



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 25

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
***(Hansard)***

***Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas***

Thursday

28 April 1988

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

### Statements by Ministers

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight for this hon. House and for public attention that government has proclaimed today, April 28, 1988 as a Day of Mourning in recognition of workers killed, injured or disabled in the workplace.

For the past two years, the Canadian Labour Congress has observed a Day of Mourning throughout Canada to draw attention to the sacrifice which many of our workers have to pay in earning a living for themselves and their families. As Minister with responsibility for occupational health and safety, I am pleased to support that effort to help ensure that effective measures are put in place to alleviate such suffering.

We are very conscious that effective occupational health and safety standards should be in place not only to prevent such tragic loss of life and disability, but also to ensure that fair and equitable compensation programmes exist to protect workers and their families where such tragedies do occur.

Our occupational health and safety legislation contains three

important provisions designed to assist workers in preventing injury and disease on the job:

First, the right of workers to refuse to work in unsafe places; second, the right to be informed of existing or potential job hazards; and thirdly, the right to participate on joint workplace health and safety committees.

These provisions provide a significant deterrent to unsafe and unhealthy working conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this to the attention of all hon. members to encourage them to focus on the workers and their families who have suffered from workplace accidents and to highlight the efforts by government, workers and employers to reduce these unfortunate occurrences.

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the minister and the government for taking this action. It is obviously a very sensible course to follow and will, I am sure, as the minister says, have the effect of keeping before all of us who are concerned about this matter the problems of unsafe working conditions and hazardous conditions in the workplace.

I noticed, I believe it was in The Evening Telegram of yesterday, that there were some twenty-four people killed in Newfoundland last year. That is two workers a month. In these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it

behooves all of us to pay a great deal more attention to safe working conditions in the workplace, particularly when you look at kind of occupations many of our people engage in; people who served on facilities such as the Ocean Ranger and who work daily on fishing vessels, who place themselves at great risk, as well as people who go down in mines, like the St. Lawrence mines, and we ought to pay a great deal of attention to that now. Again, Mr. Speaker, I commend the minister and the government for their action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is hard to agree with the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Wells) that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) should be commended. In fact, I would like to say that I believe the minister and the government should be ashamed of themselves for not participating in the memorial ceremony today. I was outside in the cool air at 12:00 o'clock. The Mayor of the city was there. All denominations were represented. There were something in the order of twenty-five community organizations, relatives of people who went down on the Ocean Ranger, numerous trade union groups, and this party and the Liberal Opposition, who all placed wreaths at the foot of the Ocean Ranger Memorial. There was

no one there from government to say a few words.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago today I stood in this House and asked the Minister of Labour why the government was not present at the official ceremonies to commemorate the Day of Mourning. The minister said that he did not have adequate notice, but would be looking forward to commemorating the day next year, which he has done today by his proclamation. But it is important that the government be front and centre to lay a wreath on behalf of the people of this Province at the Memorial and to play an active, visible part in recognizing the Day of Mourning. I am ashamed to say, Mr. Speaker, that government were not visible today, and they should apologize to the organizers of the event and to all those who participated.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member seems to be implying that we had been officially notified or something on this side of the House about the ceremony today. I have never, last year or this year, been officially informed that there was going to be a service today on the grounds of the building.

MR. MITCHELL:

Who organized the ceremony, the Canadian --

MR. LONG:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister might in his own defence say that. There has been publicity for numerous days. I checked with officials who organized the event and the government was indeed invited. The people who organized it do not understand why government was not there. It is not good enough.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to provide an update to this hon. house with respect to government's involvement with loan guarantees as they relate to fish processing companies.

In the past several weeks we have extended and provided new guarantees on behalf of ten companies totalling approximately \$3 million. This assistance has impacted very positively on approximately 1200 jobs, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Did you get Cabinet approval for that? What about the cucumbers? You could not have gotten Cabinet

approval for it.

MR. RIDEOUT:

-- thereby enabling employees of the companies affected to have meaningful and much needed employment during the coming fishing season. To be specific, Mr. Speaker, we have provided assistance to the following companies:

1. Torngat Fish Producers Co-operative Society Limited - \$750,000.

This guarantee is to enable the Co-op to operate its Rigolet facility as well as the newly leased fish plant at Makkovik and the feeder plants at Hopedale and Postville. This assistance will directly benefit approximately 150 plant workers;

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They are going fishing, I guess, in a hydroponic facility in Rigolet.

MR. RIDEOUT:

2. Aqua Fisheries Limited of Aquaforte - Government recently extended this company's guarantee of \$150,000 for a further period and our continued involvement means that 100 plant workers should continue to have employment this Summer.

3. S.T. Jones and Son Limited - As most hon. members of this House are aware, I would suspect, this company is the only industry on the island community of Little Bay Islands, in the historic district of Green Bay.

In recognition of this and to assist the company to access an adequate operating line, government has recently approved an increase in this company's



guarantee from \$250,000 to \$550,000.

MR. SIMMONS:

Who owns the company, Mr. Sprung?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Jim Mahon.

Mr. Speaker, government's sensitivity to this community's needs should provide 130 workers with employment opportunities this Summer.

4. Northeast Coast Sealers Co-operative Society - which I mentioned yesterday. Mr. Speaker, I have presented to this House now on several different occasions, government's position with respect to the revitalization of the land based seal hunt. While we have staked out our position, we have also backed up our rhetoric with solid financial assistance. For the 1988 season, government has extended the Co-op's two existing guarantees of \$200,000 and \$500,000, respectively. Furthermore, we have approved an additional \$175,000 loan guarantee to meet peak operating requirements during the seal harvest, which is now ongoing. To further assist the Co-op in its efforts, my department has been authorized to provide the Co-op with a \$35,000 grant to help defray interest costs on the Co-op's operating line.

This assistance, Mr. Speaker, will be of great benefit to the 360 Co-op members along the Northeast Coast as well as approximately 8 plant workers at the Co-op's plant at Fleur de Lys, in the great, historic district of Bay Verte - White Bay, Mr. Speaker.

5. Island Seafoods Limited of Change Islands - Government has

approved an extension to this company's \$250,000 guarantee for a further period, thereby enabling the company to continue accessing an adequate line of credit which is of crucial importance to the 250 people who work at this plant, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Do they have any markets, I wonder?

MR. RIDEOUT:

6. Eastern Ocean Products Limited, Lewisporte district - Mr. Speaker, this company is continuing its efforts to break into the secondary processing markets with a view to undertaking a profitable operation.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Where is their market feasibility study?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Both government and the company shareholders were aware that this would be a long and arduous process. Nevertheless, the company principals have made a major financial commitment to this operation and I am pleased to advise the House today that government has extended this company's \$75,000 guarantee for a further period. This should enable the company to maintain its current level of employment which has seen an average of 10 people on staff at that operation, Mr. Speaker.

7. Brig Bay Fisheries, in the historic district of St. Barbe - Government has approved a guarantee of \$150,000, Mr. Speaker, a brand new guarantee on behalf of this company to enable it to continue processing operations at its Brig Bay Plant. This operation was completely upgraded by the company in 1986

and is now one of the largest and most modern processing operations on the Province's Northern Peninsula. Government's initiative with respect to this operation will no doubt benefit the 160 plant workers who work at that facility at peak.

I know, Mr. Speaker, we have the enthusiastic support of the hon. gentleman from St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) for this particular loan guarantee.

8. Port au Port Seafoods, Piccadilly - This fresh fish operation is located on the Port au Port Peninsula, an area of high unemployment. In recognition of the approximately 80 processing jobs that this operation sustains, government has approved a guarantee to this company of \$150,000, Mr. Speaker. This should enable the company to carry on meaningful operations during 1988 and beyond.

9. Bradshaw Cove Fisheries Limited - this company operates the fish plant at Jerseyside, Placentia Bay, employing some 80 plant workers.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

How many Sprung greenhouses do we have, anyway?

MR. RIDEOUT:

In order to assist the company to obtain an adequate operating line, government has approved a loan guarantee of \$200,000. This should permit the company to continue with its operations at Jerseyside and continue providing much needed employment to the local area.

10. Superior Seafoods Limited in the historic district of Stephenville - This company

operates a fish plant at Stephenville on virtually a year round basis employing some 200 plant workers at peak production. To assist this company to continue with its operations, government recently extended the \$300,000 guarantee that we have in place and approved an additional guarantee of \$200,000. So we now have \$500,000 involved with this particular company in Stephenville, sustaining 200 jobs in the district of Stephenville that the hon. gentleman is very supportive of, I have no doubt.

Mr. Speaker, apart from the assistance I have announced today, a number of other fish processing companies are currently in receipt of government loan guarantees for working capital purposes. These include the following: White's Fisheries Limited, St. Barbe district - \$200,000; Northern Dame Bay Fisheries - \$2,000,000; Ichthus Sea Products, Glovertown I believe it is - \$200,000; and Atlantic Ocean Farms in Exploits district - \$270,000. In total, these operations sustain approximately 700 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the new guarantees, the extended guarantees that I have announced here today amount to \$5.6 million sustaining, in total, 1,900 jobs in rural Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have lost control of the purse strings. I will have to resign.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have stated and the government has stated -

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Whoop-dee-doo!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, we have one out to the Labrador Union Shrimp Company, too. I missed it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Oh, my God! Tell us about that.

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

MR. HISCOCK:  
The Minister of Fisheries announced \$150,000 for Brig Bay Fisheries. Brig Bay Fisheries owes the people in Pinware, fishermen and plant workers, \$30,000. Is that coming out of that \$150,000?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
I will be delighted to answer that question at the appropriate point on the Order Paper. If the hon. gentleman wishes to pose it, I have the answer ready for him.

MR. WINDSOR:  
Good for you.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
You know your Standing Orders.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, I have stated and the government has stated, time and again that the fishery is both the backbone of rural Newfoundland and the economic mainstay of some 300 rural communities. We have recognized our responsibility in

this regard, Mr. Speaker, and the assistance to fish processors that I have announced today clearly demonstrates our commitment to having a well balanced and vibrant processing sector. This assistance compliments other assistance that we have recently announced with respect to other fishery sectors. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, the 1988 season will see a degree of success, such that many of the companies presently with loan guarantees will be able to operate on internally generated funds.

I sincerely look forward to the day when these and many other companies can operate independently of government assistance. However, until that day arrives, Mr. Speaker, this government remains firmly committed to take whatever measures are necessary to support these local fish companies to carry out their operations and provide many badly needed employment opportunities for local residents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues on this side of the House will join with me this afternoon in welcoming this announcement. We have one regret, however. I think the Premier has been having a bit of fun with the minister's statement. I recall he said there, 'How many Sprung greenhouses do we have?' I

suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, we have one too many.

Because, Mr. Speaker, if this statement does anything - and I welcome it - it proves just how inadvisable the government is to get involved in Sprung. We have it here from the minister's own statement. They have an expenditure here, or at least guarantees, of \$5.6 million with which they have provided 1900 jobs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you were to look at the amount that they have committed to Sprung, the same amount of money put into the fisheries would have provided close to 6000 jobs.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We put \$20 million into Marystown Shipyard, and \$29 million into Baie Verte Mines.

MR. W. CARTER:

If the Premier and his Cabinet had taken the money that they have now invested in Sprung, Newfoundland, today, would be probably 6000 jobs better off.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleague from St. Barbe welcomes the announcement today on Brig Bay Fisheries. I am glad the minister has given him ample recognition for the tremendous effort he put into getting that facility started. I am sure the people of Brig Bay, in St. Barbe district, will appreciate what he did.

Mr. Speaker, I think this statement today, of course, proves that fish is the future in this Province, not cucumbers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, may I have silence. It is difficult to speak.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am sorry. It is my fault.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, all we can say is that it is regrettable that the government has not done more. I believe that more can be done, for example, with respect to secondary processing. I believe that we are exporting too many jobs to other provinces and to the United States. Certainly I think there is ample opportunity in the Province where we can get further involved in secondary processing. We have too much fish being shipped out in its raw state while Newfoundlanders are going begging, looking for jobs.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

(Inaudible) Mr. Turner when he called in today?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is wrong. They must have all been to a luncheon somewhere. I understand the Premier was in Mount Pearl. Maybe he took most of his colleagues with him. The way they are talking, obviously they had more than -

AN HON. MEMBER:

We are just excited about Sprung.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what all the excitement is about. This is a good announcement. We welcome it. We are saying that the minister should make more such

announcements. We are only sorry, by the way, that he is not announcing, today, \$10 million in guarantees to fish processing companies. We are only sorry that the government has spent so much money on the Sprung facility. I know this is a very sore spot for the Premier and his ministers, but again I repeat, if the money that is now committed to Sprung were used in the processing of fish, then we would probably have 6000 or 7000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we do appreciate the statement. We welcome it and we look forward to the minister bringing in many more such statements in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Here is Howard Pawley coming now.

MR. LONG:  
What are you on today?

MR. FENWICK:  
It beats being Richard Hatfield, which is probably your fate to come.

MR. LONG:  
Right on! Well said, 'Peter'. Well said.

MR. FENWICK:  
And I am not talking about criminal convictions, I am talking about electoral success.

Mr. Speaker, these are guaranteed loans. I think it is important to recognize that the credit of the

Province is being extended to these companies. I think we should ask some serious questions about this, because we know that with Easteel, for example, guaranteed loans are now getting us into hock to the tune of \$3 million or \$4 million, depending on which accounts and how much is settled.

Also, you would notice that several weeks ago in this House the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor), I believe, tabled the results of three other guaranteed loans that were made by this Province that went bad, one of them being Trouty Seafood, I believe, another one being a hardwood company in Central Newfoundland, and another individual fishermen.

When I say that, it is by way of saying that these particular companies, Mr. Speaker, are not the strongest and the most vibrant. Otherwise, they would not need loan guarantees. What they would have is credit at the bank and they would be able to finance their expansion based on share capital and loans and so on. What we have here is a list of operations that, by definition, need help from the government.

Mr. Speaker, a number of them, I think, are adequate and a number of them are reasonable. When we are looking at expanding the seal fishery, when we are looking at using more of the product, I think it is reasonable to put a lot of money into an operation like that because it has a hard row to hoe, it has a lot of work to do.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a number of grants in here I seriously question. Given that last year we had the highest

prices for fish in our history, if these fish companies were not making money last year then we have to start asking some very serious questions about whether they are economically viable?

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, in the forum that we have here, it is difficult to get detailed answers about some of these operations. But looking at them, Mr. Speaker, Aqua Fisheries Limited, for example - government recently extended this company's guarantee, no indication that there was severe reasons for it. And why are they requiring the extension of it if it just means operating for another year. Are they actually viable operations, or are we just keeping them going from day to day? We do not have the information for that, Mr. Speaker, and I do not suggest that this government will give it.

