossed the floor and became a PC, there has been a considerable amount more work being done there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

But, Mr. Speaker, since I announced in January that I was going to run in Port au Port, we now see more paving work for Port au Port than in its entire history.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, this is an example of the kind of thing that was done in Grand Falls. When the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) was seriously in danger of losing his seat, all of a sudden \$16 million was found to rebuild the Grand Falls hospital. It is the same kind of thing being done there. It is the way in which they use the paving money as a political tool, and hopefully it will stop quite soon.

MR. LONG:

Thanks to the NDP.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before calling for Oral Questions, I would like to welcome to the gallery seventy-five students from Mount Pearl Senior High School accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Norm Hiscock and Mr. Claude Bishop.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Russell). He would be familiar with the gas leak that occurred on March 25 at a service station on Kenmount Road. The reported loss at the time was of the order of 6,000 gallons of fuel, which, of course, raises some very serious environmental and safety concerns.

The minister, in the Estimates Committee on Tuesday night, indicated that it was his belief that the loss - I am quoting him here - "We believe it is more of a paper loss than an actual spill." I put it to the minister that his understanding of the situation, in stating it was a paper loss, is quite contrary to the findings of the investigation and does not square with the investigation. I put it to him that the investigation found that at least 2,000 gallons of fuel are still unaccounted for?

I ask him, would he undertake to verify this matter as to what is the truth, whether it is a paper loss or whether, indeed, as the investigation found out, there are still over 2,000 gallons of fuel unaccounted for. Would he undertake to verify and get back to us in the House?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment and Lands.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. member is getting his statistics. Indeed, there are about 5,000 gallons still not accounted for, not 2,000 gallons. So I do not know where he is getting his figures. The original estimate was approximately 6,000 gallons. It was subsequently learned that when the tanks were pumped out there were 1,000 gallons went back to Holyrood in the tanker truck, which reduced it to 5,000 gallons. We have only been able to recover approximately forty or fifty gallons. The Ultramar people have hired an independent auditor to look at the books, the reconciliations and so on to try and determine if, indeed, it was a paper loss. I am sure we all hope that it was a paper loss as opposed to a real loss. I have not yet received a report from Ultramar as of this morning confirming or otherwise, from the independent audit, what the result of that audit was. As soon as I get that, I shall be pleased to pass on whatever information I have to the hon. House.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, as the minister will know, the service station operator failed to report this leak after being unable for four days to reconcile his fuel report. Indeed, he did not report it, I believe, until the ninth day. Has

the minister determined that the failure to report was deliberate? And if so, what action will he, the minister, take to ensure compliance with the requirements of the act? And also did not Ultramar itself, the supplying company here as opposed to the service station itself, have a responsibility to ensure that the operator was fully apprised of his duties, including his duty to report the lack of reconciliation of his reports from day to day?

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, there is a regulation in place pertaining to service stations that when they do their dipping, after four consecutive dips there is a significant discrepancy, then they are required after that to report it immediately. It is my understanding that this was not done, that a considerable time did elapse, I think eight or nine days approximately, before it was reported. Ultramar, as I understand it, really owned the pipeline, which is being managed by somebody else. Ultramar, I would think, has a responsibility to ensure that whoever is operating their service stations is aware of the regulations, just as every other oil company and service station operator in the Province has. Ignorance of the law, so to speak, is no excuse. Everybody should be aware of what the regulations are and everybody should adhere to them.

In this particular case, I am not prepared to say it was a

deliberate attempt on the part of Ultramar or the service station operators to cover up anything. I am hoping that there will be a report on my desk maybe later today or Tuesday, not necessarily a final report because we are still doing some monitoring on it and will continue to monitor the situation as long as is necessary really to do that. In the report there may or may not be a recommendation to lay charges. I will update the Legislature as soon as I can on that.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, would the minister confirm that the contractor who installed the fuel tanks at Kenmount Road was the same contractor who was called in to investigate the loss, and that he was called in before Environment was alerted, with the consequence that any chance of discovering the real cause of the leak was probably minimized? And would he also confirm that it was that same contractor who was the installer of the tanks at Elizabeth East Ultramar which is now the subject of a separate investigation?

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

MR. RUSSELL:
The same contractor who originally installed the tanks, was called in to look at it. I understand, though, that after a very short period of time, a matter of a few hours after he was called in the matter was reported. I am waiting to get the report with all the

details in it, so subject to any change in that, I understand right now just a few hours after he was called in the matter was reported. If the hon. member is alleging that the contractor or Ultramar or the service station operator have done anything that is not quite proper, then he should come out and say it. I have no evidence at this time to indicate that.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question was intended for the Minister of Municipal Affairs, but, in his absence, I will direct the question to the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins). Mr. Speaker, my question is in relation to the great dissatisfaction, discontent, and the great public outcry that we have heard recently being expressed in the town of Conception Bay South. My reason for asking the question is to try and prevent this situation from developing in other parts of the Province. As the minister is probably aware, it is related to the assessment process.

I am wondering can the minister identify the nature and the cause of the problem about which the citizens of Conception Bay South are so vociferously expressing themselves at this particular time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, the question, as the hon. member said, is probably more appropriate to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. However, I happen to own a bit of property in Conception Bay South which is reported in my Conflict of Interest statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:
I, therefore, have a personal, if not all that unduly lively interest in the matter.

My understanding of the matter is that the municipality was pressing the Department of Municipal Affairs for a number of years to carry out the assessment of properties in the community. They were wanting to structure their revenues on the basis of property tax, they did not have properties in the community assessed in any professional way, and they were pressing hard for the Municipal Affairs Department to get on with this. Now, Municipal Affairs, of course, had many special requests on their plate and there was a bit of delay there, and I guess that is why the Conception Bay South authorities were a bit anxious and pressing hard.

Anyway, the assessments were finally carried out and that information was passed to the authorities in Conception Bay South. The order or events then would be for the municipality there to decide how much revenue it required to discharge its duties and then to fix a rate, taking into consideration assessed values of properties.

Now, I understand that the municipality has not adjusted its rate as some residents in the area feel they should have. In other words, the assessments went up, which was fair enough, that is a sort of professional thing, sort of an objective thing, how much something costs, and property values increase. But then to determine the revenues the community needs, you have to bring in the mil rate, and some people in that area felt that the municipality did not adjust the mil rate properly, in view of the new assessed values, to determine the amount of revenues that were required, and that the municipality now is really getting more revenues than it requires for its purposes because values have gone up and the mil rate has not gone down.

Now, in my understanding that is where the controversy is, and I can fully understand it. I might say - I am going to put this in here - that CBS is not the only one involved in that. The city of St. John's had assessments done a little while ago, and the mil rate was not changed, in many people's views, to the degree it should. And some people were left with huge increases in their property assessments.

MR. SIMMS:
You own property in St. John's, do you not?

DR. COLLINS:
I happen to own a bit of property in St. John's too.

MR. SIMMS:
Did you declare it?

DR. COLLINS:
I declared it for year after year after year, since 1979, on my

Conflict of Interest statement. I am very diligent about that. I am not criticizing CBS, but I am just pointing out that this is a problem that municipal authorities are faced with. When property assessments change, they have to be alert to change the mil rate also. The people in CBS feel that the municipality out there has not been alert enough in that regard.

MR. LUSH:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the minister referred to the pressure that is being put upon government, placed upon government to get these assessments done. Now, I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if this is not the root cause of the problem, that in an attempt to meet the pressure the government is putting unreasonable demands on its assessors to get this job done, thus abandoning the normal caution, the normal care that would be given to the assessment process. Because there must be something unusual in this situation when we have over a thousand appeals. There must be something irregular, unjust, unreasonable in the assessments. So, is this the reason for it, that to cope with the pressure the department is putting unreasonable demands on the assessors to get the job done?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I think I have

answered that question. The Department of Municipal Affairs were requested to do something, which they did. There was no root cause of any difficulty there. If the department had declined to do the assessments, yes, there would have been a problem there, but they did not. They supplied information. That is what the Department of Municipal Affairs did. Essentially, they supplied professional information to the municipality. Now, I do not know if the hon. member is suggesting that they did not supply it quickly enough, you could make an argument that way, but we have in actual fact increased the number of property assessors in recent time to keep up with demands put on the department by the various municipalities around the Province. We have tried to respond to that in the best way we can, but that is not where the problem is. The problem is that people find their assessed values go up and there is not a suitable adjustment in the mil rate. The municipal authorities have the flexibility to lower the mil rate. The department does not fix the mil rate, that is something the municipality itself can do, and if that is not done a particular householder can feel himself aggrieved. His property has gone up, the mil rate is not adjusted down, and he has to pay a large amount over and above what he normally paid. Now, there is in place, as the hon. member suggested, a mechanism to give some relief to the householder, and that is an appeal system. Many people in CBS have taken advantage of that appeal system, which is quite proper. The numbers who have taken advantage of that appeal system I do not think are excessive: I think in the city of St. John's, and I am

familiar with that more than most municipalities, I guess, there was a large number of people who appealed their assessments as a result of the recent property value changes. These appeals are a common thing. I think it is a good thing, but I still say that the municipality has the flexibility to change its mil rate.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that the cost of these appeals is beyond the ability of councils to pay for in view of the financial restraints that councils are now going through? My question to the minister is this: What steps are the government going to take to help alleviate this particular situation in Conception Bay South of 1000 appeals, Mr. Speaker? There are over 1000, because I am told there are several hundreds of people there not familiar with the process of appeal. What steps are the government going to take to help alleviate this problem, the problem related to assessment in the town of Conception Bay South, which appears to have been done in a slipshod manner and to prevent it from escalating throughout this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, if there is a problem, and I can recognize that many people would feel that there is a problem, it is not caused by government, by the Department of Municipal Affairs. The department

merely carried out a job of work for the municipalities. It was requested to do it. If the municipality feels that as a result of having that job of work carried out it has got itself into a bit of a bind financial-wise, I guess it is up to the municipality to find its way out of that. But I would suggest that the appeal system is not a costly appeal system. What usually happens is there is a Commissioner obtained by the municipality and the Commissioner holds hearings. They are not lengthy hearings. I know that this happened down at City Hall here. You can run through a large number of appeals in a morning, so it is not a very costly item. But, even at that, the municipality has the flexibility to get sufficient revenues through its ordinary mechanisms to cover the cost of the Commissioner. This is a mechanism that is available in all communities. It is not something new.

The hon. member may be suggesting that CBS is faced with some unique situation. That is not the case. The appeals system is Province-wide and I do not think that the member is bringing up an issue of any great importance.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister Responsible for the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation (Mr. Peach) and comes just after I asked a question to the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) concerning the ability of the

Newfoundland Light and Power to cut off electricity to clients during the Winter months. I would like to put a similar question to the Minister Responsible for the Housing Corporation, and ask whether there is a set of guidelines within NLHC that prevents officials of the Housing Corporation from taking action to evict clients of the corporation, occupants of NLHC apartments, during the Winter months?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:
I am sure the hon. member does not want to confuse the issue of Newfoundland Light and Power with regard to what they do regarding non-payment of bills with what the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing does with rental arrears. I am not sure if the member is clear on that.

The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to heating subsidies, we have just completed Phase III of a three-year programme totalling some \$4.3 million to accommodate the people who are in Newfoundland and Labrador Housing units in our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to be very clear in my question but I am not sure the minister understood what I was addressing. The issue is The Landlord Tenants Act of this Province has a special exemption for the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, and, as a result, during Winter months the Housing Corporation can give one month's notice and put people out on the streets.

Mr. Speaker, I had a constituent come to me in the month of February who was about to be put out on the street.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. LONG:
My question to the minister is: Will the minister confirm that Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation has internal guidelines which will prevent officials from taking action to evict occupants of dwellings during the Winter months?

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

MR. PEACH:
Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member must be aware of the fact that Newfoundland and Labrador Housing is very concerned with any cases of arrears and evictions. We give notices, Mr. Speaker, for various reasons during, I guess all times of the year, but always consideration has been given. And as well, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that proper notice is given, usually a three month notice, under The Landlord Tenants Act.

So I can assure the hon. member that no undue hardship has ever been caused to people who are

living in our units, not only in St. John's but anywhere in this Province, because proper notice is given according to the guidelines that are set down.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the minister says I can confirm that NLHC this past Winter has in fact been given only thirty days -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. LONG:
- eviction notice.

MR. SIMMS:
Ask your question.

MR. LONG:
My final supplementary to the minister is: Given the exemptions of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation under The Landlord Tenants Act, will the minister make a commitment to introduce legislation that will bring the Housing Corporation under the full regulations of The Landlord Tenants Act which will prevent the Corporation from taking action to evict people during Winter months without a full three month notice?

MR. PEACH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PEACH:
Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the regulations that are in place at the present time are very

suitable. We have very, very few legitimate complaints from residents and tenants anywhere in this Province. Our regulations are very compatible to the people who live in our units. Mr. Speaker, that the last thing that one wants to do is to evict somebody from a unit any time of the year, and we are always very conscious of families, single parents, people with large families, and we carry out our evictions, Mr. Speaker, under the guidelines that are set down, which are very flexible and very well accepted by the tenants that we have.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, thank you.

I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett). I would like to know if the minister could tell the House what the situation is pertaining to the Easteel Industries bankruptcy and the provincial government's liability? The reports indicate that the government may lose up to \$4 million. I would like to know can the minister provide information to the House on this matter?

