



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 36

---

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

*Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas*

Friday

13 May 1988

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. WINDSOR:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BUTT:  
Mr. Speaker, after a rather long Winter it is time to dig out the camping and hiking gear to enjoy the Summer and take advantage of our very impressive provincial park system in Newfoundland and Labrador.

I am happy to inform this hon. House that a total of seventeen parks will be open for the Victoria Day weekend.

On Wednesday, nine parks will open: Backside Pond; Butterpot Park; La Manche; Catamaran; Square Pond; Bellevue Beach; Gushue's Pond; Beothuck Park; and Notre Dame depending on snow conditions in that park. A further announcement will be made on Notre Dame Park next week. The reason for opening nine parks on Wednesday is to help reduce the expected lineups and congestion at park entrances. However, I would like to remind campers that they must have their camping units with them in order to register and must leave them on site at that time.

Another eight parks will open their gates on Friday, May 20th: Fitzgerald's Pond; Jack's Pond; Barachois Pond; Grand Codroy; Frenchman's Cove; Northern Bay

Sands; J.T. Cheeseman; and Cochrane Pond, which is a day use park only. The total number of camp sites available, Mr. Speaker, for the May 24th weekend is 1,311, which is 56 per cent of the total number of campsites within the provincial park system.

The parks opening for Victoria Day weekend have been selected to provide a park within reasonable driving distance to most people in the Province for this initial part of the camping season.

On June 3, six parks which are located near licenced salmon rivers - Jipujikuei Kuespem, Squires Memorial Park, Pinware River, Duley Lake, Sandbanks and Crabbes River - will open. The remaining parks will open on June 24.

While basic camping regulations have not changed, parks staff will be co-operating with the RCMP to ensure noise is controlled and alcohol is restricted to individual campsites and picnic areas. The seasonal campsite and camper storage programme introduced two years ago will continue this year. Seasonal camping is available in all forty-two camping parks and camper storage is available in thirty-two parks located throughout the Province. Due to these and other initiatives of my department, I wish to inform hon. members that park visitations has increased by approximately 30 per cent over last year - a very impressive 30 per cent increase over last year. Our parks private sector initiative has a similar potential. If we have the private sector involved in our provincial parks, we expect an additional 30 per cent increase this year.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to announce that there will be no increase in our basic fee structure for provincial parks in 1988.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

Park fees will remain the same as 1988 and they are as follows: Daily camping fees - \$6; weekly fee of \$35. So if you do it on a weekly basis, you will save \$7. Seasonal camping fees \$250; camper storage fees \$1 per day; daily vehicle entry fees \$2; seasonal vehicle entry fees \$10. For senior citizens age sixty-five or over and residents of our Province, of course, it is free. I see several hon. members on the opposite side who will be able to take advantage of free access to the provincial parks this year because of their advanced age.

I would like, at this time, Mr. Speaker, to wish all campers a safe and enjoyable Victoria Day weekend and another year of outdoor fun and recreation in Newfoundland and Labrador's provincial parks system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take much of the time of the House in replying to this because, it seems to me, this thing is hardly worth being called a Ministerial Statement.

MR. EFFORD:

Exactly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

We all agree that Newfoundland has very beautiful parks and that people will enjoy them again this Summer. That is great, that is wonderful, but it is a waste of seven or eight minutes of the precious time of this House to have the minister stand up and announce what we all know is going to happen, and we all know when it is going to happen. The only thing that was worth seeing done in this House this morning was the attempt at humour by the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Butt).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

There is somebody in the gallery and you are showing off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We welcome the statement by the minister. I am not sure what is the matter with the members of the Liberal Opposition. Maybe they had a bad night last night or something.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

I think the fee for the dinner at the hotel was perhaps a little bit too much for some members.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, we say the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth is obviously a minister committed to having fun in the Summer, and the spirit of his statement today in talking about the good works that his department is doing in keeping the fees the same is a positive announcement. That is significant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