But I think it is important to realize that we have a provincial debt of about \$5 million, including these guarantees. We pick up the can if these things fall down. And I would really like in the whole exercise a lot more information in terms of why we are doing this. Some of them I can approve of, others, I think, there is a serious question to be asked, given the great conditions we had last year, as to whether or not they are worth continuing on with? Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Speaker, before I begin my second statement, I would like to offer a point of clarification more particularly for our socialist hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Long).

The service this morning on the grounds of Confederation Building was organized, I understand, by the St. John's and District Trades and Labour Council. I want to categorically state that my office was not contacted, nor the Premier's office. I understand from the rest of my colleagues, nobody has received any official notification or invitation.

MR. SIMMS:  
You are wrong, Vladimir, again.

MR. BLANCHARD:  
So just a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Be sure of what you are saying the next time, Mikhail.

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Speaker, over the past several days, I guess, since the Sunday, April 24, edition of The Sunday Express, there has been considerable attention focused on the issue of hygiene at mine sites in the Province. This issue was raised as the result of an internal memo in my department written by the Chief Inspector of Mines to the Assistant Deputy Minister responsible for occupational health and safety. The memo indicated concern as to the hygiene situation at a number of mining operations in the Province. While the Chief Inspector has written a memo

respecting the hygiene at various mining operations, it is unusual because the responsibility and expertise for hygiene inspections rest with the Hygiene Division of the Department.

Really, the Chief Mines Inspector's real title is the Manager of Mines Inspection and he is responsible for the physical inspections of mines, not for any dust or radiation monitoring. He is a mines engineer. We have professional industrial hygienists in the department who are responsible for that.

I would like to report to the House that a thorough investigation has been made as to the substance of that memo. As you may be aware, established mining operations in the Province are required to monitor and sample their workplace environmental conditions. The results of these samples are reported to the Joint Occupational Health and Safety Committees and copies forwarded to the Mines Inspectorate of the Department of Labour. The Inspectorate, in conjunction with the hygienist assigned to the mines, audits the results and has the authority to require additional sampling, if it is determined to be necessary.

I would like also to emphasize that the composition of the joint occupational Health and Safety Committee is comprised of actual representatives of the workers and employers. There is every opportunity for the concerns of either of the two groups to be raised at committee meetings. Minutes of these meetings are submitted to the Occupational Health and Safety Division of the Department of Labour and are carefully monitored by staff in

that Division.

The hygiene situation regarding those operations identified in the above referenced memorandum, is as follows:

In Labrador West: Sampling of dust and gases as necessary throughout its operation is conducted jointly by a union and management committee at Scully Mines and the Iron Ore Company of Canada. The results are reported to their respective workplace Safety and Health Committees and to the Mines Inspectorate each month. The need to perform additional sampling has not been identified to date by either party concerned.

At ERCO, Mr. Speaker: Sampling of dust, phosphoric acid, fluorine, and sulphur dioxide is conducted by company safety officials and the results are reported to the workplace Safety and Health Committee. These reports are regularly audited by our inspectors. There has been no identified need for additional sampling after audit by our inspectors.

At Baie Verte Mines Inc.: Dust levels are sampled by representatives of both company and union, and independent fibre samplings are taken by the Occupational Health and Safety Division. Readings are audited by the joint Health and Safety Committee. Again, there has not been any particular, or out of the ordinary, problem identified.

In addition, a tripartite committee comprised of representatives of the Occupational Health and Safety Division, company and union, meet quarterly to deal with other

matters of mutual concern to health and safety. Our representation, Mr. Speaker, on that committee includes Dr. John Martin of Memorial University of Newfoundland. I understand that he is trained in industrial related diseases in particular. The fourth meeting of that tripartite committee was held on 24 February during which no specific concerns with sampling were identified.

At Hope Brook Mines: An extensive base-line survey of environmental contaminants was conducted at this developing operation during the Fall of 1987. A portion of the samples were such that they had to be analyzed at laboratory facilities outside the Province which has resulted in delays in reporting the results of the study.

At St. Lawrence Fluorspar Limited: Due to very serious health hazards in the previous operation of this mine, our Occupational Health and Safety Division has given more than normal attention to this operation. This operation requires close radon monitoring to insure that ventilation is adequate to meet the requirements of the Mines (Safety of Workmen) Regulations

Since the mine reopened in February of 1988, St. Lawrence Fluorspar Limited monitors radon levels at each workplace in the underground mines on a weekly basis, or more frequently if requested.

As recent as last week, Mr. Speaker, hygienists from the Department of Labour were in St. Lawrence to conduct radiation and ventilation measurements.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that prior to last week staff were in St. Lawrence during 29 November to 4 December 1987, 9 February to 15 February 1988, and 2 and 3 March 1988.

The Department of Labour has engaged the Canada Centre of Minerals and Energy Technology, known as CANMET, of the federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources to conduct a comprehensive study of the extent of radon contaminates in the mines, which will include ventilation, ground water and mining activities.

The study was conducted in co-operation with the Department of Labour staff by a senior research scientist from CANMET, plus two CANMET technologists. The study was undertaken in two phases of one-week duration and the CANMET report will be due in May of 1988, Mr. Speaker.

At Newfoundland Zinc Mines: This operation, in co-operation with professional staff of our Occupational Health and Safety Division monitors diesel exhaust emission from underground vehicles and maintains records that are audited by mines inspectors during inspection visits. A ventilation survey is also planned for this operation.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, after a careful review of the situation in each of the six mines which Mr. Bradbury highlighted in his memorandum, I am satisfied that there is no cause for concern over lack of monitoring or any other safety hazards in these mines. I would like to emphasize that the role the Department of Labour takes in relation to mine conditions is to ensure that



workers in the mines are not subjected to adverse conditions respecting workplace health and safety. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that the role of the Department of Labour has been adequately performed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:  
Are you going to run federally 'Kevin' or what?

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:  
They are not going to let him run.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Protect me, Mr. Speaker. I am a valuable resource, Mr. Speaker, and I intend to make sure that the hon. Premier and his government are dismantled in as short a time as possible. I will be doing that, Mr. Speaker, for my young and prolonged career in politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Now, to the statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker, if you could protect me from this harassment that I am receiving.

The minister comes in here today and he gives us a very nice statement which seems to indicate that everything is fine and dandy, hunky-dory, there is not a problem around in the mines of this Province. He says here 'the role of his department is to take into account the mine conditions and ensure that the workers in mines are not subjected to adverse conditions respecting workplace health and safety.' He goes on to say, "I am satisfied that the role of the department has been adequately performed."

Let me tell the minister and his government that we are not satisfied on this side that those concerns have been addressed, and we would like for this government to take those concerns seriously.

The minister in the first part of his statement says, 'the memo indicating concern as to the hygiene situation at a number of mining operations around the Province was done by the Chief Inspector of Mines, but he is not really responsible for the hygiene in the mines.'

No, he is only the Chief Inspector of the Mines. That is all he is, Mr. Speaker. That is not much of a title, as a matter of fact. Why would he express in an internal memo complete concern about what is going on in various operations in this Province?

I think it is a very serious matter. I think that this government -

MR. BLANCHARD:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) is misinterpreting my statement. Mr. Speaker, I said I was satisfied that there is no concern necessary over a lack of monitoring from month to month.

He dwells on the title of the person whom I spoke of, who wrote the memo. The title of that person in reality, as you will see in the estimates, Mr. Speaker, is Manager of Mines Inspection Services. For the hon. member's purpose, there is a comparable title in hygiene. He is misinterpreting it, Mr. Speaker, he is responsible for the monitoring the mines, not for inspection.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. gentleman.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Just to continue. Mr. Speaker, it says here, "While the Chief Inspector has written a memo respecting the hygiene at various mining operations, it is unusual because the responsibility and expertise for hygiene inspections rests with the Hygiene Division of the Department." This is his own words questioning his own officials of his department.

He comes in here then and expects us to believe, without any outside investigation or inquiries, that everything is okay.

Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough. We would like to see an inquiry into the matter to check it out so that the people and the public of the Province are fully aware of the concerns, Mr. Speaker, of the miners and of everybody else in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
It is not good enough. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, with reference to further studies they have done, he says, 'the Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources to conduct a comprehensive study of radon contamination in the mines.' He also goes on to say that the study was undertaken in two phases and the report is due in May of 1988.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder when we are going to see the report. We have had many past reports which have been presented to the hon. the minister which we have not seen for months and months and months. So I do not know when we are going to get that report, Mr. Speaker.

The way they operate over there, we are probably going to have to go through The Freedom of Information Act. It will probably cost us \$500 to get the info and it will probably take us a year and a half.

Mr. Speaker, we want an investigation into this matter and we are not finished with it yet.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker I would have to say to the minister's statement -

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
(Inaudible) left winger.

MR. LONG:  
I do not know if the Premier is going to keep interrupting, as he has been. I do not know what kind of mood he is in today. With his points of order and interruptions, I was going to tell him to go fly a kite, but he should go fly a helicopter, based on the reports we are hearing from the media, if he is not about to sit and allow the people the courtesy to speak in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:  
Do not rile them, do not rile them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker, I would to respond specifically to the first point of the minister's statement concerning the ceremony which was

held today. I would simply say to the minister again that I was told by officials who organized the event that an invitation had been extended. Nobody received an invitation in the mail, but this minister and the government published in **The Newfoundland Gazette** last week a proclamation of the day. I also assume that the minister, working in the building, would have seen the giant size poster commemorating the day.

The hon. member is the Minister of Labour! The Minister of Labour, representing the government, should not need an invitation delivered to his door -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. LONG:  
- to attend the ceremony. So the minister protests too much, Mr. Speaker. He should have been there. There is no excuse.

To the statement at hand, Mr. Speaker. I think it is a sad irony on a day that has been earlier commemorated as a day of mourning for sickness, death and injury on the job site, that the Minister of Labour comes, in response to a very interesting development that occurred in his department in which the Chief Inspector of Mines came out, and I guess through some investigative reporting by the Sunday newspaper, was willing to talk publicly about comments that the inspector wanted to make concerning hygiene, which is obviously, as the minister said, not his primary concern. But, the Chief Inspector of Mines felt that he should pass comment

in public about the conditions at six mine sites in the Province.

The minister comes in with this statement in which he goes through all six, and I have looked carefully at what the minister has placed in front of us, and he has in no certain terms addressed any of the concerns that have been brought forward. In fact, every single site that the minister addressed today confirms the concerns of the Chief Inspector.

He begins by talking about Labrador West and says that there is no need for additional sampling when we know that the position of inspector there has been vacant. He talks about ERCO, no need for additional sampling. He talks about Baie Verte and concerns not having been addressed.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LONG:  
If I may conclude, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No, no!

MR. LONG:  
Just a word on St. Lawrence, Mr. Speaker.

The minister

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

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. LONG:  
He said nothing about St. Lawrence, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before calling Oral Questions, I would like to welcome to the galleries six grade ten students accompanied by their teachers, Corinne Collins and Elizabeth Warr, from Long Island Academy, Beaumont, Green Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Canadian Helicopter Corporation is quoted by the national press today -

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. member for -

MR. SIMMONS:  
The national press quoted the Chairman of the -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I must make a comment. I am sure it was done inadvertently, but it is an abuse of privileges for somebody to call for a point of order while not in his seat. I would just like to draw attention to that matter.

The hon. the member :

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PATTERSON:

I understand that the leader of the Liberal Party on the mainland, John Turner, phoned the Leader of the Opposition in Newfoundland today -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:

- and he was wondering -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:

- if any of his assassins were on the mainland over the weekend?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Canadian Helicopter Corporation is quoted in the national press today as saying that the Premier and he had made a deal, and indeed, today's **Ottawa Citizen** quotes Mr. Dobbin as saying 'The facts are we made a deal that he was going to resign his position on the 23rd of November...He said there would be a leadership convention in mid-January and he would report on February 1, 1988 to head up my defence subsidiary.'

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Premier that Mr. Dobbin has

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is beginning to make a speech. He has read a statement which is not ordinarily permitted.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, Mr. Dobbin had made the statement -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member started, as I understand, by reading a statement, which is not normally accepted in Question Period. I called the member to order but he did not ask his question. I would ask him now to please ask his question. The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Premier, given that Mr. Dobbin made the statement I just quoted after he had heard a taped denial which the Premier had made, therefore, will he now tell the House which version reflects what actually happened, what Mr. Dobbin says or what the Premier has said publicly?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that it is my version. It is as simple as that.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

By way of supplementary, Mr.

Speaker, I ask the Premier: Does he not realize or does not care that one of his very good friends, whom he has wined and dined with, had his juice with, a man who nearly became the Premier's employer by the Premier's own admission, has said publicly that the Premier does not deal in the facts? He has essentially branded the Premier, in the last twenty-four hours, as a liar. Is the Premier not concerned about that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker: Has he talked to Mr. Dobbin since this issue became public? Has he tried to straighten Mr. Dobbin out on what the facts of the case are? How can the two versions be so divergent, I ask the Premier?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The hon. member will have to ask Mr. Dobbin, number one. Let us get the record straight. I know **The Toronto Star** is up in the gallery listening to all of this with great interest, and **The Sunday Express**, to make sure they get a story to go on for the next few days.

Mr. Craig Dobbin was not, is not, a friend of mine. His brother, Mr. Basil Dobbin, has been a friend of mine for a number of years, but Craig Dobbin has not been a friend of mine. He is not a friend of mine, and never has been. Those are the facts. That is a fact. He has not been. I

know my friends. He is not a friend of mine.

Mr. Dobbin offered me a job and I turned it down. It was just as simple as that. He is not the only one who has offered me a job, which I have turned down. I indicated to Mr. Dobbin, as I have told the press over and over again, that if I were interested in the offer I would get back to him; I would get a lawyer and negotiate a contract, and tell my caucus and tell my party and all the rest of it. I told them all of that. I cannot help it if Mr. Dobbin wants to go out and interpret our meeting, when he made the offer to me, differently than I do. I cannot help that.

As Shakespeare said, "But men may construe things after their fashion, / Clean from the purpose of the things themselves." He also said, as the member for Fortune - Hermitage knows, in Julius Ceasar, "Into what dangers would you lead me, Cassius, / That you would have me seek into myself / For that which is not in me?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS:

Shakespeare said also, Mr. Speaker, 'Is this a dagger which I see before me?'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier said today and he said formerly that

there was an offer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Now will he tell the House how far this offer was pursued?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

The Premier is having difficulty hearing.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

How far was this offer pursued? Was there this final celebratory meeting, which Mr. Dobbin talked about in The Ottawa Citizen today, that he and the Premier had in late October? How far was the offer pursued? Were there a number of meetings about it? Can the Premier give us some indication at what stage it reached before he turned down the offer to work with Mr. Dobbin's company?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is none of the hon. member's business. To start with, it is none of the hon. member's business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I know the hon. member well, the

hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage. He is a very competent, well-educated Newfoundlander, has served in the House of Commons with distinction and served in the Cabinet of Canada with distinction, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member has job offers every day, given his competence and his distinguished career. And I am not going to ask the hon. member to relate to me the tens and tens of offers of jobs that he has had in the last several years. I am sure he has had, you know, innumerable offers because they recognize in him a very competent, distinguished Canadian. I am not going to ask him how many job offers and all the rest of it.