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I distinctly remember giving all of that detailed

information to this hon. House several weeks ago. I do not know if it is necessary to reiterate all that again. I would like to refer the hon. member to press releases that were made on the subject, as well as the information that was given to this House in a very detailed explanation as to government's position in that entire unfortunate circumstance. We are certainly aware of the fact that Easteel is in receivership, and we understand that the receiver has undertaken whatever action is necessary to dispose of the assets and to pay from the disposition of those assets whatever residual is available to both the secured and unsecured creditors. I informed the House at that time the status of contracts that were outstanding with that facility, the work that had to be done, and the potential loss that the government would accrue as a result of guarantees that the government had placed on a project basis during the tenure of that company.

I do not have all that specific information in my hands. If the hon. member wants that specific information again, and he cannot find it in Hansard, I would be more than happy to provide it for him.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward).

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Well, I would like to ask the minister further on the matter which is of rather huge importance, and we do not feel there is enough importance available at the time.

I would like to ask the minister a further question concerning the security that the government asked for when they provided the loans to Easteel Industries. Could he tell us if the owners of the parent company were asked to provide security to back up the guaranteed loans and other financial assistance that was provided by the provincial government?

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

MR. BARRETT:
As I had informed the House previously, the majority of the assistance that the government had provided that company was in the form of project financing assistance, and the security, of course, was the projects themselves. When they were brought to a conclusion, then, of course, that eliminated and removed the responsibility of government to act. The reason that that was necessary, of course, was that the company and the principals of the company had really committed all of the available security that they had to the banks in order to provide an opportunity for employment for a great number of people in the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:
In St. John's.

MR. BARRETT:
No. It is not located in St. John's, by the way. Maybe the gentleman should find out where certain places are located before he makes those flippant remarks.

We are not at all comfortable with having to see any industry in this Province close. There are a

number of issues that contributed to that unfortunate event. As I advised the members opposite previously, government's position was as secure as it could have been. What was done was to accommodate a company in difficult circumstances to try and prolong the life of that company and to provide employment for a great number of Newfoundlanders for as long as was possible.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to ask the minister, now that the company is in bankruptcy, is the government going to have any input into seeing that while the assets are sold to recover monies for the creditors, that the whole business, could possibly be sold as a unit so that the business can possibly restart in the future, rather than separate parts of it being sold off, thus leaving no future at all for the operating? I am wondering is the government having any input into those proceedings that are starting in the next few days?

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

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the member opposite familiarize himself with the terms of The Bankruptcy Act. The Bankruptcy Act is a federal statute which provides the mechanisms through which companies are placed into receivership and the disposition

of those assets. That is what is happening here. A receiver has been appointed by the creditors. And the disposition of the assets will flow through, presumably, in accordance with that act.

The Province or my department have absolutely no way of influencing or having any preferred position in that process.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GULLAGE:
I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Young), but I note he is not in the House so I will direct my question to the Deputy Premier.

In light of the fact that it has been announced or a statement has been made by the Minister of Consumer Affairs that a full line of petroleum products will be available for sale in Newfoundland -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:
Now that the minister is back, I direct that question to him. My comment was now that products of the Come By Chance refinery are going to be available for sale in Newfoundland, could the minister comment on whether this would mean better prices to Newfoundland consumers? In a comparable situation of Petro-Can in Canada, with a federal mandate, the products delivered to the market did not ultimately result in better prices to the consumer at

the pumps and home delivery. Could he comment on whether in Newfoundland it will be different and we will see better pricing to the Newfoundland consumer?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Housing.

MR. YOUNG:
Mr. Speaker, contrary to the opinion of the Opposition, we are very proud that the Come By Chance refinery is putting oil products on the Newfoundland market. It is my understanding that just during the past week gasoline from the refinery has come on the market and we hope and trust that in the competitive manner eventually individual outlets will be set up in the Province and competition will reduce the cost of gasoline.

MR. GULLAGE:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Kenmount - Waterford.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, will these products be available to all companies doing business in Newfoundland and not just one particular company? Is it the intent of the government to make sure that the products are available in such a way that one company will not have an advantage in the marketplace by way of a purchase, which has been rumored, of a group of service stations by Come By Chance so that they will have access to the market in a captive way with only this one group of service stations? Or will, in fact, the products be

available to all companies so that we will see a fair competitive price on the market, unlike what we see now with the Petro-Can situation?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Consumer Affairs.

MR. YOUNG:
Mr. Speaker, the oil refinery at Come By Chance is a private firm, and I am pretty sure that this government has no intention of taking over private enterprises like the NDP want to do. We do not tell any private firm whom to sell their products to. And I hope and trust that any person who wants to can go in and buy the gasoline and other products from the refinery can do so. It is a free market.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for oral questions has elapsed.

At this stage I would like to welcome to the galleries twenty students from Booth High School, Windsor, with their teachers Mr. Warren and Mr. Fry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

DR. TWOMEY:

I would like to table in this hon. House the annual report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Public Service Commission for the year 1986-1987.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of The Newfoundland Medical Care Commission for the year ending March 31, 1987.

Petitions

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I present a petition today on behalf of approximately 325 people of Greenspond.

Actually, I should say that all of the people do not come from Greenspond; the vast majority do, but I will get around to that a little later.

The matter being addressed, Your Honour, is the road to Greenspond, the road leading from the Bonavista Loop Highway to and through the town of Greenspond. It is commonly referred to as the Shamblers Cove Road.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will read to you a petition and I believe, in

the words of my good friend, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), that it meets all the requirements of a petition.

I shall accordingly read it. It says "To the Hon. House of Assembly, in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the district of Bonavista North humbly sheweth:

WHEREAS the Shamblers Cove Road leading to Greenspond and the main road through Greenspond are in such a deplorable condition; and

WHEREAS the community of Greenspond is a vibrant and successful fishing settlement, having a very successful fish plant located in the village; and

WHEREAS the deteriorating condition of the road is not conducive to ensuring a viable fish plant operation also causing much unnecessary wear and tear on the vehicles of residents and those who commute to work at the fish plant on a daily basis from other nearby communities.

WHEREFORE, the undersigned your petitioners humbly pray and call upon the House of Assembly to instruct the Minister of Transportation to allocate monies immediately for reconstruction, upgrading, maintenance and paving of these road systems." and that is the road from the Bonavista Loop Highway to and through the community of Greenspond, commonly referred to as the Shamblers Cove Road.

Mr. Speaker, I think the prayer of the petition says it all, really. Most hon. members should know that Greenspond is one of the historic fishing villages of Newfoundland,

a prosperous town, a prosperous village, and, Mr. Speaker, a most scenic area, an area that if hon. members have not visited it they should do it to get a breath of fresh air coming right in from the Atlantic Ocean. It is a beautiful area to visit, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, the area does not get all the visitors it should, because of the condition of the road. The road is a relatively new road, because, as all hon. members will know, Greenspond is an island and it is only recently that the causeway was constructed there. We have a better causeway than we have got a road system. We have a causeway, but a very poor road system on either side of the causeway. The road is now down to bedrock. There is nothing that the Department of Highways crews out there can do in terms of grading the road. That makes little difference, because it is right down to the bedrock.

I made a recommendation to the minister. As a matter of fact, I got a letter from the previous minister, sometime early Fall, asking me to prioritize the roads in my district, which I did. I did that and I even specified the area that they should start with, knowing, Mr. Speaker, that it was probably unrealistic to think that we would get all of the road down. I think it is about nineteen or twenty kilometers. I think that is the total distance of the road, somewhere in that range. I even specified where they should start in asking that about four or five or six kilometers be started in this fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I was a little disappointed to hear this morning, when the list was being read out, that Greenspond was not included

in that list. Because, Mr. Speaker, if it is going to be done on need, certainly there is not an area in this Province that requires its roads to be upgraded more than the people of Greenspond, with this vibrant fish plant, Mr. Speaker, and people working from nearby communities, and shipping fish to and from the fish plant. Certainly, if we are talking about upgrading roads to resources, this must take a number one priority. So I was disappointed that it was not on the list this morning, but I am willing to reserve judgement, as is the member for Menihek. I am willing to wait for the other 65 per cent to be announced to see if Greenspond is going to be included in that list, and I plead with the minister to ensure that it is included.

I will say this: From the list given this morning, I am not too encouraged. The government already got themselves behind the eight ball.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, they have a lot of catching up to do, and I hope in that catching-up process the Greenspond Road, the Shamblers Cove Road, will be included.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to stand and support this petition presented by my colleague. Mr.

Speaker, I am sure Your Honour will allow me to digress just for a few seconds and say how it never ceases to amaze me when I realize the efforts which my colleague is continually putting in for his district. I understand that during the past three weeks this hon. member received ten delegations from his district, including a delegation from the very community where this petition comes from, from the town of Greenspond.

In their 'WHEREASES', Mr. Speaker, they use the term 'deplorable' to describe their road. Now, the Minister of Transportation, I am sure, is aware of the meaning of the word 'deplorable'. If he has any doubts about what the word 'deplorable' means, I would suggest to him that he would take a visit out to the Greenspond area and see exactly what those people are talking about when they describe the road. Now, this is a long weekend. The House of Assembly is not open on Monday, so I would ask the minister that he go out and talk to as many of those 325 people who signed this petition as he can. There are 325 people who have signed it, and it is a long weekend, what a lovely way for the minister to spend this weekend, to go out to Greenspond and speak to as many of the 325 as he can.

Now, when the minister gets up to respond to this petition, I am sure he is going to come up with the same old silly story, that there is not enough money to pave the Greenspond road. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a cop-out. It is a cop-out to talk about not enough money. I remember, not very long ago, when we had this crusade for prosperity, when we had the Tories up saying, 'Now, people of

Newfoundland, elect a Tory government in Ottawa and then we will have her made. We will have all kinds of secondary roads agreements. We will have agreements on everything, the only problem we will be we will have too much money.'

That is what was going to happen, Mr. Speaker. That is what they were saying, too many jobs, too many cars for our people, too much prosperity. This was the promise. In spite of the fact that this was the promise, this government, although we have had Tory Ottawa and Tory Newfoundland for the past four years, have not been able to sign a secondary roads agreement. It was promised three or four years ago, the previous minister promised it, yet, they have not delivered.

And here is the crux of the matter. I agree with the minister that they do not have the money to pave roads. I am wondering if they have enough money to pay the light bill, the way that they have been running the province. But, surely goodness, now that they have their bosom pals in Ottawa, they can get to signing a simple thing like a secondary roads agreement, and that will solve the problem out in Greenspond, Mr. Speaker.

It seems to me that they must have some sort of agreement signed on press secretaries with Ottawa. There seems to be lots of money for press secretaries. I have not heard it announced, Mr. Speaker, but I am looking forward to when they will announce that there has been an agreement entered into with Ottawa, because this Province does not have the money to pay for the press secretaries. So they must be getting money from

somewhere, and I would assume they have an agreement worked out with Ottawa.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the hon. minister, if he is talking about money, is they are on the verge of signing an agreement concerning the railway. Now, I am assuming that when that agreement is signed, this Province will turn up with at least \$1.5 billion. Now, I am putting a rough figure on what it is worth. Surely goodness they are going to get a \$1.5 billion, and when they get this 1.5 billion or 2 billion, whichever, some semblance of what it is worth -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Eight hundred and thirteen million dollars.

MR. DECKER:

Do not ever let me hear the minister say it is \$800 million, because that would be a total sellout. That would be a total sellout, \$813 million is a giveaway. At least \$1.5 billion, nothing short-

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Can I have a little bit of leave, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down. Sit down.

MR. DECKER:

Leave?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:

They just cannot take the heat, Mr. Speaker. They just cannot

take the heat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to stand and to speak in support of the petition presented by the member for Bonavista North on behalf of 320-odd constituents of his in the district, with regard to the upgrading and the paving of the Shamblers Cove Road.

I am very familiar with the Shamblers Cove Road, Mr. Speaker, having met with a delegation from the hon. member's district on at least two different occasions to talk about the Shamblers Cove Road and to indicate the need that they have to have that particular road upgraded and paved.

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated to the delegation and indicated to the hon. member on a number of different occasions, we do not yet have our capital programme dealt with within the department. The hon. member makes reference to the early tendering of capital projects and how that road was not included in that particular list. So that the hon. member will not mislead anybody, the projects that we have announced today are projects which are ready to go and which, for the most part, do not require any great extensive amount of upgrading, mostly the paving and upgrading that has already been carried out at some point past.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is a very good reason why it is not included in the early tendering of capital projects.

The length of that particular road the member refers to is approximately 20 kilometers, and what we are talking about here is an expenditure of roughly about \$3.5 million. We certainly do not know, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to be able to undertake that project this year.

The hon. member states that there is no other road in the Province in greater need of being upgraded. It is funny that the member who supported the petition, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, last week, when he was making a case for some roads in his district, was saying that there is no greater need than the road that his constituents live on, no greater need for any road to be upgraded and paved than the roads in his area.