We would say, Mr. Minister, that the fees are too high and they should be brought down. There are some things missing from the minister's statement. We will say again it is unfortunate that there is not a government employment programme for young people to keep the parks clean during the summer. We would like some more information about how the private sector enterprise project is going, and perhaps an update, in the next couple of days, about the number of places that will be opening? Otherwise, we join with the minister in encouraging people to make their plans early and to take full advantage of the long weekend next weekend and go to the parks. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro is currently building its first wood chip fired generating station at Roddickton on the Northeast Coast of the Great Northern Peninsula. Roddickton, where is that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

The 5 megawatt station when completed will be connected to the St. Anthony and Main Brook diesel systems by a 69 kilovolt transmission line. When the plant begins operation in 1989, the Main Brook diesel generating station will be closed and there will be a significant reduction in production at St. Anthony and Roddickton as output from these diesel stations is displaced by wood chip generated electricity. I am pleased today to announce the awarding of a major contract on the Roddickton project valued at \$1.1 million to Conwell Construction of Corner Brook.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

The contract is for the supply and erecting of building steel, including cladding. Conwell Construction submitted the lowest tender of nine bids in a recent tender call. The work on this contract is scheduled to begin in late August of this year and should be completed by the middle of January, 1989, and will provide approximately 16 jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

The Roddickton wood chip fired

generating station is being built at a cost of approximately \$25 million with a contribution of \$500,000 from the Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources towards engineering costs and project reports. Contracts were awarded earlier for the supply and installation of the boiler, steam turbine and generator and for clearing the transmission line right-of-way.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is good news, obviously. It is a step in the right direction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

It is good to see that we are using some of our natural resources, that in the past have been wasted, to create electricity in the Province and to get away from, in this case, diesel generation. The production of the five megawatts, I understand, is needed that immediate area.

I would like to point out to the minister that there is a whole Province out there which has the capability of providing wood chips for wood chip generation of electricity. It is a source that I know the Department of Energy and Hydro are now looking at, and we hope to see further announcements in the future concerning this use of our natural resource, because it ties in, Mr. Speaker, so beautifully with our logging industry and with our forestry industry, especially the forestry industry that has been neglected in many ways over the

last number of years.

The minister, perhaps, should have elaborated a little further in terms of jobs. He said the contract will produce sixteen jobs. The significant thing is that plant, when it is in operation, will provide far more than the sixteen jobs in the Roddickton area, and that is the kind of thing that we like to see.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out, to put this in perspective a little bit, that the five megawatts produced by this plant is not quite enough to supply the Sprung greenhouse.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menehik.

MR. FENWICK:

This is probably going to be the shortest lived honeymoon we have ever had, Mr. Speaker. I have a lot of problems with the project up there. Not with the fact that we are burning wood to produce electricity, I think that is a long overdue initiative by the government, but, of course, a tenet to this particular initiative is the failure, I think, on the part of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to reduce rates once this power plant is in place. This has been a conscious decision by the government to put a wood-fired operation in there and, in a sense, to take it off diesel power. At the same time, the reduction that will occur to Fogo and Change Islands when the interconnect goes in there is not going to occur in the Roddickton area.

It seems to me this was a

conscious decision that means that any interconnect up there is likely to take many more years before it occurs, and I do not understand why the people of Roddickton have to pay the excessively high rates for electricity above 600 kilowatts per month.

So, on that basis, although I applaud the initiative, I think the lack of a coherent policy of treating the wood-fired generated operations, and I hope this is only the first of many as an interconnected operation on an entire grid system, is extremely detrimental to the people of the Northern Peninsula and will lock them into the higher electricity rates almost forever as long as the particular wood plant is going, or until we, perhaps, change this government with a more responsive one to the needs of people like that.

Mr. Speaker, I approve of the initiative, but I think there has been a major failure to reduce rates in that area once this plant goes on stream.

MR. LONG:  
Hear, hear! Well said!