I have told the public of Newfoundland, and I do not mind saying it again, that I was offered - it is the truth! - a job by Mr. Dobbin to head up one of his subsidiaries.

MR. SIMMONS:

You accepted my offer.

MR. SIMMS:

Your offer!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- and quite likely! but it was defined because I did not get into it in any detail, in the defence area. But that was never finalized, and I did not want to pursue it any further. There was an offer of money and an offer of a position, and that was it, in a subsidiary. And it never went beyond that because I had no intention of negotiating a contract with him for a job - a contract was talked about - because I was not interested, in the same way as I have had other offers that I am not going to tell the hon. member about, because it

did not go anywhere. I am here, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to stay here. That is all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the House, and the Premier as well, that the questions that are being asked are being asked on behalf of the taxpayers of this Province, not on behalf of the individuals posing them. That is on whose behalf these are asked.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the comments contained in the paper today, would the Premier tell the House whether or not those discussions extended over a period of time during the month of October, and over a number of meetings, as is indicated in Mr. Dobbin's statement, or was it simply an offer which the Premier refused?

Mr. Dobbin's statement refers to a number of—

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to try to maintain order in this unruly house.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

I would ask the Premier to advise the House, and through the House the taxpayers of this Province, whether there were a number of meetings, and the final celebratory meeting to which Mr. Dobbin refers in the newspaper article, or is that in error? Were there discussions about a job or was there simply a simple, straightforward offer that the Premier turned down?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A simple, straightforward offer that the Premier turned down, and the rest of it is none of the Leader of the Opposition's business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, again, on behalf of the taxpayers of this Province, and it is their business, the rest of what I am asking about relates to the Premier's own guidelines for ministers. He says, 'They will not be permitted to use their position or to use government facilities to further their interest in any outside employment, office or position!'

Now, Mr. Speaker, during the month of October, the same month referred to in that paper, the



Premier will remember that that was the month that this government made loans to Canadian Helicopter Company in the amount of \$8.3 million and a grant of \$4.2 million. On behalf of the taxpayers of this Province, would the Premier tell this House if he was discussing a job opportunity for the Premier with that company at the same time he was discussing these loans?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is low-down! That deal that was done on the helicopter company was done through a federal-provincial committee. I had nothing to do with it at all. As a matter of fact, I think, at the meeting in question I was trying to attempt to get CP and Mr. Dobbin's company interested in the Strawberry Hill facility out on the West Coast, which is now being financed by the university and through us. It was at that meeting - it was only an hour meeting - he offered me a job. It had nothing to do with this other stuff, and all the documents can prove it.

Now the Leader of the Opposition has raised this to try to put a cloud over my head on that, yet he talks about the unruly House and all the rest of it. I was in the gentleman's presence and he offered me a job. There is nothing I could do about that. I did not know he was going to offer me a job, and he offered me a job and I was not interested. It was a very interesting proposition and there was plenty of money, plenty of security and all the rest of it attached to it. He was willing to do a contract with me but I was not interested, and that was all

was to it. If I was interested I would not be here now, I would be somewhere else, I would be out in the private sector working. That was all was to it.

I will get the dates now for the train of events, since the Leader of the Opposition has had the nerve to ask the question to try to demonstrate some conflict of interest. I will get the dates on which that other project was proceeded with, because I think it was already approved at that point in time, long before Mr. Dobbin offered me the job. But I will now make sure I research it and get the dates. That was never mentioned, it was already approved. The announcement might have come around that time, but it was already approved by the two governments. It was done completely outside of me altogether. It was done by boards, federal people, and so on. It has nothing to do with me whatsoever.

That was all was to it. The man offered me a job and I honestly and truthfully admit that, as I had been offered jobs by others whom I will not mention, and I turned it down. That is all. Since that time I have been offered other jobs. As a matter of fact, if you would like to know, I have been offered a few more since that, but I am not interested right now. One of these days I might be interested. Right now I am interested in operating this Province and making this Province tick, making this Province go ahead as we have seen in the last couple of years with our unemployment going down and getting the offshore going and getting a whole bunch of other things straightened out. I cannot help it if everybody is after me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I will tell the Premier, frankly, there is no other basis for raising the question other than the statements attributed to Mr. Dobbin, so I will not suggest there is anything else. I will tell him frankly, that is the only basis for raising the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Now, I ask the Premier -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, would you maintain order, please!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

I would ask the Premier: Is it fair to conclude, as I do from what the Premier said, that Mr. Dobbin's statement with respect to meetings and the final celebratory meeting, are false, they are not accurate?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier,

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They are not accurate. I do not know why the gentleman is saying the stuff he is saying. I cannot answer for him. But I was offered a job by him and I turned it down. It is just as simple as that. He was extremely eager - I can get into it - about it and so on.

MR. SIMMS:

He might have interpreted it differently.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, I do not know how he could interpret it differently, but apparently he did. I do not want to get into what he said to me at the time. The gentleman was looking for somebody to give credibility to his company, and so on, because he did not feel that he had the credibility as a corporate entity in this Province that he deserved to have. He thought that I could do something about that credibility. That is one of the things he said to me. He was very eager to be able to get someone like me to go with him so he could tell it to some of his other friends in the corporate world whom he perceives to have greater credibility in Newfoundland than he has. He mentioned that to me. But I do not want to get into that. That is all I can say on it.

MR. LONG:

Come on, boy! Get into it! We will listen!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, here is Mikhail! He wants to hear some more juicy stuff.

MR. SIMMS:

He asked the same question three months ago.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I appreciate what the Leader of the Opposition said in his last question. I guess he has a right to ask it and so on. There is a difference of opinion between the two of us about the nature of the meeting. All I can say, for my part, is that it was a very interesting proposition and I told Mr. Dobbin, 'That is very, very interesting, but I was not interested.' I said if I were interested the first thing I would have to do is go and do all the things about resigning and all of that, and I would not be prepared to go with him as a company person, I would only do it on contract, and that I would have to get a lawyer to negotiate it, and that would take several months. I also indicated to him that I had other offers which I would have to check as well before I proceeded any further, because those offers might still be available to me - nobody who does any business with the government or anything - but if I changed my mind I would get back to him, I would get a lawyer and he would have his lawyer, and see if we could negotiate something. The whole question then would be whether we could negotiate something. That was still up in the air. We might not have been able to negotiate something that was favourable or acceptable to me. That is where it is.

MR. BAIRD:

But you would know where your source of income was coming from.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The other dates on that other helicopter simulator proposal was completely separate and was not raised in that meeting. I think the final decisions had already been made in Ottawa, and so on, about it. Once again I just want

to reiterate, because the member for Fortune - Hermitage is just not correct, that Mr. Dobbin is not a friend of mine. He never was a friend of mine and is not a friend of mine. His brother Basil has been a friend of mine but Mr. Craig Dobbin has never been a friend of mine.

MR. TOBIN:

He is no friend of Roger's either!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I cannot fathom it. I just cannot fathom it. I guess it gives credibility to his side of the story, that is the only thing I can deduce from it. That is the only thing I can deduce from it. It is like, I guess, the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the NDP, or other people here, if and when I -

MR. BAIRD:

I am sure the people down in Fortune - Hermitage are anxious to hear that, and wondering what is going on today. At least he would know his source of income and admit where it was coming from.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So, that is where it was. I also, by the way - I am just trying to remember now as I am talking - indicated to Mr. Dobbin that I would not negotiate anything with him unless I had resigned first. I also mentioned that to him. I would resign first, inform the party and all of that. I had no intention, as I said this to him two or three as I was leaving, of pursuing the matter further because the first thing I would have to do is decide that I wanted to get out. I would have to be out, completely out, before I would even get a lawyer to negotiate because I do not have a lawyer. I have no money and I do

not want any money. I got nothing and I do not want nothing. I would have to go get a lawyer and pay him to start negotiating after I got out, because I would not do it any other way. There is just one thing, and I will just finish on this - I appreciate the questions from the press and from the other side - and it has nothing to do with Atlantic Accords, nothing to do with anybody - I will stop because I am taking up Question Period - I can say about myself in all modesty either, it is straight, or if it is not straight I do not want any part of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not have a lineup of corporate people at my door every day - I did at first - primarily because they know it is a waste of time to go talk to Peckford, because we are not going to be able to put anything in his back pocket.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins). In a short preamble I want to bring his attention to the fact that in 1979, 1983, 1985 and again in 1987 there were reports done at the Hoyles - Escasoni Home which

brought to the then minister's attention - now the Minister of Public Works (Dr. Twomey) - or the Department of Health's attention the horrendous conditions at the home.

Just as early as Wednesday, April 27, a staff member of the home writes very clearly that since the new management firm has taken over conditions have not changed.

I ask the Minister of Health: What is it going to take for his department to act and correct the horrendous conditions at the Hoyles - Escasoni Home?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is referring to an anonymous letter that was in **The Evening Telegram**, I do not know if it was today or yesterday. I cannot really comment on rumors and myths.

MR. SIMMS:

Apparently it was not anonymous.

DR. COLLINS:

I see. Well, I cannot even comment on that. But even if it had been signed, I can say that I recognize that people can have an opinion. That is no problem. The only thing is we have a different opinion. I might add that officials in my department, even yesterday, had meetings with the Chairman of the Board and with the management officials at the Hoyles Home to go over certain things there. There are things happening, improvements being planned, improvements occurring at the Hoyles - Escasoni Complex. In a short period of time I expect I will be given permission by

Cabinet, having made a full report to Cabinet, to make some sort of statement of a more definitive nature. I can assure the hon. member that no matter what anonymous people say in the press there are improvements going forth at the Complex over there.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious situation, and I want the Minister of Health to recognize the seriousness of the situation. We have seniors over there and they have gone public themselves, one of the management people has gone public. And if the minister had so much confidence in things being improved at the Hoyles' Home and Escasconi, with no extra funding, and no extra staff, I would ask him very clearly how does he take this article in *The Toronto Star*, Saturday, March 19, 1988, 'North York nursing home chief fined \$500. Who ran that home? - Extendicare! Did he do any investigation of the credibility of this firm prior to its coming into this Province? And if he himself has not checked into it, how is he satisfied that the situation at the nursing home here in St. John's is adequate and the residents are getting proper care?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a representative of *The Toronto Star* in the galleries today, and I suppose that someone is trying

to get a mention in the paper, or whatever. I do not know what all this is about. The management group over there tendered like other groups in the same business tendered. The proposals put forward by those tendering were given extensive examination over quite a period of time, and it was determined that this was a good group to take on the contract.

And I might add that I have had meetings with the particular person at the home who is now discharging the duties of Extendicare, in association with members of the board whom we have appointed over there. And the board Chairman is quite happy with what is being planned over there, and what has been put in place over there. There is no problem, there is no dissension between the board and Extendicare.

As a matter of fact, there is a very good relationship there. I think that there are improvements going on there, and if people do not agree with that, I cannot do much about it.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I will the minister's attention to two excerpts from *The Toronto Star*, of March 11, 1988, and I will table them. The Province of Ontario has launched an investigation into North York's Bayview Villa where thirty-two elderly people died in four months, 'Deaths of home's residents probed'. That is another article about the same firm.

I will ask the minister if these articles, plus the excerpts from staff at the Hoyles' Home, the conditions that the residents themselves have stated publicly, are not enough for the minister to act immediately to do something about it and to call a public inquiry that this mess can be straightened out once and for all, and those residents can get the proper care that they deserve.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

I think the hon. member wants me to mount a public inquiry in Newfoundland because something took place in the Province of Ontario.

MR. EFFORD:

No.

DR. COLLINS:

I think that is an interpretation of his request. I have absolutely no intention of doing that.

If there are matters brought to my attention by the very reputable citizens who comprise the Board of Trustees at that complex, if they bring to my attention some problems and I think it warrants a public inquiry, I will request Cabinet to permit me to mount a public inquiry. I will not do it on the basis of anonymous rumours or innuendoes put forward in this House or elsewhere. I will not do it on the basis of activities taking place in other provinces. And I regret to say that if people die in these sorts of homes it is a fact of life. I am not surprised at some of the statistics the hon. member has put forward there. But unless something is brought forward that sounds amiss, I will not go to my

colleagues and ask them to mount a public inquiry.

MR. EFFORD:

What about your own reports! It is shocking. It is disgraceful.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor). It has to do with a statement reported in **The Evening Telegram** today and I will quote it to him and I ask him if this is an accurate reflection of what he said. 'In an interview Wednesday' the member 'explained' the fact is the benefits which are being paid out every day are exceeding the money which we are paying in.' And he is referring to the pooled pension funds. Would the Minister of Finance please give us an indication of whether he was accurately quoted there, if that is, in fact, what he said?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, a good thing that we have some people in this Province who are writing **The Evening Telegram** or the hon. gentleman opposite would never come up with a question, because every question he asked has to come from **The Evening Telegram** or **The Sunday Express**. The answer to the question is: Yes, Mr. Speaker. And if the hon. gentleman would care to look back he will find out that what I am talking about was a report that was tabled in 1984.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I find this a little bit appalling. I have here the financial statement for December 31, 1985 for the pooled pension fund. It indicates on the final line that there was a surplus in the year 1985 of \$60 million and in 1984 there was a \$42 million surplus. We obviously do not have the 1986 or 1987 statements, so it is hard to tell what is going on.

But, Mr. Speaker, is this part of a new negotiating strategy, to try and get the unions to pay more into their pension funds? In fact, Mr. Speaker, unless something has drastically turned around -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

- there probably was a surplus in the last couple of years as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

My question to the minister is: Would you please give us an indication of what the actual surplus or deficiency was in the four particular plans, the public service one, the teachers plan, the uniformed services, and the M.H.A. plan?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has once again proven, much better than I could, the lack of knowledge that he has about such matters.

He talked about the deficit for a particular year. There was no deficit last year, there is no deficit this year, and there will not be for the next number of years. And that is the result of the incredibly good job that our Pension Investment Committee is doing in investing the funds that are in that pension plan.

What I am talking about is the unfunded liability that is building up so that some point in time, in the future, Mr. Speaker, the fund will not be able to meet the obligations that are building up under the benefits that are accruing as a result of the pension plan. And what I said was that the amount that we are paying now is not equivalent to the amount of benefits that are building up each year. Those benefits will be paid sometime in the future. And there is a point in time, in the future, when the benefits will exceed the amount of the funds available in that fund.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, looking at the same report - the only one we have, quite frankly - it is indicated that the public service pension plan of 24,000 members has a pay out in 1985 of 38 percent of what it brought in; the teachers 50 percent; uniformed services actually pays more than it gets 165,000, so there is a deficit there.