I went down with the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir last week to speak to the people from Burgeo, in Deer Lake, and the hon. member told me that there is no greater need than to have the roads upgraded in his district. So, I do not know who has the greater need. I guess probably anyone who lives on a gravel road has a need and wants to have their roads upgraded and paved. A couple of weeks ago it was the people of Bartlett's Harbour and Ferolle, who wanted to have their roads upgraded and paved as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are not copping out. The hon. gentleman says, oh, the government is copping out and saying that there is not enough money. I am very pleased and very proud of the

capital programme that we have this year within my department, because it is in the neighbourhood of approximately \$85 million, which is quite an extensive capital programme - \$40 million worth of work being undertaken by the department, by the Provincial Government, \$40 million, an additional \$35 million being undertaken Federal/Provincial cost-shared work this year, and additional \$7.5 million for airstrips within the Province. So we have a very, very extensive capital programme, approximately \$85 million which the construction industry is crying for and is very pleased to accept.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will respond to the petition from the hon. gentleman. I am pleased to take it and I will respond to his constituents in due course. But certainly I cannot give him any undertaking today as to whether that particular project is going to be done this year. But it is the wish and the desire of the department to have every gravel road in the Province completed and paved, and hopefully this will be one among many.

Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, we are on the Bill to put in place a new Internal Economy Commission. That is Order No. 4, Bill No. 16.

MR. SPEAKER:

"An Act To Amend The Internal Economy Commission Act." Bill No. 16.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I pick up where I left off, Mr. Speaker, I want to extend a personal welcome and a welcome on behalf of all members on this side of the House, and I am sure, I speak for all members of the House, when I extend a particular welcome to the twenty students from Booth High School who are in the gallery together with their teachers Mr. Warren and Mr. Fry. They are very welcome and we are glad to see them here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, in debating this bill to provide for a change in the Internal Economy Commission and to implement the proposal that was recommended in the report prepared earlier in this House as to the manner in which the salaries for members of the House, as members of the House - it has nothing to do with salaries of ministers or anything like that I assume, which is a separate thing - but their salaries as members of the House is to be paid and the quantity, I thought it an opportune time to deal with the question that has been raised and commented upon back and forth across the House, and in public media on a number of occasions, of the salary that I am paid as Leader of the Liberal Party. I started to do it yesterday with great difficulty because of constant interruption.

Before I start today I would say to hon members, look, you can have an opportunity, and everybody in this House has an opportunity, to say what you want after. That is up to the individual member as to what the member wants to say.

I just ask the members to do me the courtesy of allowing me to explain that which they have been so critical of for so long. Just do me that courtesy and then say what you want about it after. There is no restraint.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WELLS:
See, the hon. member, right away, is off on his usual approach because he is frightened to death of the truth. It is obvious.

AN HON. MEMBER:
The truth to you.

MR. WELLS:
Now, just do me the courtesy of allowing me to explain it since you have been critical of it.

As I said yesterday, I did not set about to seek the leadership of the Liberal Party and I have not for a number of year, although I have been asked by a great many Liberals over the past number of years to do so, simply because I could not afford to abandon my business and give up my practice of law. I could not afford to do it and I would not do it. I could not get involved.

Numerous members in this House are involved in various types of businesses and carry on businesses, construction company businesses, automobile dealerships, stores and restaurants, property rental businesses, insurance businesses, fish brokerage businesses, legal practices, medical practices and real estate. There are a variety of businesses that members carry on.

The people who came to ask me to

seek the leadership of the Liberal Party said to me, 'You can carry on your law practice' and I took the position that you cannot. You cannot do justice to the position of being a member of the House - you can if you are a member of the House and you have no other responsibility - but if you are a member of the House and you are a Cabinet Minister, or you are the Leader of the Opposition, or the Premier, you cannot continue to be involved in a legal practice. I think that that is wrong.

I realize others may take a different view but I do not think you can do justice to the position of being a Cabinet Minister, or the leader of the Opposition, or the leader of the government and still have an active participation in a professional practice. You can be an ordinary member and do it. I see nothing at all wrong with that.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
The other Liberal Leader did.

MR. WELLS:
No, he did not, not carry on an active practice at the same time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:
That is right.

Just let me finish and then you can make your comments after. I choose a different course. I admit to everybody in this House and everybody in this Province, I will be beholden to the Liberal Party because they will be paying me a salary. But everybody knows I am the Leader of the Liberal Party. Of course I am beholden to the Liberal Party.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WELLS:
That is right.

So I will be beholden. I have a responsibility and I will have a loyalty to the Liberal Party, make no mistake about it. I will be promoting the interest -

MR. MORGAN:
But they are not paying you, the Liberal Party.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. WELLS:
If the member would just restrain himself.

MR. MORGAN:
Give the facts.

MR. WELLS:
I will give the facts if he will be quiet, but I am going to give them, not the member.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. MORGAN:
(Inaudible) Mount Scio left your caucus.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! A point of order.

MR. PATTERSON:
I am not so much concerned about the salary he is getting, but I am concerned about what is happening to the Liberal Party in Newfoundland. What is going to

happen to the Opposition when they have to go out and buy a leader?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Order! Order!

MR. PATTERSON:
Now, the federal party is bankrupt. They cannot pay their bills. They are begging the banks to finance them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Order! Order!

MR. PATTERSON:
They cannot pay their bills in the district of Placentia East, yet this gentleman over there receives \$50,000. If he is interested in Newfoundland, if he is a patriotic Newfoundlander, he would contribute \$50,000 to the party, not take it.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, I have a limited time to speak. If the members do not have the courtesy to listen, I will go out and I can give it to the press. There is no problem. I will make the speech to the press and it will be far more effective.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:
I will make the speech to the press. I mean, this is utter nonsense.

MR. PEACH:
The press would not cover you.

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible).

MR. WELLS:

Really intelligent!

Mr. Speaker, I chose a different course. I chose to immediately abandon my law practice that I had worked on for twenty-five years.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Immediately?

MR. WELLS:

Yes, immediately. You cannot cut it overnight. I had to phase it down. My office was closed by October. Before I was elected to this House my office was closed, and so it should be. I resigned immediately as the Director and Chairman of the Board of Newfoundland Light and Power before I ran for the leadership. I resigned immediately.

MR. PEACH:

You did not disclose all your interests.

MR. WELLS:

Everything is disclosed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

All right, we will deal with that too.

MR. PEACH:

Why should I disclose?

MR. WELLS:

Everybody should disclose and I have.

MR. PEACH:

Including yourself.

MR. TULK:

That is another bombshell for him.

MR. WELLS:

Yes.

MR. TULK:

That is another bombshell. He is going to hit you.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, clearly I will be beholden to the House of Assembly and the Liberal Party and to nobody else. It is too bad that the party opposite wants it to be otherwise for their own political purposes, but it is not so, and they can claim it until they are blue in the face and it will not be so. My party has never said so. It will not make it so.

MR. MORGAN:

The provincial party was not paying you. Someone else was paying you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:

The hon. member knows better than to rely on the story in that particular newspaper and he knows why. You cannot do it.

MR. MORGAN:

Norm Whelan, three months ago (inaudible).

MR. WELLS:

Never mind! Anybody who thinks, Mr. Speaker, that I am in politics for money had better think again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:

My personal income, I will tell all the world, has been cut in half by reason of getting involved in politics. So I did not do it for money. Make no mistake about it. I have not been claiming to

be a martyr, but it is offensive and upsetting to hear the silly, stupid, unfair, unfounded remarks of the members opposite when that is, in fact, the case! I did not get into politics to get money out of it! I got into politics to contribute.

MR. MORGAN:

Out of your own party you are taking it. (Inaudible).

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, would you please name the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) and have him removed from so that the Assembly can conduct its business in an orderly manner.

MR. MORGAN:

You will never muzzle Morgan.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. MORGAN:

You tried two days ago.

MR. LONG:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a very brief point of order. To say that for our part we are quite willing to sit and allow the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Wells) to make his speech on what we believe are very important issues. We appreciate the

attempts by the leader to have the Speaker keep the members on the government side silent and show some courtesy and respect for any member of the House making a speech. We, for our part, will continue to sit allow the Leader his Full time.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Chair needs any lectures from the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) on how conduct the business of the House. The hon. member should pay more respect to the Chair. The Chair knows when to call order and when he feels that people are out of order. We depend on Your Honour's judgment.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. There is no point of order, but I would ask all members to please be as quiet as possible so that we can hear whoever is speaking, whether it be the Opposition or government members. It is very difficult to hear the person speaking when you are hearing other members singing out order. If there is going to be order called, I will call order, ask for order and I will demand order.

The hon. the leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, anybody who suggests for a money that I got involved in politics because

of expected financial rewards can clearly see otherwise. Just the opposite has, in fact, occurred.

It is difficult to accept the lies and aspersions and the smears and the distortions for political purposes. There will be things I will have to do, I will let hon. members know. I can no longer afford to operate and maintain my sailboat. It is up for sale. That is a fact. It is a simple fact!

I am not pleading for mercy, that is my problem. I have no problem with it! But to sit and hear the aspersions of those hon. members in those circumstances is offensive by any standard, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
It is particularly impossible to accept it from the members of the Progressive Conservative Party whose leader had been paid a salary by his party for years. We are not quarrelling with it. He performs a service for his party. I have no problem with that. I perform a service for the Liberal Party as well as a service I perform as a M.H.A and Leader of the Opposition. I perform a tremendous service for the Liberal Party. And I put in more than eight hours a day for the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:
You are not getting many results for it though.

MR. PATTERSON:
(Inaudible) sewer pipe.

MR. WELLS:
If it is all right for the PC Party to pay the Premier a salary, why is it not all right for the Liberal Party to pay their leader?

MR. MORGAN:
(Inaudible).

MR. WELLS:
Okay, we will deal with the amounts later.

But I assume they have no quarrel with the PC Party paying its leader, the Premier, a salary.

MR. MORGAN:
But the Party is not paying you. We have already said that over and over.

MR. WELLS:
Never mind that, I assume they agree with that. Operating on that assumption, then I take it they have no quarrel with the Liberal Party paying its leader a salary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:
What they appear to be quarrelling about is the amount.

AN HON. MEMBER:
No.

MR. WELLS:
They are quarrelling about the amount.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:
Nobody can accept that criticism in having any degree of credibility, Mr. Speaker, so long as they sit and accept the payment to the Premier of a salary.

Nobody accepts it as having any credibility, nor should they. The only difference is amount. That is what they are quarrelling with. Or as they say, who is paying it? Well, I will tell them who is paying it: Not the people they are saying is paying it, but the hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people who contribute to the Liberal Party. That is who is paying it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

They do not like that! They do not want it to be that way. They want to be able to say two or three or four people.

MR. MORGAN:

Three prominent Liberals are paying you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Could we have order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:

Do not deceive the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am going to ask the members once more on my left to please keep order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Liberal Party is paying me a salary. I am happy to accept it. I have no concern with it. It is entirely proper. It was announced beforehand. It was approved by the Liberal Party in convention by electing me as its leader in an overwhelming manner. I presume the hundreds and hundreds or thousands of contributors to the P.C. Party are similarly providing the funds with which the party pays its leader. I have no cause to think otherwise, and I would not suggest otherwise. If I had cause I might, but I have no cause to suggest otherwise. And those gentlemen opposite have no cause to suggest otherwise as far as the Liberal Party is concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

(Inaudible) that is why you are talking about it today.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

No, I am dealing with the issues that have been raised with the smear and the improper allegations.

MR. MORGAN:

(inaudible) salary leader.

MR. WELLS:

It is also impossible to accept it from the NDP, Mr. Speaker, totally impossible, and the double standard they set up when last Spring and last Fall I heard the Leader of the NDP Party complaining publicly on television about how underpaid he was. He was nearly broke. He was facing possible bankruptcy, and those were his words.

Then I heard him say, Mr. Speaker,

the real problem is the burdens I have as leader of the party. And he approves it by nodding today. The real problem is I have to discharge those burdens as the leader of the party.

Well, does he not think I have to discharge burdens as leader of the party? The Premier has to discharge burdens as the leader of the party. Those two parties choose to pay their leaders directly. The hon. member for Menihek says, 'But my party is a poor party, so, therefore, the government should pay.' That is the position he chose, government should pay me a salary as Leader of the NDP Party. That is his position.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to face bankruptcy. I am not prepared to put myself in a difficult position. I am prepared to reduce my lifestyle and take other cuts, yes. But I will not place my family in difficulty or jeopardize their security to satisfy political vultures.

MR. MORGAN:

\$125,000 a year!

MR. WELLS:

The MHA for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) can run his businesses and manage his properties and take whatever profit he likes.

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) Live on \$125,000 a year, heavy stuff.

MR. WELLS:

The MHA for Bonavista South referred to the car allowance the Leader of the Opposition gets. I had been given the impression earlier that the Leader of the Opposition had a car available to him.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, there is a car available, but I am told by the department, and Mr. Speaker will know, not yourself, but the Speaker knows, I have written to him about the matter. The media have raised it with me and that is what really caused me to go and check to be honest. Some weeks ago I had a call from a member of the CBC asking me about the use of cars. I told him I had a car, I understood at that time, on the same basis as ministers had a car, that a car was made available to the Leader of the Opposition. Except, when I checked the guidelines I find I cannot use it. I checked with the departmental officials concerned, or rather I had a member of the caucus check - I did not talk to them directly - and I found that there is a set of guidelines for all governmental cars. I do not have them with me. I am sorry, I do not have them with me. Generally, they can only be used for direct governmental purposes and they must be parked overnight in the government parking lot. Ministers cannot drive home with them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:

Just let me finish what I am saying now. That is what the official told me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:

Just wait and you will hear the rest of it. That is what the official told me or advised, at any rate, that the guidelines applied to ministers as well, that those guidelines apply to minister's cars, and we were assured of that.