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker, now that my colleagues have the Opposition in better form, I have another announcement to make:

I am pleased to inform the House that we have been advised by Teck Corporation of some very encouraging results from the

exploration programme at Newfoundland Zinc Mines at Daniel's Harbour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

As provided for in the agreements made with Newfoundland Zinc last year, the company has been conducting an exploration programme focusing on a previously unexplored area Northwest of the main ore bodies known as the 'L zone' and the 'North L-zone'.

Drilling in this area has encountered zinc mineralization in six holes outlining a zone which appears to be several hundred feet long. The grades encountered run from over 10 per cent to over 21 per cent zinc and occur over thicknesses of up to 44 feet.

The company has started drifting underground toward this new zone. This drift was established after previous underground drilling located a mineralized zone close to the existing workings. The exploration drift is now advancing in ore.

This is extremely encouraging news which holds out the promise of extended life for the operation. When the government agreed in 1987 to provide financial support of \$2,420,000 to enable operations to be reactivated at Newfoundland zinc, we recognized that the potential for the discovery of further mineralization was acknowledged to be good. Our agreements provided that \$500,000 would be spent on exploration. That exploration is now bearing fruit in a significant way.

With presently defined ore reserves we are reasonably assured

that operations at Newfoundland Zinc will continue until the end of 1989. These most recent results give us some indication that operations can probably be extended well beyond that date.

Added to the potential in the immediate mine area, there is significant potential for the discovery of new ore bodies in the general area further West of the existing mining operations. Newfields Minerals has recently announced an agreement with Tech Corporation to conduct 100,000 feet of drilling in this area at an estimated cost of \$3.5 million. This drilling programme is also currently ongoing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we harken back to the time when the mine was closing. The hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) said the reason for its closure was the fact that the federal government was supporting a mine in the Northwest Territories, Cyprus Anvil. I said at that time that the reason it was closing was because of grades, tonnage and price at the time - the price had dropped from about forty-five cents down to thirty-one cents. I am also pleased to say that the price for zinc today, on the London metal exchange, is something close to fifty-one cents. We hope it stays up there so that we will have a successful operation in Daniel's Harbour. Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, Hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, we, on this side, welcome this statement today and

we also ask the minister to harken back, now that he has asked us to harken back, to that year and a half ago - maybe he will harken back himself - and recall that it was the official Opposition who asked the government to come up with public money to guarantee the jobs for the 165 miners. And if he harkens back a little longer, Mr. Speaker, this minister will remember, and this government will remember, that it was their Cabinet decision which kept these 165 miners out of work and reduced them to welfare for twelve months of the year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am very, very pleased -

MR. HODDER:  
Stick to the truth now, Chuck.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:  
He asks me to stick to the truth. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that those miners were out of work for twelve months.

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

I am having great difficulty hearing what the hon. member is saying, as there are a number of hon. members who repeatedly interrupt the proceedings, practically on a daily basis. I certainly do not want to pinpoint any particular member, but if I continually call for order and it is not given, and there is continual harrassment, and that is all I can call it, harrassment, I will have to identify the

particular hon. member who is doing that. I do not want to do that, but in the final analysis, I intend to name a member if he continues to do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Speaking of harrassment, Mr. Speaker, it was this side which had to harrass the government and wake them up to see that 165 miners in the community of Daniel's Harbour, which is a one-industry town, had to harrass this government into providing the \$2 million loan guarantee necessary to put them back to work. The hon. the member for Port au Port asked me to speak truthfully. Well, here is the truth: The truth is that the government ignored them for twelve months. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that this member came in daily for twelve months asking for that government guaranteed loan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that we are encouraged and vindicated. We fell vindicated in our position for asking for public money to be spent up there and it shows, Mr. Speaker, that our position was right prior to the layoff, during the layoff, and after the layoff. If you want to see \$2 million well spent, Mr. Speaker, it was well spent in Daniel's Harbour.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

If you want to see \$22 million misspent, have a look at the Sprung greenhouse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I think the activities at Daniel's Harbour are probably the best example we have of what is a very poor mining policy on the part of this government over here. Why, for example, in the ten or twelve years that the Daniel's Harbour operation operated was there not some way, some means, of making sure that they did the exploration that currently has found an ore body right adjacent to the one that they were exploiting? Is there something wrong with the way we force our companies to pay royalties on the minerals they have there and force them to do additional exploration?