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Finance not agree that the MHA plan, the one that covers us - which actually in 1985 paid out

175 percent of the premiums it brought in -- is the worst funded of the bunch? And would not the Minister of Finance, as a symbol to the rest of the public service which he is asking to take it on the chin, change the MHA pension plan so that we can avoid the double dipping that is occurring in the cases of individual members of this House -- who go on pension or go on to the Senate or go to the bench and as a result can then draw the Federal Government salary in those instances and ours as well -- eliminate this double dipping as a symbol to the 24,000 civil servants and the 8,000 teachers that indeed we are willing to go and look at our plan first before we go at all of the rest of the others?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

Hon. gentlemen opposite are almost in panic here, Mr. Speaker, listening to the gentleman to their right.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman obviously does not know what he is talking about. He is confusing totally cash flow of a particular year from actuarial studies. And it is the actuary studies that I have been talking about, which really indicate the strength of the pension plan, not the performance in any one year. That is a cash flow for one year, that is a snapshot in time, that is the kind of short sightedness that gets NDP government in such financial trouble that they get into.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

What I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, is ensuring that in 25 or 30 or 40 years time the pension plan can pay the benefits to the public servants of this Province that they are paying for today.

The hon. gentleman opposite is obviously not concerned about that. He wants to talk about the MHA pension plan, which is very similar to every other MHA pension plan in every other province of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for oral questions has elapsed.

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report 1986-1987 for the Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report of the Fisheries Loan Board. I say annual. There has always been a financial statement tabled, but it is my understanding that this is the first time since 1949 or 1950 that



the board has really lived up to its legislation and produced an annual report as well.

### Notices of Motion

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, entitled, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland Institute Of Agronomists."

MR. SPEAKER:

The on. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, entitled, "An Act To Amend The Insurance Companies Act."

### Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to Question No. 11 asked by the hon. the member for Port de Grave, and also by the same hon. member, Question No. 51.

### Orders of the Day

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, continuing debate on Order 4, Bill No. 16, the Internal

Economy Commission.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 4, Bill No. 16, "An Act To Amend The Internal Economy Commission Act."

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have an opportunity to speak for a few moments on this bill. The two provisions in it arise quite directly out of the report entitled **Tools For The Job**, a report that was generated by the Committee on Member Services a couple of years ago, chaired by the then member for St. John's East Extern, Mr. Tom Hickey. I had the privilege of serving as the Vice-Chairman of that committee. My colleague for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) was a member of the committee, as was the member for Menihek and as were other members, the gentleman for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), the gentleman for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford), and the gentleman for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening).

We seven made by the committee which came up with a number of recommendations which, if implemented as a package, would have done much to improve the operations of the House and, at the same time, would have gone a long way towards addressing the issue of services available to members who are, under very difficult circumstances, attempting to address the needs and the requirements of their constituents.

That report, as members will recall, was essentially flung out the window by the administration at the time, but I am pleased to

note that the report has been retrieved and a couple of the recommendations in it are being acted upon in this particular piece of legislation.

The provision for changes in the Internal Economy Commission we welcome, as the Leader of the Opposition said in speaking in this debate earlier.

We would have preferred to have seen the legislation provide for two members of the official Opposition, including the Opposition House Leader, plus a representative of other parliamentary groups in the House, of which we just have one such group at the moment. So, with that in mind, I tell the gentleman from Menihek that we would have no difficulty supporting his amendment as it relates to makeup, because that amendment embodies what it was the Leader of the Opposition, on behalf of the official Opposition, went after in the first place, to have the commission so constituted as to provide for a member from each parliamentary group, including two members from the official Opposition.

While I am talking in terms of comments made earlier by the gentleman from Menihek, let me say to him that I submit to him that one, I support his concern that the goings on in those meetings ought not to be kept from members of the House, that members of the House should be privy to those goings on, to those minutes, as he characterizes them. But, I say to him, if he reads the legislation carefully, he has that assurance, really.

If he would look at Section 1 (f) of the legislation he will find

the provision that 'One member of the House of Assembly who sits in opposition to the government be designated from time to time by members of the House of Assembly who sit in Opposition...' That provision essentially addresses the point that was raised by the gentleman from Menihek. I say to him that that additional member, in addition to the Opposition House Leader, he or she - he in this particular case, since there are no persons of the female sex sitting on this side of the House - will not only be from the people sitting in Opposition, but will be designated by them. I submit to him that that designation carries with it a responsibility to keep those who have done the designating informed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me come to the other provision in this particular bill. I say to the Government House Leader that I know he has a lot of legislation on the Order Paper, the days are getting warmer, and the troops are getting restless; they want to get out there and put the final touches on the election, and so we would hope, then, that we will do our part to be expeditious in the handling of legislation. This particular one has had a good go-around. I wanted to have a word or two, and maybe when that is over, if it is the wish of the government, we can get on with the job at hand and call some other legislation. But there is one other point that I wanted to make about this bill. I have already addressed the issue of the Internal Economy Commission.

The other point I wanted to make relates to Section 3. I refer the minister to Section 3. He would be familiar with it, of course. Section 3 of this bill provides

that 'Section 2 shall come into force immediately after the dissolution of the Fortieth General Assembly.' Certainly we have no argument with that as it relates to Section 2 alone, because it would seem to me that the mechanism of providing for an independent commission to adjudicate the matter of members' salaries can only be triggered with the holding of another general election, so that Section 3, it seems to me, is eminently sensible.

But what the act seems to be silent on, and maybe the minister can help me on this if he would. I am looking for the attention of the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) for a moment. Where is it in the act that says the recast TEC will be triggered? The coming into force of the other sections of this act is not addressed here, is it?

MR. SIMMS:  
No. The new TEC (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:  
Exactly, yes.

MR. SIMMS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:  
No, I just found it unusual that there is no provision in the act, either that it would come into force on proclamation or on date definite.

MR. SIMMS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:  
So the intent of the administration on this matter is to implement the recast Internal Economy Commission reasonably soon?

MR. SIMMS:  
After proclamation.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Yes. The bill is silent on that particular matter.

MR. SIMMS:  
That is the intent.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Okay. I thank the minister.

Mr. Speaker, I support those provisions in the bill. As I indicated to the House, I have been involved in some deliberations on them and I am happy as one member of that erstwhile committee. I am glad that at least two of the recommendations have been embraced and are now being implemented, with the passage of this piece of legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose one needs to reflect for a moment on another aspect of this particular debate. I watched with some dismay last week the performance of the gentleman who is the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) and the one who is the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins), and were they in the Chamber I would take some time to make some comments in relation to what they have said. Since they are not here I shall forego that at the moment, except to say that I thought the Minister of Education's heart was not in it very much, and the Minister of Health, at times, did not look terribly comfortable with what he was doing either. And when you reflect on some of the things he was doing, you realize why he was not very comfortable. But again I would like to say these things man to man, face to face, so I shall restrain myself from saying them now; I am sure there will be

another occasion.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that I support the bill and I am delighted to see it here. Insofar as the Internal Economy Commission provision is concerned it is a compromise, and I repeat that I, and we in the Official Opposition, would have preferred the proposal first put by the leader of the Opposition and the one now embodied in the amendment to be put forward by the gentleman from Menihek. Otherwise, we think it is a good bill. I think so as well, and will be happy to support it at the appropriate time.

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Parsons):  
The hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. DINN:  
I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on this amendment to the Internal Economy Commission Act because I think it is a very important and enlightened piece of legislation; it provides an opportunity for members of the Opposition to sit on that commission and to see basically what is going on with respect to the operation of the House. I have never been very strongly in favour of very many committees that are almost held in secret; I like to see things done fairly openly, and this is another move in that direction.

We have gone a long way over the time that I have been in this House of Assembly with respect to making things more public and bringing them more into the open. I remember Workers' Compensation, for example, the changes that were

put in there with respect to worker representatives on the Workers' Compensation Board so they could see, basically, how it operates, and employer representatives on the Board because employers were paying the shot and a lot of the complaints were centered around the fact that they really did not know what was going on with the operation. I think they are becoming more attuned to Workers' Compensation now and accept the charges more. Obviously, when the rates go up they complain like anybody else, but at least now they have representatives there who can determine that the fees charged are basically those fees that will allow people to be looked after in the event of industrial accident or death. I think that is a good thing.

This here is another reform which allows for people who often just sit back and wonder, why have I to live in this little office here? Why do I not have my own office and my own secretary? I remember in 1975, when I was in the backbench and, as a matter of fact, responsible for the office down there when many of the MHAs were out of town, back in their districts during the Summer, I operated the office down there and there were deficiencies then and I am sure there are deficiencies now.

Now, obviously, in the parliamentary system you can only go so far. There is such a thing as Cabinet secrecy and that kind of thing, and I think these are the kinds of things that have to remain, but from the point of view of the operation of the House of Assembly it should have been done years ago, that people in Opposition sat on that Commission. I am glad that the

report **Tools for the Job** has been resurrected and some of the recommendations are being implemented.

The Leader of the Opposition is leaving the House. I have a few comments with respect to the comments he made last week, and I would like him to be here for those comments. I am delighted with this new reform, where we have a committee now set up, which will run the House of Assembly and the operations of members, which will have representatives and members of the Opposition on it. I am sure the Opposition will operate this fairly. The hon. Opposition House Leader is on the committee and I am sure, as the leader of the Opposition said, that they will flip a coin and make sure that the other party in the House is represented on this committee.

I suppose if you looked at it and looked at **Tools for the Job** and the recommendations in there, you might want to put a representative of each party on there. But I think we have to be careful there as well, because you might have a Liberal Party representative, you might have an independent Liberal Party representative on there, an NDP representative, an independent PC Party representative, and eventually the committee gets a little bit big.

MR. TULK:

How about (inaudible) party?

MR. DINN:

You would have a hell of a party in the House then, Mr. Speaker.

I often wonder now how some of these legislatures get along with all the different groups they have within those legislatures to

operate within.

You have the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker on the Commission and two members of Cabinet. Obviously, the money is going to have to come from somewhere, and somebody should be there who operate in the inner circles of government to make sure that money is there for the House of Assembly to operate, and that is obviously why we would have Cabinet represented, then.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why have two?

MR. DINN:

The reason probably why you have two on there is because there are not a lot of times you will get two or three Cabinet Ministers in town for all the meetings, so there is a good chance that they will not always be there.

The House Leader, the Opposition House Leader and a member of the Opposition, I think that has the makings of a real good Commission, and I think it can run pretty well.

Mr. Speaker, government obviously took a lot of time to determine what should go into these amendments and, I think, came up with the best of both worlds, if you want. There was communication back and forth between the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and we came up with this amendment. I am glad we did.

There are other reforms in that report, **Tools for the Job**, that we possibly could look at. I hope we get around to that as well, Mr. Speaker, because there are other things in there that I think need addressing, not the least of

which, of course, is how members operate. As the heading for the report is Tools for the Job, give them the tools to do the job that they need to do on behalf of their constituents.

The member for Bonavista North, I know, is going through a pretty severe time right now, as he did before and, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, was one of the members who resigned to go back to his former profession. I want to watch my phrases here. I remember saying 'former profession' once before in the House a member tore across the House after me, and I meant no more by it then than I do now. But the hon. member for Bonavista North left the House of Assembly. He is a valued contributor to this House of Assembly, he contributes very well to the debates and to the questions and so on. I was sorry to see him go, and I am glad to see him back here. I hope the next election, of course, he does not have a lot of success, because we would like to defeat him at the polls, obviously, being partisan. But maybe he will reform, himself, and join another political party.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to get to what the Leader of the Opposition had to say last week with respect to his salary, and he is having a hard time. I would like to say that he drew a comparison that I do not think can be drawn. The Leader of the PC Party here gets a stipend from the PC Party, which is basically expenses on behalf of the party, and they determined that to be \$6,000 a year.

MR. TULK:  
From where?

MR. DINN:

From the PC Party.

I think that is reasonable. That is just a reasonable expense that the Premier, who happens to be Leader of the PC Party, gets on things as they relate to the PC Party. And I do not think that compares at all, I really do not think it compares at all to somebody coming in to be leader of a party and getting \$125,000 in the beginning and then, as his salary goes up as a result of him becoming a member of the House of Assembly and leader of the Opposition, the party thing going down, and it is still at somewhere around \$50,000. I think there is quite a difference here. I also believe that there is something radically wrong with that as a system, just as a member of the House of Assembly.

Now, the explanation for how the cheque arrives, I mean, we have to take what hon. members state as factual information, but I will say that I find it difficult.

The Leader of the Opposition said, 'I did not want to run for leadership of the Liberal Party.' One of the reasons was there was not enough money there. Apparently what happened was thousands of liberals approached him and said -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:  
Well, that is what he said, he is getting paid by thousands of people.

- thousands of Liberals approached him and said, 'Please run to be leader of the Liberal Party, because we have nobody else, and we will pay you \$125,000, if that

is what it takes for you to be leader.

Now, I really do have difficulty with that as a proposition. Four or five people might have approached the Leader of the Opposition and said that, but I am sure not thousands; not all contributors to the Liberal Party decided that since we are contributors we are all going to go to him now, because he is the Messiah, and ask him if he will run to be leader of the Liberal Party and we will pay him \$125,000 a year.

We have to believe his word in this House - I do not question his word in this House - but I do not think that is how it happened. I have to say that I do not think that that is the way it was. I think maybe four or five people went to him and said, Would you be leader of the Liberal Party? And he said, No, they do not pay enough money for that job, it is only \$70,000, and it is not even that. The leader of the Liberal Party gets nothing. Well, what is your price? My price is \$125,000 minimum. Or, we might have to negotiate it back and forth, him with the four or five people. That is probably what happened, and finally they agreed to \$125,000 and he said, Okay, as long as you will guarantee me \$125,000, I will take it. So, they did not tell him where the money was coming from, and he did not ask. As long as the four or five people said that they would see to it that he got the 125,000, he did not care where it came from, and he did not ask.

MR. TULK:  
(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:

I must be getting a little bit close to the picture, because the hon. the Opposition House Leader is now starting to quip across the House, chirrup across the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have little difficulty with that as a scenerio. I cannot see 1,000 or 2,000 people, if there are that many contributing to the Liberal Party, going to his door and saying, We will give you a hundred

MR. TULK:  
How many did you say?

MR. DINN:  
One thousand or two thousand. There might be that many people.

I cannot see that happening. I could see four or five individuals going to him and saying that, and that is probably what happened. And they probably had the money to back themselves up. They probably said, Look, we have the money. There is no money in the Liberal Party federally or provincially, and we owe bills, but we will see to it that you get yours. He probably will eventually get his, and it probably will not take too long. The federal leader is getting his now. The night of the long knives, they call it. Federally, it is happening in the Liberal Party, and I expect to have another night of the long knives in the Liberal party provincially, because they have had it about ten or fifteen times.

I have not been in the House that long, I am only a young fellow, but not too long back I remember the leader of the Liberal party in this House at the time, Mr. Roberts, came into the House of Assembly and the boys were talking about the Liberal Party and the

indication was that Mr. Roberts knifed poor Mr. Smallwood in the back, kicked him out and became leader of the Liberal party.