So I wrote Mr. Speaker about, I do not know, ten days or two weeks ago, and asked him if in fact that was the case. Because if it is, it cannot be used and the minister's should not be using their cars. But, I have to say that that seems to be to utterly unreasonable. Nobody can say that ministers have a car available to them for the general use if they cannot use it. If they have to park it here at Confederation Building. I will never use that car if I got to follow those guidelines because there is no sense to it. I could drive from here to the CBC maybe and the fact is, I have never used. I have never driven it outside the city limits. I have driven it back and forth to the CBC or to some other place that I have had to go, and nowhere else.

It is parked there, and until the matter is cleared up, I do not have a car available, and I do not have a car available.

I do not suggest that ministers should have the kind of access to their cars that they do have. I just say that if the Cabinet Directive says "these guidelines apply to ministers cars," as the official has told us, then we cannot use it. But that should be cleared. I am still awaiting a reply from the Speaker. So, that is not available.

Then the member for Bonavista

South mentioned the Opposition expense allowance. Now that has to cover all miscellaneous expenses of the Opposition offices, subscriptions to newspapers, subscriptions to any magazines that are subscribed to, Opposition office travel - official travel, and a variety of other expenses in connection with the running of the office not specifically provided for.

Let me tell you Mr. Speaker, and tell this Province the vast sum that the hon. member for Bonavista South is talking about. It is \$800 per month -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:

-for the entire official Opposition, for their expenses. It would not pay the Premier's hotel bill for one night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan).

MR. MORGAN:

A point of order Mr. Speaker. This debate is a very important one and we are talking about the benefits to members. It is very important not to mislead the House unintentionally because the benefits to members and their offices is much greater need than \$800 a month because each member of the Opposition is using a service of being able to have all his constituents call their offices collect from all over the

Province, that comes alone to more than \$800 a month.

MR. TULK:

Every member has that.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Greening):

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

With reference to the cost of the Premier's hotel rooms when he travels, I understand that Leader of the Opposition has complimentary tickets for hotels and airlines, free, and I wonder if he would comment on that and not mislead the House when he does.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

As a matter of fact I will shortly deal with that.

Mr. Speaker, when the Corner Brook Chamber of Commerce invites me to come to Corner Brook to speak to the Chamber, that is a public responsibility. It is for the overall best interests of this Province to hear the other side, to hear the other point of view. When I am invited to go to St.

Anthony by the Rotary Club to address them on public issue, that is a public responsibility. When the ministers are invited to do that, the government pays their expenses. Ours has to come out of the \$800 a month! That is utterly unreasonable!

There is no travelling expense account for the Leader of the Opposition, other than that \$800 a month.

MR. MORGAN:

Maybe it should be paid by the taxpayers.

MR. WELLS:

I agree it should be paid by the taxpayers, but the taxpayers will not pay it. The Premier will not let them, or the government will not let them, and that is wrong.

Let us have some sense of fairness in this Province, and let us create a situation where the other point of view can be heard with reasonable facility. Let us now diminish it, and let us prevent the people from hearing. The people of this Province are not fooled by this. They recognize honesty and frankness. They are not going to be misguided by people who, for their own political motive, want to cast another light on it.

The clear thing is, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party is in a panic at the moment as a result of the growth of the Liberal Party -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

- and the growth of the support for the Liberal party.

They will say anything they feel like in order to divert attention away from the real issues, from their gross failures in the field of health, for example. Hospital beds have to be closed. There is a nursing shortage created as a result of governmental financial policies and there is a desperate situation in terms of the provision of adequate hospital equipment throughout this Province, not just one or two hospitals. They have to account for that.

They have to answer to the public, Mr. Speaker, for the great disparity they have created in education where people in rural areas of Newfoundland get, in some cases, half of what is paid to schools in urban areas on a per pupil basis. They will have to answer for that.

They are going to have to answer for the destruction of the economy of this Province and for the destruction of rural Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, for driving the people out of this Province. And they have driven thousands out of this Province in the last three years!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
Thousands!

DR. COLLINS:
A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, one can understand the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's approach here. He

really does not wish to deal with the issue. But we are dealing with the Internal Economy Commission. Whether this government is doing the right thing economically or in the terms of the development of the Province is interesting, but it is not relevant to this issue. We are not in the budget debate here; we are not in the Throne Speech here; we are talking about a particular bill, and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition should be relevant to the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To the point of order, The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:
The relevancy, Mr. Speaker, is simply this - I am addressing the point of order. The Speaker asked me to be heard on the point of order, and I am just telling the hon. members and the Speaker what the relevancy of the comment is.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is the comments that have been made, particularly those by the hon. member for Bonavista South that I am dealing with, and the other comments made in this House, are made in an attempt to cover up these failures.

I am showing them how unfounded they are. To cover up these failures, they are making these comments and they are not dealing with the real issue. That was the point of the comment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

There was no point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

I am talking about them being in an absolute panic and being driven to say anything they can to try and discredit the Liberal Party.

But we will not let them divert us. We will deal with their failures in public services, their failures in highways and municipal services. We will deal with what they have done to the people of this Province in driving them out of it over the last three years, and in doubling the direct Provincial debt in nine years, in reducing the economy of this Province to a position where the revenue from Provincial sources, the total current and capital revenue from Provincial sources for the forthcoming year is projected by the Minister of Finance to be less than it was last year! That is what they have reduced this Province to.

The people of Newfoundland be fooled by these attempts to divert their attention away to issues that they attempted to create like the salary being paid to the Leader of the Opposition by the Liberal Party. Mr. Speaker, we will not let them divert the attention of the public of this Province to the real issue.

Now, this is the only time that I am going to speak in this House on this matter. I have cleared it definitively. It is the only time I am going to speak in this House on this matter. I am going to deal with the issues.

The hon. members opposite can

speaking as much as they want. The hon. members opposite can try and create whatever diversions they want to cover the gross failure of the government to deal with the pressing problems of this Province, to try and divert attention away, but we will not be diverted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

We are going to deal with the issues and we are going to call them to account for the issues. Their personal attacks will not succeed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:

Stop your colleagues from making personal attacks, stop your own caucus.

MR. WELLS:

Nobody in this caucus will ever make personal -

MR. MORGAN:

Stop your own caucus colleagues from making personal attacks.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Nobody in this caucus will ever make personal attacks but we will deal with the issues and we will not shirk from dealing with the issues because they may affect a personality. We will not avoid it, but it will be dealt with in terms of the issues.

We take no pleasure, Mr. Speaker, no pleasure, in raising issues that adversely affect any hon. member of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

I can say to you now, I take no pleasure, and I do not believe any of my colleagues on this side of the House take any pleasure in raising issues that adversely affect any individual person on the other side of the House, but we will not shirk from our responsibility to the people of Newfoundland to deal with those issues because it might adversely affect some other member of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

That is the way we intend to deal with it. I give the public of this Province, Mr. Speaker, credit for being able to identify the difference between what the hon. members opposite would like to be the situation as far as the Liberal Party is concerned, and the reality. The people of this Province have already shown, most recently in Waterford - Kenmount, just what they think and just how they view the Liberal Party!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

I have no doubt that the general public of this Province will, in the next provincial election, see it in exactly the same way, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

I am happy to support the principle of this bill, Mr. Speaker. I think it is a fairly sound principle. I think it reflects a consensus after a fair amount of work and assessment. It

reflects a consensus.

MR. LONG:

(Inaudible).

MR. WELLS:

I hear the two members down at the end saying it is not a consensus. Now, there are only fifty other members in this House beside those two and if all fifty other members agree on something, it appears there is no consensus unless they dictate that it is okay or it is not okay. Now, I hardly call that any semblance of democracy. You have to be reasonable.

They have to remember, Mr. Speaker, that they cannot have their own way absolutely in everything. The fact that they want to be treated as though they were a major party in this House,

MR. LONG:

We are.

MR. WELLS:

- the fact is they are not. They are two individual members. They are not even going to be a major party in Manitoba in a few days.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, based on what I have read in the report **Tools for the Job**, what is contained in this bill is essentially sound, although I say again, I would have preferred the situation where there was one private member from each party, or a situation where there was no private member from either party, and then you could not complain of it, and have the Opposition House Leader sit on it instead. Either of those would have been acceptable, but the

government, for whatever reason, and I do not want to attribute motives to them, chose to recommend the course that they did. I advised the hon. the Premier that that was acceptable.

He suggested when he wrote that the private member from this side of the House be alternated between the NDP and the official Opposition. Now, notwithstanding that they only have two members, and we have fifteen, we agree. We will alternate. One year, they will have it, the next year, we would have it if we are the official opposition, -

MR. PATTERSON:

You will not be around in another year.

MR. WELLS:

- but I expect we will be in government. The hon. member is quite right, we will be on the government side then.

So, I suggested the simple answer is we are even prepared to flip a coin to decide who goes first, notwithstanding that we have fifteen, we do not insist that we should go first. We are prepared to flip a coin and decide and if they win the toss, okay, they appoint the member. Now, I think that that is being eminently reasonable and in the circumstances that this bill provides for, we are quite prepared to live with it, and we support the bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. SIMMS:

There must be some students in the gallery from his district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. PATTERSON:

(Inaudible) the Opposition is going to release his hostages over there. In Kuwait, they were released last week. He has sixteen of them over there now and they are begging to be released.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

I understood that we had a speaker from that side and I was going to speak for this side.

MR. SPEAKER:

We do have a speaker from this side and he was recognized as the hon. the Minister of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, this is a bit of a unique debate. I suppose for many people in the Province this may not seem a very important issues. But we are debating something that has to do with the House of Assembly itself. So, it is a unique thing. It involves us all. It is very important to us all.

We think, because it is important to the members of the House, it is important to the Province and I am

sure that it is so. It is the way we reflect democracy in our Province, the actions that go on in this House, and that is so to a large extent.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not have any hesitation therefore in entering into all aspects of how the members of this House and how the House itself conducts itself in the context of this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the issue that has come up here and has just been dealt with at length by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. That issue was a view put forward by a member of this House, quite properly in my view. He put forward the view that the Leader of the Opposition is receiving extra salary improperly. That was the hon. member's view, and I think he had a reason and a legitimate reason to put that forward. So, I want to deal with that question, that the Leader of the Opposition is receiving extra salary in an improper fashion.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when the Leader of the Opposition said he would address this issue, my understanding was that he was going to fully lay out all the facts about his extra salary. He did not deny that he was getting an extra salary. How could he? Everyone knows it. He is getting a substantial extra salary. My understanding, from his initial remarks, is he was going to lay out all the points about that and that it would be a satisfactory explanation.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I have to say from my view, anyway, I did not hear an adequate explanation. I think there are questions

outstanding, and I think there are three types of questions and I am going to deal with the three types of questions. They are, in my view, of ascending importance, I suppose, but nevertheless, each question in its own right is important and I am going to lay it out as I see it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the first question I have is that the Leader of the Opposition is receiving extra salary improperly. Why is he doing this and, thereby, damaging the Liberal Party? Now that is one of the three questions.

Now, what does one mean by damaging the Liberal Party? The Leader of the Opposition has been at pains several times to point out that he did not seek the leadership of the Liberal Party, and we have accepted that.

AN HON. MEMBER:
He went on sale.

DR. COLLINS:
He said he did not seek it. We are not claiming the contrary, we are just reporting what he is saying. He said, 'I did not seek the Liberal Party leadership.'

MR. DAWE:
No! Somebody put him in a bin on \$1.44 Day.

DR. COLLINS:
Now, Mr. Speaker, that raises the question why he did not seek the Liberal Party leadership? He is here. Why did he not seek it? Is he not a Liberal? He says he is a Liberal, and we have to believe him, and all the remarks he has made are in defence of the Liberal Party, so we can put that aside. It may be that he did not want to seek the leadership of the Liberal Party because he did not want to

get into public life, and that would be a legitimate point of view. As a matter of fact, after the previous leader was dispatched in a rather unseemly fashion by his colleagues, he was asked, I believe, by one of the media representatives, 'Are you going to seek it?' And he said 'I would not touch it with a ten foot barge pole.' I think that is a fairly accurate comment on what he said at the time. So, it may well be that he did not want to get into public life.

However, that is negated by the fact that he is in public life. So, what is the other reason why he said he did not seek it? It must be money. What other reason can there be? He is a Liberal. He wants to be in public life, because he is here. But he said he did not seek it. Is there any other reason why he did not seek it? I suggest it was money. Everything points to the fact that it was a money question. There was not enough money in the position of Leader of the Opposition to satisfy the hon. member. Now, that is fair enough. I have no problem with that. No one is forcing anyone to get into public life. No one is forcing anyone to accept a higher or lower or the same salary. It is quite a legitimate thing to do, but he did not answer that question. I think to clear this whole matter up, he should have answered that question. He should have said, am I in public life for the money or am I not? I think the evidence shows he is in public life for the money, because he said I would not be in it otherwise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Now that is the question.

Mr. Speaker, he then claims that the Liberal Party had every right to give him extra salary, and I say fair enough! But can we believe that the Liberal Party is giving the hon. the Leader of the Opposition the extra salary, a sizeable extra salary?