To give you an example, the amount of money, according to the Minister of Mines, that we get in direct royalties from the billion dollars plus in minerals that are extracted out of our Province each year is actually less than \$20 million. Now, that works out to about 2 per cent a year in direct royalties. At that level, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we are doing anything to get the kind of economic return from the resource that we should, nor are we building up funds so that places like Daniel's Harbour and like Labrador West, when the ore body runs out, are capable of making a safe transition to a different



economy.

The fact of the matter is, no matter how much ore we find, it is a finite quality. Daniel's Harbour will eventually have to face the problem of the closure of that mine. There should be funds and policies in place so that these miners and that community are looked after in a humane way, unlike the callous treatment that was received by the people of Labrador City and Wabush when they went through a major downsizing in the 1982 - 1983 period. So what we are asking for is good taxation and good policies to address places like Daniel's Harbour and other mining communities in the Province.

MR. LONG:  
Hear, hear! Well said!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER:  
At this stage I would like to welcome to the gallery Mr. Brian Tobin, the Member of Parliament for Humber - Port au Port - St. Barbe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
I would like to welcome thirty Grade V students with their teachers, Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Critch and Mr. and Mrs. Peddle, from Purchase Pentecostal School in Botwood.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
I would like to welcome sixty Grade XI students with their teachers, Ed Neil and Claude

Taylor, from Ascension Collegiate in Bay Roberts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:  
Mr. Speaker, most members will remember in the last couple of days there has been a great deal of discussion, publicly and privately and in this House, about the provision of health care services in the Province. A great deal of attention was raised as a result of a letter written by Mrs. Rowsell about her mother and the failure to admit her to the hospital when she ought really to have been admitted, when in fact there was an admission slip issued, not on an emergency basis, but there was an admission slip filed to have her admitted to hospital, as the facts turn out.

The minister has made certain statements, following on all of this, which, if you judge by statements that have been made privately and in the public media, have turned out not to be correct. Statements have been made to the effect that only -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is making a statement. I would ask him to ask a question.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to ask the minister to address these particular statements in terms of his statements in the House because the two cannot stand together. Statements have been made by people involved in health care services -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, you have already, a few minutes ago, brought the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to heel because he was not asking a question. Now he says 'I am going to ask' the question. This is Question Period and there are a lot of members here who have questions to ask. We are only too happy to answer questions if we get them, but at the present moment we have not gotten one and I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is abusing the rules of this House.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the point of order, if I may?

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I would say I am the last person in this House who abuses that privilege -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:

of laying a reasonable foundation for asking a question. And I think Your Honour will agree with that.

Now in this particular case it is necessary to present to the minister the statement that I am going to ask him to address. It will only take about thirty seconds, if I have a modicum of silence, and it can be done.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I think the preamble of the hon. member has been too long. So I would ask him to get to his question. This is Question Time.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is: Will he explain to the House how he could make the statements that he made to this House in the last couple of days, that everything is normal in health care services, and is being done as it was in previous years, when people directly involved in health care services have said in the last twenty-four hours that the Health Sciences Complex is operating almost entirely on an emergency and urgent admission basis? It is time for the government to admit that there is a problem. It has not been going on all the time, it is getting worse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is quoting a physician, I think he may have been a spokesman for the Newfoundland Medical Association, on television last night. This was part of an interview. I heard what he said but I have not seen a statement of what he said. I think it was not an official statement by the NMA, he was answering a question. So I am not certain that his remarks reflect what the NMA really feels. And, of course, he was not in that capacity speaking on behalf of the hospital. I had a letter from the Executive Director of the Hospital which laid out certain information to me and I would take that as the official position of the hospital concerned. The individual was on television as part of an interview, and if he was anything he was a spokesman for the NMA, but I do not think he was emoting an official policy or statement from the NMA but a personal statement.