I do not agree with that, because what Mr. Roberts did was he won the leadership -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Fair and square.

MR. DINN:  
- at an open convention. Fair and square he won the leadership. We had a succession of people after that.

MR. TULK:  
What is your pay, Gerry?

MR. DINN:  
I do not know. I never look at money. I never try to find out, even. I just get it and I pay my bills. And I declare everything I own in my conflict of interest statement, which is fairly blank. There are not a lot of things in my conflict of interest statement.

MR. EFFORD:  
Whatever you are paid is (inaudible).

MR. DINN:  
That is what the hon. member says, but, then, there are not too many people in Newfoundland who believe the hon. member anymore. He has only been in here a few years and already his credibility is something to be questioned.

MR. CALLAN:  
What about this man here? He must be wealthy, with all those stores.

MR. DINN:  
I suppose. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, this bill is a good bill.

MR. J. CARTER:

It is not a good bill. It is sickening!

MR. DINN:  
The Leader of the Opposition in his feeble attempt to explain his salary - I think it was a feeble attempt, anyway - left a little to be desired. No thousands of people went to the leader's House and asked him to run, there were four or five who had the money and they said, If you will run, we will pay you.

Whether that is coming from those people directly or through the Liberal party, does not matter to me. It is still going there. Mr. Speaker, hon. members now want me to stop. I will not be too long. I probably will not take up all my time, which is strange for me, because I generally take up all the time I have allotted to me.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:  
Do not worry. There are a few people writing a few things down, if that is what the hon. member is wondering. There are.

Just to go through the scenario the Leader of the Opposition basically said that thousands of people came to him and asked him to run. He did not want to run, but they asked him to run and he eventually decided, I am not going to run, no. I do not want to be Leader of the Liberal Party because they do not pay enough. Then they dickered about price. He came out at \$125,000 and he said, 'Okay, you have me convinced,' and he eventually ran.

Mr. Speaker, then he says that all of these thousands of people who came and convinced him to run and



offered him \$125,000 now contribute to the Liberal Party and the Liberal Party doles out the little emoluments on a monthly basis. I do not know in what form he is given the money, but he does get the money. That kind of stretches even the credibility of the Leader of the Opposition, because most people in Newfoundland will not believe that. They believe it was four or five people who went and talked to him and they finally convinced him. They said, 'We have the dollars. Will you run?' He said, 'Yes.' From then on they dig down every once in a while and somehow throw the money into a pot and somebody gets that pot and divides it up and sends little cheques or little brown envelopes to the Leader of the Opposition. That is how it happens.

What comes out of that, then, from the point of view of the House of Assembly? For example, if I knew how exactly that was happening, I would stand up, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order in this House and raise the following: I would raise Standing Order 77. Hon. members should listen to Standing Order 77. Because if I find out how the hon. Leader of the Opposition is getting paid I am going to raise Standing Order 77 which says, "The offer of any money or other advantage to any member of this House, for the promoting of any matter whatsoever" - now he might be in here to promote the Liberal Party, I do not know, or he might be in here to promote something else - "depending or to be transacted in Parliament, is a high crime..." That is what Standing Order 77 says. I think, since he is not here, that somebody should point it out to him when they go down and have their caucus this week.

They should say, 'Here is Standing Order 77, Clyde, maybe you should read this and see what is going on here.'

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

It is a marvellous suggestion, and we undertake to point out that to the Leader of the Opposition and to other people in our caucus. We want, for his part, to point it out to the Premier. And if he is not sure why we are pointing it out, it is in relation to his scandalous dealings with the President of the Canadian Helicopters Corporation. So you point out Section 77 in that respect, will you?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, not only is there not a point of order, but the hon. member knows that the Premier gets nothing from Canadian Helicopters Corporation. He knows that. But we know that the Leader of the Opposition does get something. Our problem is we do not know. One person was offered something to go into the House, and another person was offered something to get out of the House and then do something. That is what your talking about, just to straighten up your point.

Now, Standing Order 78 says, "If it shall appear that any person hath been elected and returned a member of this House, or

endeavoured so to be, by bribery, or any other corrupt practices, this House shall proceed with the utmost severity..." - Standing Orders 77 and 78.

If we could find out for sure how that money is going and coming, we might bring up Standing Order 78, which is a very important Standing Order in this House. We cannot do it now because we do not know, and we do not do it here. We have to believe until we know. But we are endeavouring to find out. We want to know. He has not told us. If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would get up and tell us in the House - he said that thousands of people are doing it through donations to the Liberal Party.

MR. J. CARTER:  
That is shocking.

MR. DINN:  
Did thousands of people approach him? Is that how it was done? Or was it four or five people?

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

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

MR. FUREY:  
The Minister of Health said that the Premier's supplement comes from the PC purse. Now, I can only assume that thousands of people pay into that PC purse, or is it hundreds of people pay in? At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I will yield and say thousands of people pay into that purse.

Similarly, the Liberal Party have thousands who contribute to its purse and the lists are growing daily. Thousands of people from

all walks of life. So we accept as truthful the statement by the Minister of Health that thousands pay into the PC purse, and we only ask for equity here and fairness, that the minister accept our statement that thousands, indeed, do pay into the Liberal purse as well.

MR. J. CARTER:  
That is not a point of order.

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not have a lot of time, but I am just pursuing a couple of points. The Leader of the Opposition got up and made an explanation. I find it very, very difficult, and if I could find out the truth, then I might bring up those Standing Orders. I cannot, because I do not know. If he would tell me, then I would know.

Here he is. I know he has been listening.

MR. WELLS:  
I was up in the news gallery.

MR. DINN:  
Oh, where you? Forewarned is forearmed.

MR. WELLS:  
I was being interviewed. I was not listening.

MR. DINN:  
Do you want me to make the points again?

Some of the points I have been

making are -

MR. WARREN:

I think you should make some of them again.

MR. DINN:

Okay. I like to do it straight out. There are no backdoors or anything. I found it difficult listening to the Leader of the Opposition last week and his explanation. What he talked last week was \$50,000. But we have to go back to the beginning and talk about how it all started, and that is what we were talking about. I will take his word until I find out something different. But the conundrum that I have and the problems that I have with it, I have laid out fairly well here in the House.

Apparently the scenario is that the Leader of the Opposition did not want to run for the Liberal Party. 'I would like to, but they do not pay enough,' he said. He said, 'Now if they paid enough, I might run. So thousands of people went,' he says - I think it was four or five - 'thousands of people went and talked him into running and made different offers.' Maybe he said, 'I will run for \$125,000.' I do not know. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition said thousands of people contributed and, therefore, thousands of people must have asked him to take the job. I have difficulty with that. I would say four or five people went, maybe six.

MR. SIMMS:

Three, I think.

MR. DINN:

Three probably.

Anyway, they said, 'We will pay

\$125,000 if you run. We have nobody else.. There is nobody we can see who can be leader. The only leader we had, we are after giving him the knife.' That is the tenth or the eleventh now. 'So,' they said, 'we are looking for somebody else now.' He said, 'Well, that is a pretty risky job. We have had nine or ten or eleven of them. I would need at least \$125,000 just to stop the bleeding, in case they have a night of the long knives with me.' So they said, the four or five of them, 'We will give you \$125,000.' He said, 'Okay. On that basis, then, I will go.'

If that is how it happened and if that is how it is happening, then I said that I would have to look at Standing Order 77. Now, the Leader of the Opposition is versed in rules of debate and, of course, law, and maybe he will be able to interpret Standing Orders 77 and 78. I read it in the House and I will put it in the record for the hon. the Leader of the Opposition again if he wants to hear it. What does he think?

"The offer of any money or other advantage to any member of this House, for the promoting of any matter whatsoever, depending or to be transacted in Parliament, is a high crime..." it says here. Now, is he breaching Standing Order 77? Now, Standing Order 78 also says: "If it shall appear -

MR. SIMMONS:

(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:

My, God, he is getting better at figures, Mr. Speaker. The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage is getting really good at figures now. He was not very good a few

years back, but he is getting right good now. He knows 78 comes after 77 and everything. He would be wise to use that now in his ciphering before the end of April. In his ciphering he would want to know about 77 and 78.

Standing Order 78 says, "If it shall appear that any person hath been elected and returned a member of the House, or endeavoured so to be, by bribery" - I do not know if he was bribed. Did you offer him \$125,000 to run, or did you offer him \$125,000 to be leader? It is hard to say - "or any other corrupt practices, this House shall proceed with the utmost severity against all such persons..." That is serious stuff. We are talking about the basic rules of the House of Assembly. It has not been explained to my satisfaction yet by the Leader of the Opposition. He tried to slough it off by saying, 'Well, the Premier is getting \$6,000 that the P.C. Party is paying him for expenses.' To his \$125,000 and now \$50,000, I do not think it compares at all. It is not the same thing. It is not even in principle the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, I think that these things are still on the public conscience, on the public mind. They are not going to go away. People will ask these questions until the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will destroy himself like the other leaders of the Opposition we have had, the dozen or so that we have had since 1972. Mr. Speaker, it is not going to go away. It is a serious thing and I think that it is incumbent on the Leader of the Opposition to answer those questions.

He is going to have to answer them

one of these days, anyway, because what will happen is the boys on the other side will get a little bit fed up with him one of these days, when he does not perform, and if what we have seen over the past few months as his performance is what he is going to do for the next while, they are going to get upset with him pretty quick. And when that happens, whether he tells how it happened or not, they will. They will get so upset that they will spill the beans on the Leader of the Opposition, the jig will be up then and people will know. There is another Leader of the Opposition who will die a quick death.

I remember Mr. Roberts made a few quips across the House when he was Leader of the Opposition and I was making a few remarks and I told him to beware of the night of the long knives, as a matter of fact. A good fellow, by the way, a great parliamentarian. He is a real sharp individual. I am surprised, as a matter of fact, that he goes on once a week or once a month defending the Liberal Party still.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:  
The School of Hard Knocks was not the school that he attended. Silver Spoon School, I think, is what it was.

Anyway, that is neither here nor there. We cannot knock a fellow for the way he was raised, it is how he turns out.

MR. TULK:  
(Inaudible) speech.

MR. DINN:  
Yes. Well, I could send my speech out to the hon. member's district.

MR. TULK:  
I will send it out tomorrow.

MR. DINN:  
Will you? Okay. How many would you want?

MR. TULK:  
There are 3,300 out there, I believe.

MR. DINN:  
Thirty-three hundred for the hon. member. I will if I can get the Pages to do that.

As a matter of fact, the Pages will do that for the hon. member if he will pay the postage. I do not see why he cannot do it himself. I know that he would be interested in it. He will probably get it and read it night after night, because I know as the Opposition House Leader he will want to keep up on the rules of the House.

MR. TULK:  
I need some copies.

MR. DINN:  
Yes. Well, you might need something. You are going to need a new leader, I think, before too long. I do not know how you are going to get rid of this one, but you got rid of nine or ten in your time. You did them all pretty good. They all got their just deserts in one way or another, but there is probably no one who will deserve it more. When the night of the long knives comes for the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans, there is probably no one who will deserve it more. I know that is coming, and he knows. He has a \$125,000 insurance policy which is not going to help him when that night comes.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few

remarks, I want to say this to finish up: I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, when he gets another opportunity in the House, should not try to cloud the issues, he should get up and tell the people how it is actually happening so that they will believe him. And when they do, who knows? He may be Leader of the Opposition this time next year, Mr. Speaker. If he is in the House at all, he is going to be in Opposition a long time.

So, with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the House. The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage has to go out and do a little ciphering now. I do not know if he has got it done yet this year, but he should get out and do it because the feds are sticky, as the hon. member knows.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Are you supporting the amendments?

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker, if he was here for the whole time I was speaking, he would know that I supported the amendments as very good amendments to The Internal Economy Commission Act. The hon. the House Leader was out for a while. I will clue up my remarks now. The Leader of the Opposition will, no doubt, get a copy of Hansard tomorrow and go through it to see if he can figure out a way to get himself out of this box, this corner that he has painted himself into, Mr. Speaker. He is going to have to do it, and he is probably going to have to do it before the House closes this year. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before I recognize the member for St. John's North, we have three questions for **The Late Show**, the first is from the hon. member for St. John's East. "I am not satisfied with the answers given by the Minister of the Environment, and the Minister of Forestry concerning the fenitrothion spray program." The second that the hon. member for Bay de Verde -

MR. EFFORD:  
Port de Grave.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Port de Grave. I am sorry. I am very sorry. "I am not satisfied with the answer given to my questions by the Ministers of Social Services." The third question is again from the same hon. member from the same hon. district. "I am not satisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Health." Those will be the three questions.

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

MR. J. CARTER:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:  
A point of order.

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

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker, my point of order was that I had risen to stand to participate in the debate and I understand it is the tradition and custom of the House to go back and forth. We just had a Minister from the government side speak and the Speaker went back to the government side. I would just beg for an opportunity to make an

intervention at this point. I do not intend to use a full half hour, by the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER:  
There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker. You have to be reasonably fast on your pins in this House.

MR. LONG:  
I was up before you were.

MR. J. CARTER:  
If you are going to be like a snail, then that is what happens. I would assure the hon. member I do not intend to be very long either, so if he gives way to me, he will not have long to wait.

MR. SPEAKER (Parsons):  
To that point of order, the Chair did look on both sides of the House as the hon. Minister of Mines had finished and he did not see anyone rise from his place. The first one to rise was the hon. member for St. John's North. The second person to rise was the hon. member for St. John's East.

I recognize the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:  
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

He must have been daydreaming about a visit to the Soviet Union or something.

Mr. Speaker, I find this bill very, very objectionable, and for the following reasons. There are four ways that you can spend money. You can spend your own money on your self, in which case you try and get reasonable value, you shop around. You can perhaps

spend your own money on someone else, in which case you are not quite as careful. It is probably a gift you are trying to give someone. As long as you get something for them, it does not really matter what, you feel you have gotten your money's worth. Or you can spend someone else's money on yourself. You may be fairly careful how you spend it, but you like to spend as much as you possibly can, or you can spend someone else's money on someone else, in that case you do not give a damn.

MR. EFFORD:

That is unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, it is unparliamentary.

MR. J. CARTER:

It is parliamentary, Mr. Speaker, and I will defend it. A dame is a small Austrian coin named after Maria Theresa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

And to say I do not give a damn, spelled d-a-m-n, is quite parliamentary.

As far as I am concerned, the Internal Economy Commission should consist of, Speaker, Deputy Speaker, a member of Executive Council, and perhaps, and only perhaps, one member of the Opposition, perhaps just a token member of the Opposition. I do not think I would even mildly object to a member of the Opposition, I suppose for reason sake, as long as he would guarantee to keep quiet and be there as just a watch dog, with emphasis on the word 'dog.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER:

Otherwise it is just an invitation to gut the Treasury. That is all it is, an invitation to gut the Treasury, just legalized piracy, that is all this bill is, legalized piracy, because I know very well how much the Opposition would like to have spent on their quarters, spent on their salaries, spent on their trips, and spent on their expense accounts. I know what it is like and I think it is crazy.