I have to state, Mr. Speaker, in my view that is not a factual disposition of the facts. We know the Liberal Party federally is not paying it, because they say they are not, and we know they are broke. So, it is quite illogical to think they would send a very sizeable extra salary to the leadership of a provincial party when they, themselves, are broke and they had almost a fracas at their last liberal convention, over the fact that they were so broke and they did not know where they were going to get money. So, it is ridiculous to think that the Federal Government is sending money down.

Now, how about the provincial Liberal Party?

Mr. Speaker, I have no intimate knowledge of the finances of the local Liberal Party, but I am quite willing to say that the average person in this Province does not believe, for one minute that the provincial Liberal Party has \$50,000 a year extra to spend - the Party itself. As a matter of fact, there is evidence of that, because when the Leader of the Opposition's extra salary first came to light, my understanding is that the Leader of the local provincial Liberal Party said, 'I do not know where the money is coming from.'

I mean, if he is the president and he does not know where it is coming from, how can you say that the local Liberal Party is doing it? So it is clear that the local Liberal Party is not supplying the money, and I think the Leader of the Opposition did not clarify that point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he may say, 'There are Liberals supplying this money to me and, therefore, that is equivalent to the Liberal Party.' Now, Mr. Speaker, no one is going to accept that. There is a term for that. The term is called laundering. You can launder money. Now, if hon. members do not know what laundering means, it means, for example, drug pushers in the United States may get money illegitimately and they want to use some of that money to pay off police officers. They do not do it directly, because it obviously would be easily detected, they send it elsewhere, perhaps to the Royal Bank in Toronto, or whatever, and the money comes back to the police officers who are being bribed. That is a very simple aspect of laundering. It is a nefarious and devious tactic which is well known; it is not very well thought of.

Now, for the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to say that there are private individuals giving the extra salary in the name of the Liberal Party is a laundering activity, and I say that that is damaging to the reputation of the Liberal Party.

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

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

Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, the standard of the minister's speech is so high that I do not believe he would want to spoil it by allowing the word 'nefarious' to stand. According to the rules, it is totally inappropriate. The speech has such a high standard that only the hon. minister could present it. I would hate to see the caliber of his speech lowered by using a word which is not allowed in this House, according to Beauchesne.

MR. PATTERSON:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:
How do you spell nefarious?

MR. DECKER:
N-e-f-a-r-i-o-u-s.

DR. COLLINS:
If I may, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member feels that that is unparliamentary, I will withdraw the term.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I have a concern for the Liberal Party and I would not like to see the Liberal Party tainted in this way. The Liberal Party is one of the great political institutions in this Province and I think it is a dastardly deed - I hope that is not unparliamentary. I am talking about a deed. I am not talking

about a person - to do damage to the Liberal Party. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if there are individuals giving the extra salary to the hon. Leader of the Opposition and it is done under the laundering activity of putting it through the Liberal Party, that is a damaging thing to the Liberal Party, and I think it is a most unfortunate, unfair, and shameful thing to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we do not want the Liberal Party to go back to the old days. The old days are very clear in our minds, although fortunately they are a bit in the past. I am talking of the Vardy days. I am talking of the Doyle days. I am talking of the Shaheen days. I am talking of the Liechtenstein days. I am talking of the Valdmanis days. Hopefully, all that is behind us. The Liberal Party has been tainted by that in the past; it has made a valiant effort, through several leaders in recent years, to get away from that type of taint.

Mr. Speaker, for that now to come back at this late stage in the redevelopment of the Liberal Party, I think is most unfortunate, is most unforgivable, and that is why I think that if private individuals, whoever they may be, are laundering money through the Liberal Party in order to give the hon. Leader of the Opposition extra salary it is a shameful blot on the Liberal Party; it is a slipping back to something that everyone hoped they had left behind them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at another question. This question relates not to the Liberal Party, this question relates to the constituents the hon. Leader of the Opposition represents. As hon. members know, we in this

House represent our constituents. We do it by a majority vote. We are not here to represent groups, small, large, private, or public, other than our constituents. It is improper to do so. Now, Mr. Speaker, we in this House, in the representation of our constituents, present our own views. We do not present other people's views. It may be thought that we have to present the views of our constituents, but as hon. members know, that is not the case, that is not British parliamentary practice and tradition.

Our constituents put us in here, having confidence in us, to present our views in the understanding that our views are consistent with the way they want their representation to be presented. So, we are in here presenting our own views and to do otherwise is to do damage to the British parliamentary system. Now, Mr. Speaker, how can anyone be in this House being in the pay partly, totally, I suppose, but certainly partly, of a private group over and above the amount of money that is coming to the person from the public purse.

As was stated yesterday, the public purse pays every member in this House approximately \$23,000 a year, or whatever it is, something of that order. Mr. Speaker, how can anyone claim to be presenting his views consistent with his own constituents' interests if he gets paid extra, at least double what the public purse will pay him, and this is coming from some private source? I have already laid out why I think it is logical, and the conclusion can only be drawn that this extra money is coming from a private group. It is certainly not coming from the public purse.

It is certainly not coming from the Liberal Party as it is normally understood. If it is coming from anywhere, it is coming from a group in the Liberal Party and that is a private group. How can anyone claim to be in this House presenting their own views when they are receiving twice the money that the public purse is giving the person to be in here, they are receiving twice that amount of money from a private group? Mr. Speaker, I think that is damaging to the constituents of the district that put that person in the House. It is inconsistent with the possibility that that person is representing his constituents as he should be.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take my full length of time on this because I think other members wish to express themselves on this very important issue, and I think it should be so. I think this final question is the most important of all, because this final question relates to the public of the whole Province. It does not relate to the Liberal Party, important though that is, it does not relate to the constituents of a district, very important though that is, it relates to the whole Province, the people of the whole Province, which is of extreme importance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as has been stated, and we do not have any quarrel with this, a member in this House may hold a job or may carry on an occupation quite separate from his position here and his duties here. There is no problem with that. For instance, it is quite all right for a member in this House to have another occupation, i.e., the leader of the a partisan party. If your are leader of a party that is an

occupation. It is not the same as being a member of this House. They are two different things. It is quite alright to do that. Traditionally, when a person is in that position, the party will supply that person with some funds. Traditionally, those funds are supposed to be and have been of the order of covering the out-of-pocket expenses of that person who is the leader.

For instance, the present Leader of the PC Party receives \$500 a month from party funds. It is not from anyone else. It is quite identified that it comes out of the party purse, \$500 a month, and this is of the order of dealing with every day expenses.

Now, as an aside, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition suggests that his \$50,000 a year is the same as that \$500 a month that the Leader of our Party is receiving. Mr. Speaker, the difference in amount is enough to establish it is different in kind. You cannot compare \$500 a month with \$50,000 a year and say it is the same type of money that is being given and it for the same purpose. It is ridiculous. The disparity is too great. But that is an aside. What is more important, Mr. Speaker, is where that money comes from. And this is where every member of this House is involved, where all the people in this Province are involved, because he, like all of us, is bound by The Conflict Of Interest Act.

I do have to go back and do point out that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition himself referred to that \$50,000 as salary. He referred to it as salary. He admits it as salary.

MR. MORGAN:

Not expenses.

DR. COLLINS:

Not expenses. What we are saying, the stipend that the Leader of our Party gets is for expenses. And I think the difference makes it clear in everyone's mind. Now I do not care whether people argue about it or not, the public is not to be fooled. The public knows that \$500 a month is quite legitimate for out-of-pocket expenses for the leader of a party. The public is not fooled in thinking \$50,000 a year is legitimate for out-of-pocket expenses for the leader of a party. So, let us not get into that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, all members in this House are covered by The Conflict of Interest Act, which means there is nothing wrong with carrying on activities in addition to your duties in the House. But, if there is any possibility - not probability, not fact - if there is any possibility that the income from that other occupation is likely to impact on your duties as a member, it must be laid out so it is visible where that income is coming from so that people can judge if there is a conflict there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is where I have, personally, the greatest problem with the Leader of the Opposition over this issue. I do not know where that money is coming from. No one in this Province knows for certain where that money is coming from.

MR. MORGAN:

He does.

DR. COLLINS:

He knows. There are other people who have some inside information

which leads them to think that they know, and they may well be correct. But it is not clearly laid out, and this is where the Leader of the Opposition should have laid it out clearly, it is not clearly laid out where that extra income is coming from, so the people of this Province are not in the position to know whether the Leader of the Opposition is in a position of conflict. He is leaving that area unclear, and he is therefore violating, in my view, an act of this Assembly to which he is bound particularly. Because that act relates particularly to the members of this House. He is leaving it unclear that he is not violating - I suggest he is violating - The Conflict of Interest Act.

Now, we know that there are no teeth in the act. You do not put people in jail over it. You do not take away their house over it; you do not do anything of that nature. It is required by, traditionally, ethical, honourable activity on the part of members that they will abide by the act and, indeed, they will lean over backwards to abide by the act. I am quite sure that many in this House, including many of my friends opposite, put things in their conflict of interest statement that they, themselves, know have no real relevance to conflict of interest. But they are going to put them in anyway to lean over backwards to show their allegiance and their abidance by this act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the Leader of the Opposition to take a different approach, to not lean over backwards, in my view not even abide by the act but indeed to try and get around, to flaunt

the act, I think that is a very unfortunate attitude of mind and it is a very unfortunate type of activity.

MR. MORGAN:

It reflects on the whole House of Assembly.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, I was interested in what he was saying about the conflict of interest and the obligations of members. I wonder if he would just elaborate on that point. I missed a couple of sentences there.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that the conflict of interest in letter and in spirit puts an obligation on all of us to indicate in writing, once a year, if we get income other than our M.H.A. income, and I suppose, ministerial income, but certainly our M.H.A. income, if we get other income and there is any possibility that the source of that income may put us into conflict, or might put the person into conflict with his duties in this House. He has an obligation to lay that out. And it is not an obligation that is put down with a threat of sanctions, it is an obligation that we are supposed to be acting ethically and honourably as members of this House.

MR. DAWE:

And it must be shown on the conflict of interest statement every year.

DR. COLLINS:

And it must be shown clearly, it is not a case of putting some phrase in there that will just deal with the wording of the act. This act is for us and we deal with it in word and in spirit. I would say the Leader of the Opposition, if there is any possibility that his extra salary is coming from a source that might put him in conflict with his duties, should put that down clearly and unequivocally and without any subterfuge whatever.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Leader of the Opposition has not done that, I think, brings dishonour on us all. It brings the Liberal Party Leadership back to a period that one had hoped it had forgotten and that it would never arise again, and, indeed, it puts his representation of his constituents into grave doubt and grave jeopardy. I, therefore, have to say that I am disappointed and I am disturbed that when the Leader of the Opposition had his opportunity to give all these answers, to lay this thing to rest, to give an explanation that would be logical, rational and acceptable, he did not do it. He did not do it, even though he said he would do it. I find that very disturbing and very unfortunate. And even though he said, 'I will not speak on this matter again,' I would hope he would change his mind and he would come into this House and say exactly where that money is coming from.

MR. DAWE:

Probably an audited statement would be in order.

DR. COLLINS:

Absolutely! My hon. friend has made an excellent suggestion. As a matter of fact, I think the suggestion was also made by the Premier. The Premier says, 'I have absolutely no problem in giving an audited statement of my \$500 a month that I use to discharge out-of-pocket expenses as Leader of the P.C. Party.'

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is that what the Premier said?

DR. COLLINS:

Absolutely! If they are identifiable. But, as I mentioned, that money comes from the P.C. purse.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Fund raising and tickets.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

It comes from the P.C. purse, and there are thousands of people contributing to that purse. There is no direct link from a small private group to the problem at all.

Now, what I am saying is that the Leader of the Opposition has to show in his audit whether or not there is a link between a small private group putting money forward that ends up in the Leader of the Opposition's party. An audit of that nature is very simple to carry out. So, if the Leader of the Opposition will come in himself and say where the money is coming from, and if he even goes so far as to say I will get an audit done on it, I think that would accentuate and underline the truth of what he says, and that is all we require him to do.

Now, having done that, it would be up to the Liberal Party itself, and there are many people on that side of the House as disturbed as I am, and I believe as disturbed as my colleagues are over this whole issue, to decide what they will do about it; it would be up to the constituents of the district of Windsor - Buchans whether they feel that their representation is untainted, or whether it is tainted by another group who is supplying large amounts of salary to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important issue and I would hope that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will reconsider the stance he has taken and do the right thing.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Before recognizing the hon. member for Menihek, I would like to welcome six students from the Avalon Community College Campus on Bell Island and their Instructor, Laurie Tulk.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have ever heard such pious comments from the government side in my entire life.

They are standing there admitting that the Leader of their party gets \$500 a month and the Leader of the Opposition gets \$50,000 a

year, and they say that that is not different in principle. There is absolutely no difference in principle whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, let us get down to the basics of what is wrong with this system. The Liberal Party in Newfoundland or of Canada or wherever wants to pay the Leader of the official Opposition \$50,000 a year, that is their problem. That is the Liberal Party's problem. It is a stupid thing to do, but it is up to them to do that.

Our problem is not so much the \$50,000, our problem is who is paying it? Is it four people in a back room? Is it 50,000 Liberals? We do not know the answer to that. But the government over there has the power to make that disclosed by establishing good elections legislation that would force the Liberal Party to disclose who their donors are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Not a bad idea.

MR. LONG:

Not a bad idea, he says.