I am glad the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked me about admissions to hospitals, because I just happen to have with me the admissions over a number of years to the Health Sciences Complex and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition might be interested in hearing these.

For the year 1984, there were 9,979 admissions. For the year 1985, there were 10,059 - not much change, plus .8 per cent. In 1986, there were 10,019 -- not much change, minus .4 per cent. In 1987, the last figure I have here, there were 10,574, a plus 5.5 per cent increase. So in actual fact from 1986 to 1987 there were

increased admissions to the Health Sciences, whereas in the previous two years there was not much change - it was a little bit up or a little bit down - but in actual fact in the more recent year that I had figures for there was a significant increase. So I am just quoting facts, not some sort of statements that some people make off the top their heads.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, the minister alluded to the Administrator of the Hospital. Will he say if she was speaking accurately and reflecting the true situation when she said that the Health Sciences Centre is operating almost entirely on an emergency and urgent basis? Does that reflect the truth of the situation at the Health Sciences Centre?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, again the hon. member is referring to an individual who was responding to a question in an interview. I do not know how clearly she, in actual fact, was prepared for that question. I do not know what facts she had in front of her. I will certainly ask that. But I do have to point out that in 1987 there were 10,574 admissions to the Health Sciences

Complex, and I would not think that those 10,000 were emergency admissions. The total number of admissions to hospitals throughout the Province in that year was approximately 90,000, so about one-ninth of all the admissions in the Province went into the Health Sciences, so I doubt whether they admitted only emergency admissions. One-ninth of all the admissions in the Province happened to go to the Health Sciences Complex.

I like to deal in facts. If the hon. member wants to pick up little squibs out of television programmes, where people are asked questions on the spur of the moment and they have to respond on the spur of the moment, he can do that, it is a free country. When a serious issue like this comes up, I like to go to the source of things and get actual documented facts.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am glad the Minister of Health referred to the high number of admissions in our hospitals last year. That brings me to my question concerning ambulance drivers, because it must mean that they require a lot of funding and a lot of qualified staff to operate the ambulances.

In relation to the protest and the march to Confederation Building last year by the operators, would the minister tell us what progress has been made in giving necessary

funding to put qualified drivers and a second attendant on the ambulances, and especially the private operator ambulances around this Province?

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I am glad the member asked that question, because I happen to have a few statistics in my mind. I do not have them written down here but I have them in my mind. Of all the ambulance trips made to hospitals in this Province, 98 per cent of them now have a second attendant on board. Now, hon. member will understand, of course, that not every ambulance trip is of an emergency nature requiring extra assistance. So if you have 98 per cent of ambulance trips to hospitals covered by a second attendant in addition to the driver, I would say that that very likely covers 100 per cent of the situations where a second attendant is required.

Hon. members will also recall that we have a contract in place now with St. John Ambulance to provide training and to provide in-service upgrading to ambulance drivers, especially for the second attendant.

MR. EFFORD:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Port de Grave, a supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:  
Make no wonder he is not the Minister of Finance anymore, the way he misleads this House and fools around with figures!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. member should be asked to withdraw that word 'misleads'.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if I said anything unparliamentary, I will withdraw any unparliamentary words.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has withdrawn the statement.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Health a very clear question: How much funding has been provided to the ambulance operators of this Province to hire second attendants and qualified drivers? The question was very clear. Would the minister answer that question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no problem in taking that question as notice. He wants me to give a dollar figure and I do not have a dollar figure in my mind. In addition to the normal subsidies given, I do know that we supply to the ambulance owner eight cents per kilometer for the payment for the second attendant. That is a ballpark figure.