Since being in this House and before I have always counselled restraint, and I would like to think that perhaps by being here I have saved quite a few dollars over the years.

We are not a wealthy Province. We do not have a lot of money to spend on foolishness and the kind of things that the Opposition wants money spent on is just crazy, crazy.

I have no objection to legitimate out of pocket expenses, and I did go to the trouble when the committee was meeting on government expenses, members opposite will confirm this, -

MR. SIMMONS:

Has Napoleon reached Moscow yet?

MR. J. CARTER:

- that legitimate expenses, I have no trouble with, but just figuring out ways to cut the Treasury, I think it is shocking. I really do.

I really suggest that we should, in this case, Mr. Speaker, - I think I can sum up what I am trying to say - we should observe the golden rule, he who has the gold, makes the rules. So there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. sook can speak.

MR. BAIRD:

He is rushin'.

MR. LONG:

Thanks also to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) for such a kind word. I just have no choice at times but to plead my case to try and get some time here to speak. I thought the member for St. John's North might make a long speech on issues that I am sure are very close to his heart. In any case, he was brief and I will also be brief before we get to the late show this afternoon.

I want to talk a bit about the bill that is in front of us on the Internal Economy Commission and say, by way of opening comments, that I think I would like to make a personal note of congratulations to the fine initiative and good work that was made the the Leader of my party in bringing forward a proposal to the Premier on a number of occasions through correspondence in the last couple of years, to call on the government to take action such as we have seen in the form of the bill that has been presented to us.

The member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) demonstrated in the case of calling the Premier's attention to the fact that we are the only provincial jurisdiction in Canada that did not have opposition membership on the Internal Economy Commission. The member for Menihek demonstrated one more time his foresight and clarity on issues relating to the operations of the House. I would say, Mr. Speaker, the perspective of the member for Menihek, having been a leader of one party and been a single representative or member for that one party for two full sittings of the House is a perspective that brings a unique view to this Chamber from one who has had great difficulty in establishing a certain presence, not only in the Chamber, but also in establishing some rights and privileges as the member of the House in terms of the provision of services and the basic protection of a member of the House of Assembly, who happens to be sitting alone as one member of a party.

In the last year, of course, the situation of the member for Menihek has changed and not there are two of us. I think it was a significant development in the history of this Legislature when the Speaker a year ago brought forward a ruling to officially recognize the New Democratic Party as a third group, a third caucus within the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that in the short time since I have been here I have also come to experience the frustration that brought the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) to a position where he was appealing to the Premier of the Province to establish an Internal Economy Commission with



Opposition representation.

The difficulties that we have had in making clear for all members of the House our status as a party, having been recognized as a third group, is something that we experience both in the daily proceedings of business in the House, but more importantly it is something that we experience outside the Chamber itself in trying to conduct our business as a third party and to represent the many people who have sent us here, both the people of Menihek and the people of St. John's East.

It is has been clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is very difficult to function as a member of the House in trying to - as the Leader of the official Opposition says, discharge ones duties, when one does not know to whom one must appeal for basic support in carrying out ones duties.

Mr. Speaker, we have in the past had on occasion a need to appeal to the Speaker through the Internal Economy Commission for basic services and necessary supplies to run our caucus office and have, on those occasions, received an answer to an appeal for support that was simply expressed in terms of, 'No, your request cannot be met and your request has been denied.'

Mr. Speaker, we have not been able to have any access any deliberation that may have happened within the Internal Economy Commission that might have produced such a determination by the Speaker that we would not be allowed the services and supplies that we have requested for our office. We have no indication of any rationale or explanation or arguments that might have been

made in our favour or considerations that might have been made by members of the committee that would have produced such a response from the Speaker to any requests we make.

We have been for some time, and still are, quite in the dark and we do not believe that is a fair way to conduct the business of the people of this Province when the House of Assembly should be seen as an entity independent of any political affairs or any department of government.

The business of the House of Assembly is something that should be seen in a non-partisan way and something that should be carried out in a non-partisan way. That is essentially the purpose of an Internal Economy Commission, to provide an independent mechanism which will govern the activities of the Chamber and all hon. members of the House of Assembly from all sides.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a positive response from the Premier in bringing forward this bill that will allow for Opposition representation, but unfortunately it leaves us, as the third caucus, in exactly the same position that forced us to make representation for this legislation. The legislation does not guarantee that our caucus will have representation on the commission.

The Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) when he spoke in the debate said that he thought the representatives of the official Opposition would go about their business in appointments to this commission in a fair way and through a flip of a coin would make sure that both opposition parties were represented.

Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, I had to laugh at that. I had already been having a laugh at the idea that this is fair to all members of the House, to suggest that we flip a coin and in that way we will produce a fair result in which the interests of all members of the House of Assembly will be represented on this commission.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a shameful way for members to suggest that the House of Assembly should conduct its internal business by tossing a coin. If it happens that we in the third party are cut out as a result of that, well, so be it.

Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough for us. We are very concerned. The business of this Internal Commission is very important to all individual members and to all parties in the House, and we are quite concerned. As a member who represents a district in St. John's, I do not have the same kinds of difficulties that the member for Menihek would have.

In the case, Mr. Speaker, of the Commission defining rules and regulations governing allowances to be made for members from outside of town, what we have is a situation, Mr. Speaker, in which this Commission, if we are not present for those deliberations, will determine what allowances will be set and what rules and regulations will be defined to govern those allowances. Because there is no provision in the bill to bring forward the minutes of these discussions, to bring forward the minutes of any meetings held by this Commission, we will not have access to the information that will be

determined. So we could, as the member for Menihek suggested the other day, be put in a position where we may compromise our position as members of the House and find ourselves in violation of regulations that are established by the Internal Economy Commission without even knowing so.

Mr. Speaker, we are presenting two amendments, which we will do during the final reading, during Committee stage, to the bill. The first amendment, as the member for Menihek has read into the record, is to call for representation by all recognized groups within the House, and the second amendment is to call for the minutes of the meetings of the Commission to be either tabled in the House or in some way made public.

Mr. Speaker, that is a basic appeal to the government and to the House to ensure that we, as members of a third caucus, are protected by the business that this Commission will carry out, by the decisions that it makes and the rules and regulations that it determines, Mr. Speaker. We are quite concerned that we may be placed in a compromising situation where, because there are no minutes, because we will not have guaranteed membership on the Commission, we will not know what the Commission is setting out as rules and guidelines. We could be in the position where we might be in violation of rules governing the activities of Members of the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I would also say that both amendments reflect our own analysis of the situation of Legislatures and their internal governing committees across the country. The member for Menihek read into the record the other day

a survey that was carried out by the Canadian Legislatures publication, a publication of the Government of Ontario, which showed that all Legislatures in the country have Opposition representation of all groups on their internal boards or committees or internal commissions.

The Government House Leader may not be as clear, I am not sure if this particular article has been brought to his attention, but my reading of what is in this article on the Canadian Legislatures shows that all governing committees of all Legislatures in some form or other bring the minutes of their meetings, the minutes of the discussions that determine the rules and guidelines governing members, forward to the Legislature or publish them and make them available to the public.

Mr. Speaker, according to the survey, every single one of them in the Canadian Legislatures one way or the other make the deliberations of their internal boards public record. If they do not publish it in a public way, then all these commissions across the country are obliged to table reports of their meetings to the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, what we are calling for is quite consistent with the initiative that the member for Menihek undertook in the beginning, the initiative of the member for Menihek which brought forward this legislation. The Premier responded in a positive way. But the member for Menihek is also being very consistent in calling for legislation that would only make sense if it does two things. One is to guarantee representation to all recognized

groups within the House and the other is to ensure that the minutes of any meetings of the Commission would be tabled in the House.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of issues that have been raised in this debate concerning ethics in government and ethics in politics in this Province at this point in our history. I would say there are many outstanding questions which I am sure we will hear more debate on.

One issue I would like to speak to, which I think might be the subject of some discussion in the Internal Economy Commission of this House, is a further consideration of the status of the third party.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, there has been much debate about the required or needed or possible salary levels for Leaders of parties in the House, both the Leader of the Government Party and the Leader of the Official Opposition Party.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, at this point - perhaps it is a kind of personal intervention that I would like to make - having worked with the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) and joined him after he had been Leader of our party for six years, Leader of the party in the Legislature of two years, and now Leader of an officially recognized group for the last year and a half, that there is a question, Mr. Speaker, of the ability, the capacity of the Leader of the New Democratic Party in this Province to, as the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Wells) says, to discharge his duties, given the current level of remuneration. Mr. Speaker, I

would like to argue in this debate that the leader of a third party, the Leader of the New Democratic Party in this House, is not the same as any other individual member of the House of Assembly but, in fact, carries particular, unique and special duties as a leader of a recognized group in the House and as a leader of a party that is gaining momentum and growing all of the time in this Province.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the Internal Economy Commission would be well served to consider the question of remuneration for leaders of parties in the House. But, Mr. Speaker, from our point of view, certainly from my point of view, it would make very little sense to make a suggestion that the Internal Economy Commission consider whether the leader of a third party might be entitled to extra remuneration if there is no representation from that party sitting in on those discussions.

What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is there are some fundamental contradictions in the internal logic of the legislation as is proposed. If the Internal Economy Commission is able to do the job that the legislation is defining for it, then it must include representation from all recognized groups in the House. We, for our part, do not look forward to the establishment of an Internal Economy Commission with Opposition representation that would be dealing with the position of the two members of this recognized group in the House without having us present. It makes very little sense and it is cause for great concern, Mr. Speaker, that we might have issues raised in that Commission concerning the level of salary for the leader of the third

party, or indeed, Mr. Speaker, we might have questions raised on - I am sure the Commission would consider it - requests in the future for assistance for our caucus office.

For example, Mr. Speaker, we believe that at this point in history with modern technology being what it is that in our modest caucus office, such as it is, with only two members of the House of Assembly, we could make good use of a word processor to allow members of the House of Assembly, as individuals and as caucuses to conduct their business, to represent their constituents with the aid of modern technology.

Mr. Speaker, if we were to make such a request to the Internal Economy Commission we would have no way of knowing what kind of debate would happen within the Commission as to the merits or the de-merits of such an idea. We think that that would be a very important and interesting discussion for the Internal Economy Commission to carry out. But we would, under the rules of this legislation, be deprived of an opportunity to make representation to the Commission on our own behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take too much more time, just a couple of more minutes. I want to conclude by saying that if we are not able to have some movement in this legislation, the way it is presented, if we are not able to have our amendments successfully adopted, then we are going to continuously be in a position of rising on points of order and even making our appeals public for some more respect to be shown to the members of the third caucus, as

recognized by the Speaker, that we are not being given the full opportunity and the respect and space to carry out our duties that we have been sent here to do.

The people of St. John's East and the people of Menihek, Mr. Speaker, will not be well served by the business of the Internal Economy Commission if we do not have representation on that Commission from the third party.

That is a very important point of principle, Mr. Speaker, and that is what I would like to particularly impress upon the Government House Leader. By way of closing, that is the essential principle that the member for Menihek and myself are bringing to this debate.

In order to adequately and properly serve the interests of the people of St. John's East and Menihek, we must be guaranteed representation on this Commission so as not to compromise our ability to know what rules govern us and, also, to not compromise our ability to function as members of the House of Assembly and as members of a third party in this Province which is growing every day, day by day, and gaining momentum.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that members of both other parties in the House should give serious consideration before the adoption of such legislation. It may not be long before we, in this party, are in a different position sitting in this Chamber in terms of the numbers of seats, and that members on the government side and, indeed, members of the official Opposition should take care to consider what position they may find themselves in come

the next election and when the House of Assembly prorogues and reconvenes, to examine the seating arrangement that they might find in the House of Assembly and the possibility that, at some point in the future, members of the government party or of the official Opposition might find themselves in exactly the same position that the member for Menihek and myself find ourselves in now, which is to call for basic measures of representation and protection of our rights and privileges.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will allow the government members to respond.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
If the hon. minister speaks now, he will close the debate.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to say a few concluding remarks in this debate. I must say that the normal practice for a minister, if he introduces a piece of legislation, is to take notes as the debate progresses of points that are raised and matters that are brought up related to the bill. Other than what was said on this side, by members on this side, I really have nothing to respond to, very little to respond to.

However, the question of who should make up the new Internal Economy Commission, and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long), I just heard him as he concluded, talked about how the people from Menihek will not be well served if somebody from his party are not represented on the Internal Economy Commission. I honestly think that is really stressing it a tiny little bit. As a matter of fact, the member for Menihek has already told the people of Menihek that he does not want to represent them any more, so I am not sure if being represented on the IEC will make any difference in that respect.

I did have a chance to briefly talk to the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Fenwick). I believe he mentioned it when he spoke earlier in the debate about a couple of amendments that he proposes. Just so that he will not be waiting with baited breath or anything for the respond of the government to it, I can indicate to him now that we will not be supporting either of them.

The amendment with respect to the minutes, our proposal is that we would refer that question to the Internal Economy Commission and let them make the decision and the recommendation. If they so decide, fine. It really is not a big deal. But we would prefer for

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible.)

MR. SIMMS:  
Not everybody in the House can be on the Internal Economy Commission.

MR. LONG:  
We would like to know.

MR. SIMMS:  
Know what?

MR. LONG:  
Whatever it is. (Inaudible) published in the minutes, we will not even know that.

MR. SIMMS:  
Oh, yes, you will. I can guarantee you -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:  
I will give the member the assurance that if the newly structured Internal Economy Commission decides to publish the minutes, we will inform the hon. member for sure. In terms of amending the legislation for that purpose, no.

The other question is the question about where there are two Opposition caucuses. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very interesting point. The hon. members down in the corner, often, often say that they are recognized as a caucus in the House of Assembly.

I recall Your Honour's ruling when that infamous incident occurred and I believe Your Honour ruled that the hon. members would have the right to respond to Ministerial Statements. I do not recall Your Honour ruling, 'They are officially a caucus; they are officially a party' or anything.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Yes.

MR. SIMMS:  
No, he did not. He ruled that the hon. members could respond to a Ministerial Statement. That is a far cry. I am -

MR. LONG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

Hon. member, I only have thirty seconds. I withdraw, okay? He said it. Okay?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order.

MR. SIMMS:

In the thirty seconds I have left -

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:

The Government House Leader is standing up and misrepresenting a very important ruling that the Speaker of the House made and I would appeal to the Speaker to set the record straight, if the Government House Leader does not take the time to check the record himself on what, to us, is a very important ruling.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. The hon. the President of Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Exactly. But, Mr. Speaker, since he interrupted my train of thought, I am going to adjourn the debate and finish it up on the next day, because there are a few

other points I want to make. Perhaps I will get back to that particular issue.