MR. FENWICK:

It also has the power, Mr. Speaker, to put in legislation so that the donors to the P.C. Party should be divulged and, Mr. Speaker, we quite readily acknowledge that our donors should be listed as well.

MR. LONG:

Of course.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking

about a revolution here. As a matter of fact, I would like to read into the record a short little quote here: It says, "There is a direct link between the health of our political processes and the health of our economy. Moreover, we know from our own more recent experience that our existing political system is far from perfect, that it is vital that we always be ready and willing to reform our political system."

"My government believes that at present political reform must have two features: (1) A new elections act will be introduced so that members of this House will henceforth be chosen more freely by the provisions of partial public funding of an election expense and by requiring full disclosure of the amount and source of election contributions."

Mr. Speaker, this is not a speech made in the House of Commons or in Manitoba or in Ontario. This is a quote from the Throne Speech of July 12, 1979, in this very legislature.

MR. LONG:

In 1979.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

In 1979.

This government promised in 1979 elections legislation in which there would be full disclosure of the amount and source of election contributions which would have attacked the very problem that they are piously complaining the Liberals have been involved with.

It is not a problem of paying your

leaders. The problem is, is it an open political process, or is it not? I would argue to you, for example, that in 1979 when the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) contested the leadership of the P.C. Party and said that he would start opening the process, he said he would divulge how he spent the money to get his campaign financed. If I recall correctly, it was about \$60,000 or \$70,000.

Mr. Speaker, he never, ever divulged who it was that contributed his \$50,000 or \$60,000 back in 1979 who, in my opinion, have the biggest call on his ear in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I use the old example, if it is sauce for the goose, it has got to be sauce for the gander. They have got to bring in that kind of legislation.

The other question, Mr. Speaker, is I believe that that legislation is long overdue and it is something that we have got to bring in before the next election.

The reason I do is, I refer back to questions we asked in the House yesterday. We asked the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) if she was going to be bringing in for us a piece of legislation to control election spending and, of course, to make parties divulge their supporters and so on.

The reason, Mr. Speaker, that we brought that in was that we were appalled to find that in Windsor - Buchans in the last election the PC candidate had spent \$34,000 in

order to run their campaign. I have the records from the 1982 general election, the 1985 general election and every byelection between there, and the \$34,000 spent by the Tories is \$7,000 more than the next highest spending by any candidate anywhere in this Province in history, as far as I am concerned, because I assume that from 1982 onward, we have pretty well the highest numbers.

The PC Party spent \$34,000 trying to buy the Windsor - Buchans byelection.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Shameful.

MR. FENWICK:
Now, that is shameful. Of course, the only problem is that the Liberal Party spent \$41,000, another \$7,000 more and they were successful in winning the Windsor - Buchans byelection. Now, I do not know if they had spent a reasonable amount if they would have won, but I am saying to you what it clearly indicates is the desperate need for proper legislation into controlling these kind of things.

MR. LONG:
That was more than the federal limit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:
Four thousand, one hundred dollars in change, I forget the exact amount. The problem is that we do not have equivalent legislation to what the federal government has.

If you look at the federal government legislation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I think everybody else wants my time here. Could you give me a bit of order?

MR. LONG:

The hon. member is asking for order.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, in the federal legislation, if I wanted to find out if John Turner is receiving a supplement and if he is receiving donations from individuals, I have no problem whatsoever. Every year a report is published of every donor in the country who gives over \$100 to the federal Liberal Party, who gives over \$100 to the federal PC Party and who gives over \$100 to the federal New Democratic Party and every other registered party in Canada. That list is public information. I have a copy of it and I can even show members. It is a massive list indicating the supporters.

Mr. Speaker, why do we not have that here? Why do we not have a list of the contributors to the PC Party on a yearly basis and during their election campaigns? This is the government that has the power to bring that legislation in and has had that power since 1979, so why are they complaining about the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Wells) and the fact that he has a supplement?

They have it within their hands to divulge his supporters in two or three days, or whatever time it takes to pilot legislation like that through! You have already been told by the Leader of the official Opposition that he will support it. We will support it, so all you have to do is do it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, even if we were to accept the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), who by the way was the chairman of the last committee who tried to revise the Elections Legislation, brought in a very terrible bill, quite frankly, it was badly flawed in many ways, but one of the things it said was you have to control spending at \$25,000 per election campaign. I think that is a grossly exaggerated limit.

As a matter of fact, looking back at the 1982 and 1985 election, only one candidate in those two elections actually spent over \$25,000 and that was Randy Collins, the former member of this House for Port de Grave in 1982, only one. Yet in the byelection we have just had parties went above it by \$9,000 in one case and by \$16,000 in another case.

Again, I do not say that that would change the results if the spending were less, but clearly, if we are going to have any sense, if we are going to have any democracy or any equality in terms of competition in the presenting of ideas, we need controls on that. That is just as important as divulging who the Liberal supporters are, who our supporters are and who the PC supporters are.

Mr. Speaker, again, the pious - and I was going to use the word 'hypocrisy' but I know it is unparliamentary so I will not use it - but the piousness of a government that complains about the supporters when they have all the means in their own hands to divulge it is just beyond belief. It is just beyond belief, Mr.

Speaker.

Getting back to the bill and judging from the House Leader's comments and from the Leader of the official Opposition, I am going to take a considerable amount of credit that we have this piece of legislation here.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is half a loaf. It does not nearly go far enough in making the kind of reforms we think are necessary. We, Mr. Speaker, in committee stage, will be introducing two amendments to it. I will give copies of the amendments to both caucuses so they will have a chance to look at it. It does a number of things.

The first and most important thing it does is to say that we need Opposition representation on the Internal Economy Commission. Mr. Speaker, the government is trying to put that forward as a tremendous innovation. They are trying to suggest that this is a particular initiative that puts us well ahead of the entire universe.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at **The Canadian Legislatures**, a book that is put out by the Clerk's Office, I believe, in the Province of Ontario, it does a comparative study of all the legislatures in Canada on an annual basis. I quote, by the way, from page 21 of the 1986 report: "It is important to note that Newfoundland is now the only jurisdiction where Opposition is not represented on the legislative management body," the only jurisdiction and that includes every province, all the territories, and the federal government.

We are the only jurisdiction that did not have Opposition

representation. Mr. Speaker, it was that quote that I sent the Premier about a year ago or so, that prompted the exchange of letters that has led to this piece of legislation today.

MR. LONG:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

But, Mr. Speaker, it does not go far enough.

We have looked at the jurisdictions in which there are more than two recognized parties in the Legislature and, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, in all of those, all recognized caucuses have representation on the Boards of Internal Economy or the equivalent. That is the case in Ottawa. We are all recognized caucuses, and if there were three of them, there would be three, if there were two, there would be two, and if there were four, there would be four. All recognized caucuses have access to it because all caucuses have to be represented in order to make their point of view, to clearly point out the problems that they are having, and to take part in the way in which the legislature is operated.

Mr. Speaker, Ontario has one of the only mature three-party systems in Canada that has existed for a long period of time. In Ontario there is representation, in this case, and I should point this out to you, by the Liberal government, by the NDP official opposition and by the PC Party that is the third party in Ontario. I will say to the high and mighty that you shall not always be in that position, and you may have to look forward to different positions in the future.

But I say to you, as a matter of fairness and equity - a term that we often hear in this House - the Ontario legislature at Queen's Park has said that all recognized caucuses shall have representation on the Internal Economy Commission, and indeed they have.

MR. LONG:

Including the PCs, the third party.

MR. FENWICK:

The other jurisdiction that I point to, Mr. Speaker, is Nova Scotia. I think Nova Scotia is the most appropriate for our contrast. Nova Scotia, as you know, Mr. Speaker, was the jurisdiction that you most pointed to approximately a year ago when you indicated that the two of us here, because of other circumstances and because of the fact that there were two of us in legislature, represent an official caucus for the purposes of this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, in Nova Scotia there is representation by third parties on the Internal Economy Commission as well. So, what we have, Mr. Speaker, is this government just bringing its own House in order, up to the level that is the standard across the country.

By the way, in New Brunswick, they did have some other provisions, but, of course, as everybody knows in New Brunswick, they do not even have a second party, so I would be curious to see how they operated there, as well.

Mr. Speaker, to summarize, the first amendment that we will be introducing at committee stage, and I will provide copies of for the official Opposition and for the government, is that we will amend the provisions of this particular bill to ensure that

where there are additional caucuses represented in this Legislature, and when there are, that those caucuses will also receive representation on the Internal Economy Commission as well. By way of giving of it, the wording is, and I just provide this as advance information because when the Committee stage occurs, I wish to make sure that everybody does know it: "That Section 4 be added to the bill after Section 3 to read, 'All minutes of the Internal' - Sorry! That is the wrong one.

MR. LONG:

That is the second amendment.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the notice is that we will be asking for an amendment to it to provide that when there are additional caucuses that they will receive representation on it. I do not have the exact wording of it here, but you can take it as notice.

Mr. Speaker, the second amendment that we will be proposing to it, and the second area that we felt that should have been advanced by the Government House Leader, is in the whole question of reporting to the Legislature.

Personally I have gone through a unique experience in the sense that when I was elected back in the Fall of 1984, I was not a member of a caucus that had individuals there who could tell me what the rules of the game were, what the expense regulations and so on are. I got some of them from the Liberals. I got some from the Speaker at the time, who sat down with me and explained what was going on.

I have asked on various occasions

in letters to the present Speaker that I be given a copy of the minutes of the Internal Economy Commission that outline what the expense regulations are and what is permissible. At no time have I received one, the argument being, as I recall correctly, that this is confidential information and, therefore, it is not accessible.

Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough anymore. My belief is that by not having clear-cut regulations that are publicly available to all members of the House and all members of the public, we run the risk of the same kinds of problems that are occurring in Nova Scotia. As all members know, there are now two Nova Scotia members who have been evicted from their House as a result of contraventions of the regulations, essentially, of the Internal Economy Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you one question: How can we possibly know what these regulations are and abide by them if we do not have copies of them? This is an incomprehensible concept on my part. If you do not tell me what the regulations are, how can you abide by them?

Mr. Speaker, if inadvertently, by not abiding by them, we end up later on legally in trouble, as those two members in the Nova Scotia Legislature are, one of which has to spend a year in jail as a result, obviously, of fraud, but inadvertently you could break them as well, I suggest to you that not having the regulations as a matter of public record is totally unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the second amendment we will be proposing is that all the minutes of the Internal

Economy Commission be tabled in the House of Assembly as soon as the House of Assembly opens and then on a frequent basis thereafter, so that everybody knows, not only all the members of the House but all the members of the public.

MR. LONG:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
We think that that is absolutely critical.

MR. LONG:
Common sense.

MR. SIMMS:
Why do you think it is called the 'internal' commission?

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader says, "Why do I think it is called the Internal Economy Commission?" I should also tell him that if he had spent the time to do the research on this piece of legislation he should have and had gone and looked at the Canadian Legislatures report, again, the same one that I was referring to, he would find that the rule is that these particular minutes or these rules are a matter of public record in virtually all jurisdictions.

MR. SIMMS:
Not true.

MR. FENWICK:
Yes, it is true.

MR. SIMMS:
List the jurisdictions.

MR. FENWICK:
I will give it to you one by one. The question is being asked in the comparative, reporting

relationship, House of Commons, Section (b) - this is on page 121 or so.

MR. LONG:
Got his homework done again. Always has his homework done.

MR. FENWICK:
"Proceedings for a preceding session are tabled in the House within ten days of the start of each session. Decisions related to Committee budgets are tabled immediately. (D), the minutes of meeting become public when tabled in the House."

MR. SIMMS:
Does P.E.I. publish them?

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, could I have a bit of protection here? I will give the Government House Leader all the information he requires and I will do it in due time.

"The House of Commons does report the minutes. Newfoundland, not published nor available to public." Those are the notes they have on it."

Nova Scotia, at the time of this report did not report to the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, their minutes are a matter of public record.

MR. LONG:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
They have changed their procedures. They have mended their ways.

MR. SIMMS:
Are they tabled in the House?

MR. LONG:
Common sense.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
"Ontario, published periodically, available to public within forty-eight hours of meeting."

MR. SIMMS:
Periodically, yes.

MR. FENWICK:
Okay, whatever. "Manitoba, becomes public when tabled in the House. Board of Internal Economy reports to House, must report annually." So Manitoba does. "Alberta, published and available to the public."

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting to you that all the jurisdictions do, because they do not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:
What I am saying to you -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
- is that now we are getting to the point where a majority of legislatures in Canada do report and -

MR. SIMMS:
(Inaudible) all these provinces. Tell us about them.

MR. FENWICK:
"Quebec, all decisions of the Board of Internal Economy are tabled in the House, not published but is available to public after tabling it." So Quebec, as well.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying to you is there are a growing number of jurisdictions that feel that it

is absolutely critical to have this information on the public record.

We will be moving an amendment to it and I will read it to you.

MR. SIMMS:

You were wrong when you said firstly that all -

MR. LONG:

Case closed. Case closed. Point proven.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Admit you were wrong.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, the amendment we will propose on that I will give the wording of and I will distribute some copies as well. Obviously it is not appropriate to introduce it at this time. It will be in Committee stage. It really does not violate the intention of the bill because we agree with the overall thrust of the bill, we just think it is a half thrust. It has not gone far enough to give us the kind of reforms that should have occurred.