As to the actual number of dollars that eight cents multiplied by kilometers, multiplied by numbers of trips, multiplied by numbers of

second attendants, I will come up with that dollar figure for the hon. member as soon as I can.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Again we see the minister not knowing what is going on in his department. Let me say to the minister, is it not a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the sum of \$330,000 was provided for in the budget, and of that amount a \$165,000 went to pay off last year's debt, and they have made absolutely no gains whatsoever?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is making a statement. I do not understand it as a question.

The hon. member.

MR. EFFORD:

Is it not a fact that \$330,000 was provided in the budget, \$160,000 went to pay off last year's cost, leaving only \$143,000, and there have been absolutely no gains made to provide qualified drivers and second attendants to private ambulances around this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is coming with specific figures, and I do not know if they are right or not. I told them that I would find out. I told them the broad parameters of how this program is arranged, but I will come up with the precise figures. I do not know but what he is saying is full of hogwash, I suspect it is, but I do not know it is. I will say this, that there was a 4 per cent

increase over the previous year in the budget that the hon. Minister of Finance brought down a little while ago, for ambulance services.

And I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that we have received a request from legal counsel for the private operators asking us to mount a financial study on the whole system, and we said, 'Delighted.' We are absolutely delighted,' and we have gone back to legal counsel for the private ambulance operators as to a number of ways it might be done, and I think very soon, there will be mutual agreement on the particular way it will be done. That will give us absolute facts, and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows what I am talking about because I told him previously I like dealing in facts, not sort of glib statements. That will give absolute facts as to whether these services are funded adequately, whether it is funded inadequately, whether it is funded too much.

These are the facts that the private operators want, they are the facts that we want, and we are now putting in place a mutually acceptable mechanism to get those facts.

MR. SIMMS:

That should be an NDP question, anyway.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Peach). Given the mandate that was described in the Budget Estimates

of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation to provide housing to low income families, seniors and the disadvantaged, would the minister explain why we continue to have market units, competing with the private sector in the marketplace, maintained by the government?

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Housing.

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is aware of housing and the vacancy factors and problems in the city. I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, that we were attempting to ensure that our market rentals, those owned by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, are in line with what the marketplace now demands, and we have that, Mr. Speaker, in pretty well nearly all places in the Province. I indicated a rental increase during this year so we would not be in competition with the private sector.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:

Well, again, considering the priority mandate that was described in the Budget Estimates was listed those three areas of housing as most important, will the minister now assure us that the government will not commit to the \$4.5 million they plan to spend on upgrading, making exterior renovations and so on at Elizabeth Towers, and not have

Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, in particular, continue to expend taxpayers money on a building in direct competition with the private sector? And not only do we have the -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member is making a statement. This is a supplementary.

MR. GULLAGE:  
Those costs could go beyond the \$4.5 million, to maintenance, operations and energy supply.

Will the minister assure us that that \$4.5 million will not now be spent, but rather will be directed towards the mandate that he said was a priority for the government?

MR. PEACH:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PEACH:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. member is indicating to the House that he would like to see no funding spent on securing and making Elizabeth Towers suitable for the tenants who are there. We do have tenants there, Mr. Speaker, who require that the building be in proper condition. We are aware, as I am sure the member is, that there is some deterioration in the building and it needs to be repaired. We indicated some time ago that we would, over the next two to three years be spending some \$4.2 million or \$4.5 million on Elizabeth Towers.

But, Mr. Speaker, we do have a mandate to provide rental housing

accommodations in this Province. I do not know if you would get any suggestion that we should ask the people who are in our housing units in St. John's and Stephenville to vacate them. Then where would they go? I get a request every second or third day from the hon. member for people who are looking for some of our units. We have, Mr. Speaker, over the past number of years put many of our units up for sale in this Province. We had a great number of units in Stephenville last year bought from us, and obtained by the private sector. Because of that we have adjusted our rentals this year in Stephenville so that we would not be in competition with those people who purchased our units. We are always open, Mr. Speaker, with our units up for sale, so if some private investor wants to take those units and make them a viable operations we are open.

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary.