Since it is 5:30, I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The debate is adjourned by the hon. the President of the Council.

Debate on the Adjournment  
[Late Show]

MR. SPEAKER:

There are three questions for the Late Show. The first one is by the hon. member for St. John's East to the hon. the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Forestry. I do not know who it is addressed to, or which minister. It is concerning the spray programme.

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure either who on the government side, which of the ministers, would like to take the opportunity to speak to this very important issue. Perhaps between themselves, the Minister of Forest Resources can rise to the occasion or the Minister responsible for the protection of the environment could speak to it. If the member for Conception Bay South, as former Minister of the Environment, would like to have a few words, then by all means.

The issue, Mr. Speaker, is a very important one. I was surprised to see yesterday, when I asked my question concerning the

publication of a report that was commissioned by the government's own forest management people and by the Canadian Forestry Service, that the Minister of Environment (Mr. Russell) essentially would not the responsibility for the contents of the report and did not really want to comment on the questions I was raising about the spray, the application of fenitrothion, versus Bt.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Environment if he would advise the House on what position he might be taking on this important matter in his consultation with the Minister responsible for Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. FENWICK:

Forest Resources. He has lost the Lands.

MR. LONG:

Oh, he has lost his Lands, okay, along with a few other things.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Environment declined comment and deferred to the Minister of Forest Resources, and I believe was, in fact, wanting me to put my question to the Minister of Forest Resources.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the reason I put my question to the Minister of the Environment is that I believe that this is essentially an environmental issue and that the Minister for the Environment is sometimes a minister responsible for promoting other priorities of government, be it industrial projects or the causes of certain proponent interest groups. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister for the Environment does not always see his role as being the minister responsible for the protection of

our environment.

I believe that the issue of the continued use of the fenitrothion chemical agent is a very serious environmental issue. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we do not need me to bring that concern to the House of Assembly. For a number of years we have had wildlife groups, salmon fishermen, environmentally conscience individuals in this Province, bringing forward the evidence that has been accumulated all throughout North America, the United States, other provinces of Canada, and, indeed, in this Province, that the chemical fenitrothion is a dangerous substance to be letting loose in our environment.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister for Forest Resources eventually got up and talked about this year there being an expansion of the application of the biological agent Bt. I was surprised at his response because I understood he gave a different answer yesterday than when he was asked in the Estimates Committee only a week or so ago a similar question. He said that the agent Bt would be used on a much larger scale. It would represent one-third of the spray being applied this year and it there two-third fenitrothion.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forest Resources said that it would be 25 per cent. So we have gone from one third to one quarter of the application of Bt in a couple of weeks. That, of course, Mr. Speaker, has to raise questions about the commitment of the government, the commitment of the Department of Forestry, which is responsible for the spray programme, to increase, beyond a simple test programme, the application of Bt.



Mr. Speaker, if we have a report that has been given to government that shows that Bt is quite effective where it has been sprayed, and in fact can be shown to be more effective than fenitrothion, I do not see any reason why the government is unable to extend in a substantial way the use of the spray Bt. It seems that the scientists and the people who carry with them natural concerns about the effect of fenitrothion on the environment are strongly recommending, because of the dangers of fenitrothion, the use of Bt.

Mr. Speaker, I just have a few seconds to clue up here and I would offer, again, a challenge to the Minister of Forest Resources (Mr. R. Aylward) and to the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Russell) that every single independent group, agency or individual who has considered this question is calling on the government to reduce and begin to curtail to a point of elimination the application of fenitrothion.

If the only reason why this government is not able to move toward a full application of a biological agent which has proven to be sensitive to the environment, if the only reason is because the forest companies, Mr. Speaker, are not willing to pay their share of the increased costs, then that is shameful, inexcusable and unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

MR. FENWICK:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

It amazes me, Mr. Speaker, for a person who gets five minutes to elaborate on a question that he was not satisfied with, I counted six times that he was completely wrong in the five minutes he was talking.

'Every independent group recommends against fenitrothion,' that is one statement that he made, which is a very serious one. There was a Royal Commission set up on forestry which recommended the use of chemical sprays including fenitrothion. The Pesticides Advisory Board also, last year, recommended the use of fenitrothion.

Mr. Speaker, fact, and the most important fact of all is that there is one chemical registered in Canada to use against the hemlock looper. The fact is that we are spraying against the hemlock looper.

MR. FENWICK:

How can you use one third Bt?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the first fact is that we are spraying for the hemlock looper and there is one chemical registered to use in that spray programme which is fenitrothion. It is used in Quebec, it is used in New Brunswick, it has been used in Nova Scotia, and is continuing to be used in Quebec and New Brunswick even this year, Mr. Speaker.

We had a temporary permit last year to experiment with Bt, never found before to be effective with hemlock looper. Last year we experimented with two or three

different types of Bt. We strengthened it with Diapel 176, I believe was the actual name of it, under scientific conditions, very well controlled and it was very successful.

Mr. Speaker, what we want to do this year is get, again, a temporary registration, if that is necessary, because we do not have a full registration of the Bt, we want a temporary registration to put 25 per cent of our spray programme - 90,000 hectares are going to be sprayed - some 20,000 of it will be sprayed with Bt and we want to see if we can go from the controlled environment that we used last year and get the same type of results in a commercial spray programme this year. Mr. Speaker, we are hoping that we can so that we can increase the use of Bt in our forests.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member also said that I said in the Estimates Committee that we will be spraying one third of our programme with Bt. Mr. Speaker, this is completely and absolutely wrong. The socialists in this House have their hands stuck in their ears. When they want to hear something that is convenient to them they will hear it. I said the companies pay and the spray programme goes one third, one third, one third. That is the cost of the spray programme, Mr. Speaker. We will be spraying up to 25 per cent, between 11 and 25 per cent is actually what I said, I believe, in the Estimates Committee. We are planning to go as much as 25 per cent in this year's spray programme, Mr. Speaker.

The report that came in last year on the effect on wildlife in the area. His statement was that

every group says that there is a negative effect on birds, salmon, and fish and other flies and insects, Mr. Speaker. The study that has been done over the past two years, and will continue this year, Mr. Speaker, shows point plank that the evidence is inconclusive that there are any major effects. There are effects, yes. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the only dead songbirds that were found last year were the five or six that they shot to see if they had depression in their mind from the spray programme. If I was being shot at, I would probably have a little bit of depression in my brain.

That is the findings last year, Mr. Speaker. One spray they found so much depression in the birds, the second spray they found less depression. So, how can you say that that has any correlation, Mr. Speaker? We are doing more studies this year to see what the effects are on some songbirds and other aspects of the environment, Mr. Speaker.

My department is working very closely with the Department of the Environment and will continue to do so. We will do everything in our power, Mr. Speaker, to protect the 25,000 jobs that are affected by the forest in this programme and we will do everything we can to stop the damage that is occurring to our forests in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, there are 25,000 jobs directly or indirectly affected by the forest in this Province and we are having a hard enough time supplying enough trees to the different users right now, because we are finding increasing demands every year for the use of our forests and we do not need them

killed off by budworm or hemlock looper.

The major concern with the hemlock looper, Mr. Speaker, is that the trees will die two years after the attack. At least with the budworm, we had five, six, or seven years to try to salvage it. After two years of a hard hemlock looper infestation, Mr. Speaker, the trees will be good for nothing.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

I now call on the hon. member for Port de Grave who is not satisfied with the answer given to him by the Minister of Social Services on the poverty level.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to draw the Minister of Social Services attention to what I am about to say. I would have preferred not having to do this this afternoon because I would have expected the Minister of Social Services would be aware of the situation with the children of this Province and with the many, many families in the Province from the numerous times this Opposition party, in the last three years, have brought it to his attention.

It is not something that we on this side or any member of this hon. House of Assembly takes any pride in bringing out in public and nor should we have to, because when we have twenty-two and a half cabinet positions in this government you would think that each minister would be able to represent and to run his

department and to protect and to look after the priorities and needs of the people of this Province, not so with the Minister of Social Services.

It is a bit disappointing actually because when he became minister he gave a very clear message, Mr. Speaker, that he would, with his background in social services, with his experience in politics, that he knew the problems with the social services recipients in this Province and he would, with all of his energy and his background, change things and make things better.

Newfoundland is certainly behind the rest of Canada in almost every aspect and it is due to the administration that we have had for the last, I suppose, seventeen years. But there comes a point in time when someone has got to recognize how serious this situation is.

When the Minister of Social Services rises to his feet, it is no good for him to get up and be critical and start attacking me. I am not attacking him. I am trying to point out how serious this situation is. I should not have to do this. When he was appointed Minister of Social Services, he assumed the responsibility for the social needs of all the people in this Province.

When we received a report, Mr. Speaker, yesterday which shows we had 27 per cent of the children of this Province living in poverty, then there is definitely something wrong. Our 27 per cent is compared to the rest of Canada's 16 per cent. There is something desperately wrong with the Department of Social Services.

What made it even more shocking, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that the Minister of Social Services did not know the figures nationally, or provincially. That is a very serious situation, when we have to have the national Welfare Council to point out to the Department of Social Services of this Province how serious the situation actually is.

When we look at how much money is being spent in salaries in the Department of Social Services, we are talking about some \$60 million plus, salaries that are being paid out to the Department of Social Services, and we have to look at the situation where somebody from another province has got to be brought in to say, 'Look, Newfoundland, at the children in Newfoundland and 27 per cent are living below the poverty line.'

The minister very clearly is going to stand to his feet and talk about the programmes that are being reinstated in his Department over the last twelve to fifteen years. He is going to talk about the community development programmes and, no doubt, at the beginning, when those community development programmes were initiated in his department, they probably were the best at the time.

It should have been looked at as a trial basis, but the minister and all of his officials and all of his staff knows full well that they are not the answer to the situation in Social Services in this Province. That is just not the answer.

There is no way you can take somebody, put them into the workforce for ten weeks, earning \$200 a week, at \$5 an hour, then after the ten weeks, they go back

on unemployment insurance, where they receive approximately \$120 to \$125 a week. During the waiting period, between the community development programme and their unemployment insurance, they are three to four, five weeks, whatever it takes, they are without any money.

Then, they go on the unemployment insurance where, because they have just come out of a job development programme, they have assumed a total bill, they have to go back and try to get the department to pay their rent, and to pay other subsidies that they have lost since they dropped from \$200 a week down to \$125 a week. And that takes another six or seven weeks.

The situation is not only the fact that the financial means is not there in those jobs, what is needed in this Province, what is needed in the Department of Social Services, is to develop a programme to train people to get off the dependency on Social Services, and to get into the work force on their own.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:  
That quick, Mr. Speaker?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman gets up in the House and tries to speak as some sort of an expert on Social Services programmes and he clues up by saying we should have some sort of training mechanism

put in place.

I do not know where the hon. gentleman has been all the time, Mr. Speaker. We have several training programmes in place in this Province. As a matter of fact, it was only recently we had over in Fortune, Mr. Speaker, over in my colleague's district from Grand Bank, we had a big major training programme this year. It was only a few weeks ago myself and my colleague were down in Fortune dealing with that training programmes. As a matter of fact, it has been very, very effective.

Just recently, we were out to visit another major training programme we are involved in with one of the organizations here in St. John's in terms of training people for day care facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman gets up and he condemns the Community Development Programme. I find it somewhat strange that the hon. gentleman can come in here and say everything is bad about the Community Development Programme when some of his colleagues are looking to me to try to get some additional development programmes approved in their constituencies. I suggest that the caucus get together over there and decide on where they are coming from as it relates to the programmes.

The hon. gentleman said that I was going to get up and attack him. I can say to the hon. gentleman that I have never attacked anyone personally in this House. I have attacked policies, but when it comes to dealing with personalities, Mr. Speaker, I am not there, that is where his leader is.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, no, no.

MR. TOBIN:

No, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact some of your colleagues just recently said to me that I am not one who attacks people personally in the House and I challenge anyone there to prove otherwise that I have ever said anything personal to any member over there. I have dealt with issues, Mr. Speaker, but I have never, ever dealt with anything personal. I say that here and nobody over there can prove otherwise. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells) is the expert in personalities, Mr. Speaker, and it does not auger very well for him either.

As it relates to what is happening. I say again what I said yesterday. We in this Province got to get control over our own destiny. We have to be able to deal with the - as the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), Mr. Speaker, mentioned here today as it relates to the poverty line, the people who are living below the poverty line, we are conscious, Mr. Speaker, as a people, I guess, in the Province of what the situation is. But we are doing the best available to us with the resources that we have available. Until such time that we can get control over our resources and get the finances available to us, that we deserve, Mr. Speaker, do you think this government and the people of Newfoundland would not like to have Hibernia going a long time ago?

Let us face it, how often in this House when I came here first did we see resolutions going? Did we see the Liberal Party not

supporting the Province in terms of trying to get Hibernia going? Did we see the Federal Newfoundland M.Ps. in Ottawa, the Liberal M.Ps. siding with the Chretiens and the Lalondes? Did we see the Leader of the Opposition, the legal lawyer acting on behalf of these people, the federal Liberal government, to try and deprive Newfoundlanders the right to their resources?

If we had that type of funding available to us, we would be able to do the things that need to be done in the social programmes of this Province. As a government we want to do it. We are going a long ways towards doing it. As I said so often, we have increased our budget in the Department of Social Services by 159 per cent, Mr. Speaker, since 1979. That is a very significant increase.

This year, Mr. Speaker, there is approximately I think \$20 million increase in the budget to address our various programmes in each division. Each division will receive, Mr. Speaker, additional funding.

As it relates to the \$60 million that is in the budget, Mr. Speaker, that we are paying for salary which the hon. gentleman said, I believe, he said, in excess of \$60 million -

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman asked the question and now he does not want to listen to the answer.

We do have a very competent staff. As a matter of fact, there is somewhere in the area of 1,000 people working for the Department of Social Services, some very capable and able people, and we are trying to address it.

The fact of the matter is, is that as a government and as a Department of Social Services we are trying to do what needs to be done and what we can do with the resources that are available to us.

Thank God, Mr. Speaker, for the Leadership of the Premier of this Province since 1979. Things may begin to happen. We may get control of our destiny. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that is his dream. It is the dream of this government that we can have, Mr. Speaker, the funding put in place so we can do with the social programmes in this Province what we want to do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the minister's time has elapsed.

MR. TOBIN:  
Okay, Mr. Speaker. I will take it easy, but I know what the hon. gentleman is saying.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The final question is also from the hon. the member for Port de Grave, who is not satisfied with the answer given by the hon. the Minister of Health with regard to the Hoyles/Escasoni Complex.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have to make one quick reference to what the Minister of Social Services just said when he said, 'Thank God for the Premier of this Province.' Thank God for the Premier of this Province, when we have one in every four children

starving. Thank God for the Premier of this Province! That is a good statement to make.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, the question I asked the Minister of Health this afternoon during Question Period is a continuation of questions that we are putting to the Minister of Health, and I can see by his attitude right now, he is just as interested as he was earlier this afternoon. It is in relation to the situation that has been of vast public knowledge over the last several years.