This one reads: "All minutes of the Internal Economy Commission shall be a matter of public record and those minutes which are current and effect shall be tabled by a member of the Internal Economy Commission designated for that task no later than two weeks after a new session of the House of Assembly convenes." This will be the motion on public disclosure of the minutes.

The first one, which I now find a copy of will add after the words in this bill here "who sits in

Opposition of the Government." Remove the period and insert the words "And when there are two Opposition caucuses in the House of Assembly, that the representation on the Commission be from the caucus other than the Official Opposition." So what we are saying in that, Mr. Speaker, is that there will be access to this particular Committee.

This access, by the way, is absolutely critical given the circumstances that none of this material is published and none of this is the matter of the public record. So the question could be asked by us, how do we know what the regulations are? The answer is, we do not. We have no regulations to look at.

Mr. Speaker, the whole question of what is being addressed in this piece of legislation is part of a much greater whole. It has been pointed out in some of the debate that has gone back and forth from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells) to the government benches, and it deals with the whole question of how we regulate the politics of this Province. That is an important question.

MR. LONG:

It is very important.

MR. FENWICK:

Looking at the expenses revealed by the Windsor - Buchans by-election, looking at complaints that have been about the Official Opposition's (Mr. Wells) salary and his salary supplement, the fact that the Premier himself does have a salary supplement from the PC Party, looking at the fact that we know nothing about where the money is that is generated to run of the election campaigns in this Province, looking at all of that

indicates to me that we have not been forthcoming with how we operate our business.

We do not produce annual statements like businesses do and we do not produce statements and reports to conventions like trade unions do. We generally are completely silent about how our operations go. Mr. Speaker, that, I think, tends to discredit this whole House and the whole political system in this Province.

We have an obligation to tell people where the money comes from, because the old expression, 'He who pays the piper calls the tune,' is never more appropriate than in politics. I want to know who the people were who donated the \$70,000 to the Premier's campaign to become Premier back in 1979. I think the legislation should cover that, although there is disagreement on that particular point.

I think that is important because if you are starting out in politics as the premier of a province or as a leader of the party, the people who support you at the very beginning are very dear to you. It is only human nature that they would be. I think in the future we should know who those dear people are, because we should know if they get favoritism or improved pieces of legislation or discretionary government grants or contracts as a result of that particular relationship which is established at that time.

I am not suggesting our Premier has done that. I would be very careful about that. But what I am saying to you is not knowing who the donors are means that we do

not know when that particular situation is.

MR. SIMMS:

Is this legislation in effect now in Manitoba with the NDPs?

MR. FENWICK:

Yes it is. Legislation in the country on a federal level, as a result of the New Democratic Party's interventions back in the early 1970s has brought forward the political process on a federal level to such a point that the federal disclosure legislation is probably the best in the world.

I have, for example, Mr. Speaker, a list of all the contributors -

MR. SIMMS:

You did not answer my question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

I am not going to answer the question. I want to make my point.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is this: I have in my files a list of every single individual who contributed to the Federal P.C. Party in 1986, every single person who contributed to the Federal Liberal Party, and every person who contributed to the Federal New Democratic Party. If I want to know if there is influence, I can look at that list. If Craig Dobbin is on one list, and I am not saying he is, by the way, because I cannot recall at this point, if he is a major contributor to one party and then he gets preferential treatment, or it looks like preferential treatment, we can look at that and see if there is a connection. But we do not have that here. We do not have any idea who has donated

to the P.C. Party or the Liberal Party or to us, although there are guesses that can be made. But that is unfair, because if the donation did not occur and there is no relationship, you are slandering somebody because you are trying to guess about it.

I think that it is long overdue that we have the kind of disclosure legislation necessary to clean up the entire political process.

So I am extremely pleased that in the particular debate on the Internal Economy Commission that it has been widened to a whole question of ethics.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to one point that the Leader of the official Opposition made, and that was that he thought it was - he never said it was hypocritical but I think he assumed it was - hypocritical for me to complain about his \$50,000 when I was, at the same time, saying publicly that I was having financial difficulties by trying to maintain the situation that I have, which is entirely true. I had financial difficulties. I still have them. I am hoping they will disappear in the future with some changes, but the fact is they are there.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any particularly good parallel between the two. I do not have a \$50,000 supplement, nor, Mr. Speaker, if I was offered one would I accept it from an outside source because I do not think that is acceptable. But that is my own personal concept of the morality of it. My complaint about the official Leader of the Opposition has never been that the Liberal Party does not have the power or

the legitimate right to do that. It is the master of its own home. It can spend its money where it likes. If it wants to burn it in a bonfire in front of us in the middle of the floor of this House, other than burning the carpet, I guess there is not much wrong with that. The fact is, I complained that we did not know what the source was.

At the same time what I said to the individuals was that in Nova Scotia, where a third party is recognized in the Legislature, there is support for the activities of the leader of the third party by virtue of that position. That support is 50 per cent of the salary of the Leader of the Opposition. I have argued with the Internal Economy Commission, which I have obviously not been successful with, that if that is appropriate for Nova Scotia, and it is also the rule in Ontario and in the House of Commons, if it is appropriate for those three jurisdictions, it should be appropriate here. On that basis I thought that was a legitimate request to make. It has been turned down continuously, and maybe that is because the Board of Internal Economies has not had Opposition representation. But I do not believe that it is a parallel situation, because it is not a situation that I think compares to the kind of support that comes from individuals who essentially are not known.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to you that I welcome this particular piece of legislation. I think that it is, as I said, half a loaf. It has gotten us somewhat towards improving the situation, and I hope that the Internal Economy Commission will look much

more realistically at the plight of P.C. backbenchers, although they are an endangered species, at the plight of Liberal backbenchers who are, I believe, having a difficult time as well, because they have told me the same thing, and at my colleague from St. John's East and myself, who have, I think, not really had much influence on that Board in the past, mainly because we have not had that kind of representation.

Even if it ends up as two Liberals, it is better than what we had before. I would argue with you that the only way we will find out what is going on is to put one of us on, and that is the reason that I maintained that position all the way through the negotiations. But the fact is, if it is two Liberals, it certainly is better than what we had before.

On that basis we hope that we will see additional benefits for the members, which will make it easier for them to do their job and make the compensation better to do their job, and, therefore, we will end up with a legislature that can better serve the people of this Province, which is what we are all after. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HEARN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Having listened to the final remarks of the Leader of the NDP when he says the only way that we will find out, and the public will find out, what goes on on the Internal Economy Commission, or, I

presume, any committee, is if they are represented, looking across at them I was reminded of Robin Hood and Little Gene.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister of Education and any other hon. members when they address this Party and they refer to us as the NDP Party. The Minister of Education is one who should know that that is a tautology. We are the New Democratic Party, or we are the NDP. We are not the NDP Party, and I would hope that the Minister of Education can set a good example for all other hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I apologize to the gentlemen and from on I will refer to them as the New Democratic Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
The Socialists. The Socialists.

MR. HEARN:
The Now Disappearing Party. I have heard other terminologies, too, but, Mr. Speaker, we have more important things to deal with.

When I picked up the piece of legislation and went over it, a

couple of sections in particular stuck in my mind.

Section (2). The Commission shall act on all matters of financial administrative policy affecting the House of Assembly, its offices and its staff.

I thought back to when I was first elected and one of the first days I was in the House of Assembly I had the pleasure of riding the elevator down with the then Leader of the Opposition, thrice removed I believe, a very hon. gentleman who introduced himself and he said, "You know, in the House of Assembly we will probably be at each other's throats, but when we walk out through the doors, it is you and me against the world."

These words have always stuck with me, because when we zero in on the Eternal Economy Commission, in particular, Internal Economy Commission - well, it is eternal also - we realize that it affects us as members and our rights and privileges, and perhaps how well we can really operate not only in the House of Assembly but in our districts and in the Province.

When I was first induced into running for a seat, I was told of all the great benefits that members had. I am sure the newly elected member for Waterford - Kenmount undoubtedly has learned some harsh lessons the last few months.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) lesson.

MR. HEARN:
Well, I do not think it matters. I recall my first couple of years in a little two-by-four office on the fifth floor - it was certainly no better than anything anybody

else had, and perhaps no worse - sharing it with a colleague and trying to entertain delegations, and so on, and it was just impossible, entirely impossible to do so on the salary we received, and still receive, because it has not changed that much.

A person operating as a private member spends much of his time when the House is not in session out in his constituency, doing everything that the constituents require. In rural areas, in particular, you are the person who has to deal with many of the problems, whether they be social or in relation to resource development, or whatever, and the costs are borne by the member. You hear people saying, Oh, yes, you get an expense allowance. But I know for a fact that before the year was half up the expense allowance would be used up on your second car, because you had destroyed one with the dirt roads, and the expenses and everything else.

So, representing a constituency in Newfoundland, if you are in it for the money, certainly wakes you up once you get into the job. Consequently, I suppose, it is no surprise that people look to other ways to better themselves. As I listened to the New Democratic Party Leader talk about the amount of money we and the Liberal party spent on the elections, I wondered if, in the meagre amount they purport to have spent, they factored in the contribution of the union personnel who went door to door, drove around their candidates, and used their cars. I am not sure whether these contributions have been counted. Because, certainly, it is a contribution. Paid employees, etc. and all of that he assures me

will be factored in, and I would like to see the details, because I would think that in certain areas the amount spent on the election campaign would be a lot more than it is now.

I spent, perhaps, on the last campaign more than quite a few members. But looking at a district such as mine, we have thirty-seven polls, I believe. And in many parts of rural Newfoundland there is a tradition that always has been there, and is still there, where you pay the agents, you pay the drivers, even though many of them offered to volunteer. There are always some people who have always been agents and drivers. It is a standard thing. And we carry on that tradition. I am sure members Opposite find the same thing. If you have thirty-seven polls and a couple of drivers, that drives up your bill.

In large rural areas, the only way, perhaps, to communicate and get and see all your people or your constituents during the campaign is to call a public meeting. If you rent a public building, you must pay for it. And if you look at my campaign, for instance, and I am sure it is similar to many others on both sides of the House, the amount of money spent is strictly in relation to the exact election costs that you cannot get away from. You will not find anything there covering the cost of booze or any other inducements to the electorate. So, consequently -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) another one.

MR. HEARN:

You will not. I have never used it, and will not, and the expenses

will be strictly for agents, drivers, the hire of hotel and publicity, and not too much of that, I do not need it.

However, in an election campaign, of course, unless you live in a very rich area, a lot of it comes out of your own pocket and that cuts into the meager salary that you get. This brings us to the second recommendation, number 2 on the following page, page 14, Section 13, which talks about, after a general election an independent commission be put in place to look at the salaries and so on for members. I think that is something that is long, long overdue. We get criticized by the public, the unknowing section of the public who are really unaware, perhaps, of what we do get paid. Because for any member here to go out and tell somebody you are getting \$23,000 or \$24,000 a year less taxes, they would laugh at you. It is hard to believe. And I would not blame them for laughing, because I did not believe it either. But it is factual. You know, they talk about your perks. The only perks you get is your district allowance which, as I say, in most cases does not cover your district expenses, and that is it. Access to the telephone and so on, that is just a service your constituents. So, really what you are living on is the \$14,000, approximately, which you take home, and in some cases you have to cut into that.

So, serving Newfoundland as a member of the House of Assembly, is not any great shakes. Consequently, as I say, it is hard to blame people when they look to other areas to find some remuneration.

In certain parts of the Province, because of the district work load, it is impossible to do unless you have a business that you do not have to pay any attention to, or you have a big retirement fund or something. Then you have no other choice, you either serve your constituents or you leave the job and go on into private business. Some of our own members have made that choice, and perhaps there are others. We look at our future and our families and so on and ask ourselves, maybe, why we are in it. If we want to benefit ourselves and those around us, certainly it is not the place to be.

That brings us to the point of salaries. We have had the major portion of the debate on this bill taken up in relation to the salary supplements paid to the Leader of the Opposition and to our own leader, the Premier. There is a little bit of a difference. As to the Premier, it has always been known that he receives a supplement from the party. The coffers of our party, I suppose we would always like to have them in better shape, but they have never been empty. There have always been a few dollars around. It has been made quite clear that the leader receives a supplement for his work as leader of the party of \$500 a month, which is a significant amount to help out to defray party expenses, etc. I do not think it is fair to compare the supplement to the salary of the Premier to that received by the Leader of the Opposition. We are not comparing apples and apples. If we are, we are comparing the little crab apple to the big MacIntosh apple.

It goes a lot further than that, and gentlemen opposite know this

because some of them have expressed concern themselves. Now, the problem is that we have here a salary that is being paid by, as the leader says, the Liberal Party.

MR. LUSH:
(Inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:
That was a good quip from the very silent, quiet, sad-looking member for Bonavista North. I can take a joke. Like the old saying, 'He got me. I have been had.' Now, I have been had, but I cannot be bought.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:
The Leader of the Opposition receives \$50,000 a year as a supplement. From whom? He says from the Liberal Party and we accept that in part. **The Toronto Sun** certainly had all kinds of different interpretations put upon where he receives the salary from. The President of his own party says they do not pay it, they do not have any money. There are too many inconsistencies. Now, the hon. gentleman today tried to clarify these points. I hope for his own sake that he does, and I hope for the sake of politics generally in the Province that he makes it so clear that there is absolutely no dispute. Because the biggest issue outside the House of Assembly, forget about Sprung, or Come By Chance, or anything else, which are issues which are now becoming non-issues, the biggest issue that will be brought up regardless of party affiliation is, What do you think

of the salary that the Leader of the Liberal Party is getting? The second question is, who do you think is paying it? That is an extremely important question for the sake of clean-cut, clear politics in the Province.

We have \$50,000 which is not coming from the party according to the President, but is coming from the party according to the leader. Now, somewhere along the line they have their lines crossed. If it is coming from the party, is it coming directly from the general coffers? I have no argument at all with the \$50,000, absolutely none. As I mentioned earlier, I have been through it and I know the sacrifice that a member has to make to himself and to his family to run here, to offer himself as a candidate. The Leader today mentioned that it is more than an eight hour job. I have absolutely no doubt it is. To me it is a sixteen or eighteen hour job, and then there are many things that are still have left undone.

I represent the district represented by the now member for Twillingate, when he was Minister of Fisheries, and he knows what the district is like, how big and how rural it is. The first year I was in I took a time frame of several months, I listed the hours I spent on the road attending meetings and getting back home late, and I then checked my salary. I was getting the great pay of \$2.19 an hour. I would think there are other people in this House whose salary on an hourly basis would be very close to that; \$2.19 an hour you pay someone to represent you. Now, we are supposed, in the view of the general public out there, to be the well-off, highfalutin people.

When you are bringing home, as I said earlier, \$12,000 or \$14,000 a year to feed a family of three or four, perhaps, or maybe even more, you are not very highfalutin. Consequently, I have no argument with the supplement received by the hon. gentleman. The concern I have, however, is, as he is aspiring to become Premier and, of course, a lot of members over there have aspired to become Premier and perhaps we have people over here aspiring to become Premier, I not being one of them, but if it ever happened that such an hon. gentleman, regardless of side, was automatically elected as Premier of this Province and was receiving or had been receiving a supplement from questionable areas, and I say questionable because it certainly has not been clarified to this point, and I hope it will, there is one thing that will always concern me. If that money came from supporters of the Liberal Party, part of the general public, a small percentage out there, if it had been raised by means of a door-to-door collection, a bottle drive, raffling a hen, it would not matter to me. But the problem is the money is not coming from any of these sources, the money is coming, as has been rumoured and many people say they can prove the fact, from a handful of magnates who are channelling their money through the Liberal Party so that they can get tax credits, which means we are all contributing, as I said yesterday.

And I said 'magnates' n-a-t-. Maybe magnets might be a better word, because a magnet takes hold of you. And if somebody is paying your salary, if somebody is paying a large amount of money to put you in power, surely it is not that nobody else could take the job, or

that they just wanted to contribute to one, they had a personal concern in that. If I am going to put a lot of money behind one person, consequently I would feel that I own that person, that that person owes me something.

The gentleman went half way. I presume he is going to go all the way, or he will clear that what he said this morning is factual, aboveboard and completely true. Then the issue should be dead. You should never hear of it again. But until he completely comes clean and lays the facts on the table, the major concern will be there that the hon. gentleman is in the pockets of a few, and that for the Province of Newfoundland, or any province, could be detrimental. I am sure that nobody on this side or that side would want to see the Leader of the Province controlled by a few people, perhaps for their own benefit down the road. That is extremely dangerous.

I presume, for the sake of the House of Assembly and for all the members in it, and for the Province, that this issue will be clarified completely and unequivocally, so that when you go out there people will say to you, you know, the hon. gentleman is getting a \$50,000 salary. He deserves it. He needs it. I do not argue with that.

MR. FENWICK:
(Inaudible) my concern.

MR. HEARN:
We all could use it, and we still would not be rolling in riches.

I respect what he said that he had to cut back on his life style. He left a lucrative business and consequently divorced himself from

a number of avenues where he could enrich himself and his family, to do what? To offer himself for public life. Sometimes, perhaps, we ask why? For the ridicule and so on that comes with it. Anybody who offers himself for public life in this Province for what is in it financially or any other way, is showing that he or she is willing to contribute some of his or her efforts for the betterment of the Province. You can have no other reason.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:
I have the deepest admiration for anybody who is involved in politics. It would be detrimental to the people who are involved in such a field to feel that somebody can be manipulated. But, as I say, hopefully before this debate on this bill ends we will all be able to stand up and say to the hon. gentleman, 'Yes, we know now. We accept your explanation without any problem and, consequently, in our discussions outside and we can say, Do not let me hear anything else about this. We know where that money is coming from. He is not being bought, he is receiving a clean-cut supplement which he deserves and which he needs, and he can continue to do his work as Leader of the Opposition without having to worry about being in somebody's pocket.

In relation to the bill itself, we support it. It is long overdue, because a number of members have gone through this House of Assembly with very, very little remuneration. We talked yesterday, when we had the people in from the Canadian Legion, about paying the Supreme Sacrifice. I

do not know but we all should get decorated, too, for paying the supreme sacrifice. I hope and I think, in fact, the majority of the people out there do appreciate the work the members do in the House of Assembly. I think they do. But, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the only time anybody gets any publicity, regardless of who he or she is or of what political stripe, it is usually on the negative side of things.

Consequently I, as I say, support the bill and will look forward to discussing it later, especially in relation to the amendments that will be put forward by the New Democratic Party.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage has about one minute.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, if it suits the purpose of all concerned, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:
The debate is adjourned by the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, just before we move the motion to adjourn, I inform hon. members now of the Estimates schedule for next week as determined by the Committees themselves, to the best of my knowledge.

Monday, of course, the House will not be sitting because Monday is a

holiday, St. George's Day. Tuesday morning, the Resource Estimates Committee will continue dealing with the estimates of the Department of Fisheries. Tuesday night, at seven thirty, the Government Services Committee will deal with the estimates of the Department of Consumer Affairs and Communications. Wednesday evening - of course there is no meeting Wednesday morning, I keep reminding members - the Social Services Estimates Committee will deal with the estimates of the Department of Justice. Thursday morning, at nine-thirty, the Government Services Committee will deal with the estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs. Thursday night the Resource Estimates Committee will deal with the estimates of the Department of Development and Tourism, maybe. These are all subject to the committees themselves, I suppose, wanting to carry on with one of the aforementioned. Everybody understands that, so I do not need to go into a lot of detail.

For the information of hon. members with respect to the business of the House next week - the Opposition House Leader might wish to know this. He will be asking me this now Monday or Tuesday. This is the business of the House for next week:

Again, Monday will be a holiday. Tuesday we will be back into the budget debate. Wednesday, of course, we are looking forward to a great debate on the Private Members' motion brought forth by the member for Naskaupi, I believe it is, on Freedom of Information. I am looking forward to that one. Thursday we will be continuing with legislation, and Friday is not quite determined yet. It could be Meech Lake. It

could be an election. It could be Hibernia. It could be anything. It could be the railway, all those things mentioned in **The Evening Telegram** yesterday evening.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at three of the clock and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOURTH SESSION, FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND:

Hon. P.J.McNicholas.....Speaker
 Mr. Glenn Greening.....Deputy Speaker
 Chairman of Committees
 Mr. Kevin Parsons.....Deputy Chairman of Committees

MEMBERS

NAME	AFFILIATION	DISTRICT
Mr. K.Alyward.....	Lib.....	Stephenville
Mr. R.Alyward.....	PC.....	Kilbride
Mr. Baird.....	PC.....	Humber West
Mr. Baker.....	Lib.....	Gander
Mr. Barrett.....	PC.....	St. John's West
Mr. Barry.....	Lib.....	Mount Scio-Bell Island
Mr. Blanchard.....	PC.....	Bay of Islands
Mr. Brett.....	PC.....	Trinity North
Mr. Butt.....	PC.....	Conception Bay South
Mr. Callan.....	Lib.....	Bellevue
Mr. J. Carter.....	PC.....	St. John's North
Mr. W. Carter.....	Lib.....	Twillingate
Dr. Collins.....	PC.....	St. John's South
Mr. Dawe.....	PC.....	St. George's
Mr. Decker.....	Lib.....	Strait of Belle Isle
Mr. Dinn.....	PC.....	Pleasantville
Mr. Doyle.....	PC.....	Harbour Main
Mr. Efford.....	Lib.....	Port de Grave
Mr. Fenwick.....	NDP.....	Menihek
Mr. Furey.....	Lib.....	St. Barbe
Mr. Gilbert.....	Lib.....	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Mr. Greening.....	PC.....	Terra Nova
Mr. Gullage.....	Lib.....	Waterford-Kenmount
Mr. Hearn.....	PC.....	St. Mary's-The Capes
Mr. Hiscock.....	Lib.....	Eagle River
Mr. Hodder.....	PC.....	Port au Port
Mr. Kelland.....	Lib.....	Nascopie
Mr. Long.....	NDP.....	St. John's East
Mr. Lush.....	Lib.....	Bonavista North
Mr. Matthews.....	PC.....	Grand Bank
Dr. McNicholas.....	PC.....	St. John's Centre
Mr. Mitchell.....	PC.....	LaPoile
Mr. Morgan.....	PC.....	Bonavista South
Mr. Parsons.....	PC.....	St. John's East Extern
Mr. Patterson.....	PC.....	Placentia
Mr. Peach.....	PC.....	Carbonear

[CONTINUED]

[CONTINUED]

Premier Peckford.....	PC.....	Green Bay
Mr. Power.....	PC.....	Ferryland
Mr. Reid.....	PC.....	Trinity-Bay de Verde
Mr. Rideout.....	PC.....	Baie Verte-White Bay
Mr. Russell.....	PC.....	Lewisporte
Hon. Mr. Simmons.....	Lib.....	Fortune-Hermitage
Mr. Simms.....	PC.....	Grand Falls
Mr. Tobin.....	PC.....	Burin-Placentia West
Mr. Tulk.....	Lib.....	Fogo
Dr. Twomey.....	PC.....	Exploits
Ms. Verge.....	PC.....	Humber East
Mr. Warren.....	PC.....	Torngat Mountains
Mr. Wells.....	Lib.....	Windsor-Buchans
Mr. Windsor.....	PC.....	Mount Pearl
Mr. Woodford.....	PC.....	Humber Valley
Mr. Young.....	PC.....	Harbour Grace

THE MINISTRY:

Premier A. Brian Peckford.....	Energy
Mr. R. Alyward.....	Forest Resources
Mr. Barrett.....	Development and Tourism
Mr. Blanchard.....	Labour
Mr. Brett.....	Municipal Affairs
Mr. Butt.....	Culture, Recreation and Youth
Dr. Collins.....	Health and Deputy Premier
Mr. Dawe.....	Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Dinn.....	Mines
Mr. Doyle.....	Transportation
Mr. Matthews.....	Career Development and Advanced Studies
Mr. Peach.....	Minister Responsible for Housing
Mr. Power.....	Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
Mr. Rideout.....	Fisheries
Mr. Russell.....	Environment and Lands
Mr. Simms.....	President of the Executive Council
	President of Treasury Board
	Government House Leader
Mr. Tobin.....	Social Services
Dr. Twomey.....	Public Works and Services
Ms. Verge.....	Justice
Mr. Warren....	Minister Responsible for Northern Development
Mr. Windsor.....	Finance
	Minister Responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro
Mr. Young.....	Consumer Affairs and Communications

CONTENTS

Friday, 22 April, 1988.

Statements by Ministers

<u>Transportation, highway upgrading and paving:</u>	
Mr. Doyle.....	1106
Mr. Gilbert.....	1108
Mr. Fenwick.....	1109

Oral Questions

Gasoline Leak:

Paper loss or real. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Russell.....	1110
Course of action if failure to report was deliberate. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Russell.....	1110
Contractor being called in before Environment could minimize chances of cause being discovered. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Russell.....	1111

Municipal Assessments:

Cause of complaints from Conception Bay South. Mr. Lush, Dr. Collins.....	1112
Pressure on assessors might be the cause of the problem. Mr. Lush, Dr. Collins.....	1113
Cost of appeals beyond means of municipalities. Mr. Lush, Dr. Collins.....	1114

Housing:

Guidelines to prevent evictions in Winter. Mr. Long, Mr. Peach.....	1115
Confirmation sought of such guidelines. Mr. Long, Mr. Peach.....	1116
Requests legislation to stop Winter evictions. Mr. Long, Mr. Peach.....	1116

Easteel:

Government liability in Easteel bankruptcy.
Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Barrett.....1117
Security for government guarantees.
Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Barrett.....1117
Asks government to have easteel assets sold
as a unit to facilitate resumption of
operations by a new owner. Mr. K. Aylward,
Mr. Barrett.....1118

Come By Chance Refinery:

Sale of refinery products to benefit
consumers. Mr. Gullage, Mr. Young.....1119
Products general availability.
Mr. Gullage, Mr. Young.....1119

**Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees**

Annual Report of the Public Service Commission.
Dr. Twomey.....1120
Annual Report of the Medical Care Commission.
Dr. Collinss.....1120

Petitions

Transportation, road conditions:

Mr. Lush.....1120
Mr. Decker.....1122
Mr. Doyle.....1124

Orders of the Day

Order No. 4, Second Reading, Bill No. 16:

Mr. Wells, continues debate.....1125
Dr. Collins.....1138
Mr. Fenwick.....1146
Mr. Hearn.....1157
Mr. Simmons, concludes debate.....1163
Adjournment Motion.....1164