I did not realize until a meeting I had with an official of that home, who is no longer working there, who just recently retired, that so many reports have been put to the Department of Health since 1979.

I indicated that in Question Period earlier, in 1979, 1981, 1983, 1985, and 1987 reports were done by officials of the Department of Health and the former Minister of the Department of Health and each and every report indicated very clearly the situation and conditions of the staff and residents of both of those homes. Each report very clearly said that until adequate staff, nursing assistants, janitorial, kitchen staff, and all of those, are addressed, that conditions cannot change, nor can the residents of those homes receive the proper care they deserve.

Now, it only takes a few dollars and the attention of the Department of Health. The answer that the Minister of Health always

gives is that there is not enough money available.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read yesterday's Hansard, April 27, an answer given to my colleague from Fogo by the President of Treasury Board. He said, "The Premier said at the press conference that whatever money is required to do it, we are going to have to do it. So there is no question of concern about money." That is on the pay equity thing that has come before NAPE. There is no question about the concern over money. There is lots of money available.

If we have lots of money available, why would the Minister of Health allow the situation to continue in the Hoyles Escasoni Complex that is continuing. It is no good to shrug and to hide and say it is not happening because it is a fact.

When you get the residents and the minister's own management staff, that just came in under Extendicare, came publicly on **CBC Radio**, and stated very clearly, yes, the problems are there; yes, there is a shortage of staff; yes, there are problems even with the construction of the home where senior citizens have to climb up an embankment to get into a bathtub. It is a very, very serious situation.

All we are asking and all the residents of the home are asking for is proper, decent care. The staff are not asking for extra thousands of dollars in wages. They are asking for extra staff to be hired on so that they, themselves, can give the proper care that the residents of the home deserve.

They are senior citizens. Most of

them are bedridden. Most of them have Alzheimer's disease, so senile that they cannot think for themselves, and we allow those people to live no better, in some instances, according to reports they gave themselves, than cattle in a barn and we just do not give a second thought to it.

How can the Minister of Health take it as lightly as he is doing there now, and be so humorous about the situation, when we are talking about over three hundred residents, just next door to the Confederation Building, living in these conditions. If the minister wants us to get down on our knees and beg, we will do that. If that will correct the situation, we will beg for the rights of the senior citizens of Hoyles and Escasoni. There is no reason in this day and age, when money is being wasted by this government, that any government should be allowed to permit a situation such as is taking place in these Homes. I beg the minister to correct this situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member just argued a very good case. He argued very effectively. If there ever is another leadership race across the way, it could be very, very close because I think the hon. member -

MR. SIMMS:

It never has been a race, as such.

DR. COLLINS:

No, but if there is, they might change things. You have to have many people looking for something to have a race. And in most cases you have to try to entice people to take on the leadership. But there is a race, I think the hon. member has a good chance at it, because he argues well and he argues vigorously, and he argues sincerely. The only thing is he does not argue from a factual base. No one is perfect. No one is perfect, of course. But if he ever got his facts straight, I think that he would be an absolute wow!

Mr. Speaker, just to put the whole matter in context, we in this Province are doing very, very well for our senior citizens. We are not doing as well as we would like. This government will never be satisfied with its services. Never! When we get the oil, when we get Labrador power, when we get another ten Sprung greenhouses in this Province, when we get all of these things and the money rolling in, we will still never be satisfied that we are giving sufficient services to our people.

In our view, the sky is the limit. Having said that, I do have to say that we are managing extremely well in almost all areas, with the means available to us at this time. When I look at many services that we are giving, many programmes, I am amazed how well we are governing.

This body of men on this side of the House, I suppose, are giving the best government in the Western world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!



DR. COLLINS:

If I wanted to be boastful, I would get into hyperbole, an exaggeration, but I want to be very modest. I will merely say we are giving the best government in the Western world, and probably in history. As evidence of that, hon. members will remember -

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:

A very brief point of order. I heard the minister refer to the body of men on this side and I am wondering if the minister is not including the hon. Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) in the good works that the government are doing.

MR. SPEAKER:

I think the hon. member must realize that that is not a point of order. It is more a point of interruption.

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I have the highest regard for my colleague, the Minister of Justice, who is a lady.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

The only thing is she is not in the House.

Everyone, lady, girl, whatever, woman. That is the okay word these days. Anyway, she does not happen to be in the House at this

point in time and I was directing my remarks particularly to those in the House.

Hon. members will remember that we had a bed study. Now that bed study came up with a figure of the number of chronic beds we should have in this Province, taking into consideration the number of senior citizens we have in this Province, and it came up in round figures to 2,000. We should have 2,000 level II and level III care beds in this Province to handle the number of senior citizens in this Province. We have 2,300. In the last number of years we added, I think it was 284. We are going to, very shortly, add, because they are now under construction and about to be open, something over 215, I think it is.

So we are doing our very best, and we are doing exemplarily with the means available to us. And, the Hoyles Home is part of that excellent job that we are doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

For instance, there are 410 residents in the Home over there, there are 465 staff. There is more than one staff for each resident. That is just an example of how well we are handling that home.

On motion, the House at its rising, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 29, 1988 at 10:00 a.m.

**Index**

**Answers to Questions**

**tabled**

**April 28, 1988**

*Tabled by Hon.  
Minister of Health,  
28 April, 1988*

QUESTION NO. 51

**QUESTION:** Mr. Efford (Port-de-Grave) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

When will the freeze on construction of new nursing homes be lifted?

**RESPONSE:** In the Budget Speech of April 2, 1987, Government announced a three year freeze on construction of, or expansions to, nursing homes.

The period of the freeze will end on March 31, 1990, at which time a further assessment shall be undertaken.

QUESTION NO. 11

*Minister of Health  
28 April 1988*

**QUESTION:** Mr. Efford (Port-de-Grave) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

1. Invoices, vouchers, receipts, etc., to cover the cost of accommodations, travel, car rentals, and entertainment incurred by the Minister, Parliamentary Assistant and/or Parliamentary Secretary and other Members of the Minister's staff in the Province between the dates of November 25th and December 18th, 1987, inclusive.
2. List regions visited during that period and for what purpose.

**RESPONSE:** 1. One voucher and invoice attached covering the cost (\$300) of a dinner meeting for eight persons at the Stonehouse Restaurant on December 17, 1987. The Minister of Health hosted a dinner meeting with the executive officers of the Newfoundland Medical Association to discuss various matters of mutual concern.

One travel claim attached covering Minister's attendance at a Social Policy Meeting in Lewisporte November 24/25, 1987.

2. Lewisporte - Social Policy Meeting

**GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR  
PAYMENT VOUCHER**

FISCAL YEAR: 1987/88 VOUCHER NUMBER: 020837-20

VENDOR NAME: *Hens House Restaurant*  
 ADDRESS: *8 Kennas Hill*  
*St Johns, Nfld*  
 POSTAL CODE: *A1A1H7*

DEPARTMENT: *Health*  
 ATTACH INVOICES AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION TO LEFT CORNER IN THE SPACE PROVIDED. ATTACHMENTS INCLUDED   
 AUTHORITY OF A DIRECT CHARGE:   
 CAPE VENDOR NUMBER: *31328727*  
 PAYING ENTITY: *ISHE*

A/R	INVOICE / CREDIT MEMO NUMBER	ENCUMBRANCE NUMBER	INVOICE DATE			DAYS PAST DUE	DUE DATE			GROSS INVOICE AMOUNT	RST AMOUNT	DISTRIBUTION AMOUNT	C	ACCOUNTING DISTRIBUTION		PROJECT	
			YY	MM	DD		YY	MM	DD					ACCOUNT	CENTER	NUMBER	COMP
	871229DINNER		87	12	29	✓				300.00		300.00		5106105100	1511010000		
														51			
														51			
														51			
														51			
														51			
														51			
														51			
														51			
														51			
														51			
														51			
										300.00			<b>← TOTALS</b>				

TEAR ALONG BROKEN LINE IF MORE THAN ONE SET IS REQUIRED TO COMPLETE VOUCHER. THE FINAL SET MUST REMAIN INTACT.

TOTAL PAYMENT AMOUNT

THE ATTACHED INVOICE IS FORWARDED FOR YOUR CERTIFICATION OR OTHER AS SPECIFIED BELOW. IF FOR SOME REASON THIS CANNOT BE EFFECTED WITHIN THREE (3) DAYS, WOULD YOU PLEASE INFORM THE DEPARTMENTAL ACCOUNTANT AT YOUR EARLIEST CONVENIENCE. NOTE: BOTH STAMPS, IF AFFIXED, MUST BE COMPLETED.

TO: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

*[Signature]* DATE: *8/15/88*

DEPARTMENTAL ACCOUNTANT: *[Signature]*

Stonehouse Restaurant

DATE 17 Dec 1987

NAME Department of Health

SOLD BY	C.O.D.	CHARGE	ON ACCOUNT	ACCOUNT FORWARD
1				
2		Jenni for 8		v
3				
4				
5				
6		Admission for 2		
7		Janice Dec 02 87		
8				
9				
10				

TOTAL 30.00

SIGNATURE  
12760 [Signature]

87/98

GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR  
TRAVEL EXPENSE CLAIM VOUCHER

CLAIM NUM. TC 0196

CLAIMANT: **Ed. Thomas THOMPSON**  
 HOME MAILING ADDRESS: **14 Windsor Court**  
**St. John's**  
**St. John's**  
 POSTAL CODE: **A1A 1A1**

DEPARTMENT: **HEALTH**  
 DIVISION: **Minister's Off.** POSITION TITLE: **Minister**  
 CLAIMANT'S HEADQUARTERS: **Confederation Building**  
 ADDRESS: **58 St. John's**

CAPS VOUCHER NO. **11**  
 DATE: **87/12/01**  
 PAYMENT AMOUNT: **131.04**

PURPOSE: **Social Policy Meeting - Lewisporte - Nov. 24, 25**

DATE	PARTICULARS	TIME OF DEPARTURE	TIME OF RETURN	DOCUMENT NUMBER	MEALS	ACCOMMODATION	TRAVEL	PRIVATE VEHICLE	OTHER
	Per Diem - Nov. 24, 25								84
	(2 x 42)								
	Hotel					47.04			
CLAIM TOTAL \$ 131.04		COLUMN TOTALS ▶				47.04			84

TEAR ALONG BROKEN LINE IF MORE THAN ONE SET IS REQUIRED TO COMPLETE CLAIM. THE FINAL SET MUST REMAIN INTACT.

TOTAL AMOUNT OF CLAIM	▶ 01	131.04	PAYMENT AMOUNT	131.04	51103104001511101000	FOR ACCOUNTING USE ONLY
STANDING TRAVEL ADVANCE						
LESS: AMOUNT OF CLAIM APPLIED TO STA	▶ 02		51			
LESS: TRIP ADVANCE (IF ANY)	▶ 03		51			
AMOUNT PAYABLE TO CLAIMANT	▶ 04	131.04	51			
AMOUNT DUE TO GOVERNMENT (IF ADVANCES EXCEED CLAIM)	▶ 05		131.04	◀ TOTAL PAYMENT AMOUNT		
EXPENSES NOT PAID BY CLAIMANT						
REVENUE RECEIPT NUMBER			CLAIM VERIFIED BY: <i>[Signature]</i> ACCOUNTS DIVISION			
I CERTIFY THAT THE WHOLE OF THE EXPENSES INCURRED BY ME WERE ON GOVERNMENT BUSINESS AND ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TREASURY BOARD TRAVEL RULES.		CERTIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 30(1) AND 31(1) OF THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT				
Nov. 26/87	<i>[Signature]</i>	APPROVED BY: <i>[Signature]</i> ACCOUNTANT				
DATE	CLAIMANT'S SIGNATURE	AUTHORIZED FOR PAYMENT BY: <i>[Signature]</i> DEPUTY MINISTER				
APPROVED AND CERTIFIED BY: <i>[Signature]</i>						
DATE	SUPERVISOR OR DIVISIONAL HEAD					

## CONTENTS

THURSDAY, 21, APRIL, 1988.

### Statements by Ministers

#### Special day for workers killed, injured or disabled:

Mr. Blanchard.....	1275
Mr. Wells.....	1275
Mr. Long.....	1276

#### Update on loan guarantees for fish companies:

Mr. Rideout.....	1277
Mr. W. Carter.....	1280
Mr. Fenwick.....	1282

#### Hygiene at mine sites:

Mr. Blanchard.....	1282
Mr. K. Aylward.....	1286
Mr. Long.....	1288

### Oral Questions

#### Press reports of job offer:

Do reports reflect what happened.	
Mr. Simmons, Premier Peckford.....	1289
Divergence of versions.	
Mr. Simmons, Premier Peckford.....	1290
How far was offer pursued.	
Mr. Simmons, Premier Peckford.....	1291
Period of discussions.	
Mr. Wells, Premier Peckford.....	1293
Did discussions proceed while Canadian Helicopters was seeking financial guarantees.	
Mr. Wells, Premier Peckford.....	1293
Accuracy of Mr. Dobbin's statement.	
Mr. Wells, Premier Peckford.....	1295



Hoyles - Escasoni Complex:

Alleges horrendous conditions, seeks  
action. Mr. Efford, Dr. Collins.....1297  
Was Extendicare's credibility checked  
before it took over the complex.  
Mr. Efford, Dr. Collins.....1298  
Requests public inquiry.  
Mr. Efford, Dr. Collins.....1298

Pooled Pensions Fund:

Were **Telegram** quotes accurate.  
Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Windsor.....1299  
Surplus or deficiency of the four  
plans. Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Windsor.....1300  
Increase MHA contributions as example  
to all public servants. Mr. Fenwick,  
Mr. Windsor.....1300

**Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees**

Annual Report of Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission:

Dr. Collins.....1301

Annual Report of the Fisheries Loan Board:

Mr. Rideout.....1301

**Notices of Motion**

Respecting the Newfoundland Institute of Agronomists:

Mr. Power.....1302

Amend The Insurance Companies Act:

Mr. Young.....1302

**Answers to Questions  
for which Notice has been Given**

Questions Nos. 11 and 51, Dr. Collins.....1302

## Orders of the Day

### Order 4, Bill No. 16:

Mr. Simmons.....	1302
Mr. Dinn.....	1305
Mr. J. Carter.....	1315
Mr. Long.....	1317
Mr. Simms, adjourns debate.....	1322

## Debate on Adjournment

### [Late Show]

### Spray Programme:

Mr. Long.....	1324
Mr. R. Aylward.....	1326

### Poverty among children:

Mr. Efford.....	1328
Mr. Tobin.....	1329

### Hoyles - Escasoni Complex:

Mr. Efford.....	1331
Dr. Collins.....	1333

Adjournment motion.....	1334
-------------------------	------