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker, the minister continues not to answer my questions. My final supplementary is that given the mandate, once again, of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, the fact that these buildings, not just Elizabeth Towers, but Pleasantville, Churchill Square and Linden Court, to name the city locations, are all in competition with the private sector, and the reason why the government cannot -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. GULLAGE:

- dispose of Elizabeth Towers was because the last time it went on -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. GULLAGE:  
- public tender the tenders were unacceptable because they were selling one

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Would the hon. member please sit down?

I have drawn the hon. member's attention, on two occasions, that while he was asking his final supplementary he was making a statement. I ask him now to direct his final supplementary. Otherwise, I will recognize some other hon. member.

MR. GULLAGE:  
Will the minister, Mr. Speaker, assure us that he will put all units on the market, not just one set of units to be sold by public tender, and that in fact the \$4.5 million will not be expended on Elizabeth Towers?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister Newfoundland and Labrador Housing..

MR. PEACH:  
Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat ironic that three members on the opposite side today had to be called to order for not abiding by the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, in St. John's, in Centennial Meadows, as one example the member used, we have indicated a rental increase of 6 per cent

this year, because there was no increase last year, and that will bring it up to the market rental value in that area. At Elizabeth Towers we have not indicated an increase this year because of the renovations, and those renovations are absolutely necessary because of the deterioration that has taken place on that some twenty year old structure. At Pinebud, Linden Court and Allandale we are increasing the rents, Mr. Speaker, by 10 per cent. That will mean that they will be only 1 per cent below the market rentals in that particular area. In Churchill Square, we are doing some 4 to 12 per cent increases. At Pleasantville, 1 to 8 per cent, and in Arnold's Loop, Pleasantville, we are going to increase the rates there by some 10 per cent. We would have probably increased those more with the market value, but because we have ongoing renovations in many of our units we feel that certain increases would not be in order. In some three buildings, I think, in Pleasantville, Buildings 501, 305 and 307, we have some problems there with the federal government, a dispute over land; and we felt that a rental increase would not be in order because we do not have the security of the land and therefore we feel that some renovations would not be in order.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to my good friend for Lewisporte, the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Russell), who made an announcement



a couple of days ago about a contract to clean up the PCB waste at the US radar site in Cartwright. Conspicuously absent from the statement is any indication of how the PCBs are to be stored, or whether the site is to be secured. Would he indicate to the House in specifics what is to be done to store or otherwise dispose of the PCBs?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the final decision on where they are going to be stored has not been made yet, but as soon as it is I will be pleased to inform hon. members. They are to be cleaned up properly and stored in barrels and all that kind of thing, but the final location where they are going to be stored has not been decided. I will let you know.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

I want the minister to bear his answer in mind in the context of the next question, because it relates -

MR. LONG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that it is very frustrating to sit through a Question Period of only

half an hour and hear the long preambles by members of the Opposition. The Speaker today has continuously called the members to order for long preambles. Now, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, we are going to go through another Friday without having an opportunity to ask a question at all. I would simply appeal to the Speaker to demand that there be shorter preambles, especially in supplementary questions, by members of the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. I would point out that the hon. member rising on a spurious point of order is actually using up the question time.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I would even compliment myself on such a short preamble the first time around. Watch this one. I go directly to the question.

Will the minister confirm -

MR. SIMMS:

I will not congratulate you but I will listen.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is hereditary.

MR. SIMMS:

Not from my side.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

As long as they are having as much fun as we are having, Mr. Speaker.

Will he confirm -

MR. SIMMS:

Your preamble is awfully long already.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Do you allow that to go on indefinitely, Mr. Speaker? I am embarrassed that he is related to me.

MR. SIMMS:

You are embarrassed!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

When the sheep are finished, Mr. Speaker, I will put a question to the lamb over there. Will he confirm that last August, in the process of cleaning up another USAF site, PCBs were accidentally not only discovered but spilled, resulting in some medical examinations of the personnel involved, resulting in a fast exit from the site. The site has not been cleaned up to this point in time. Will he confirm that his officials estimate the cleanup of this site could take up to \$1 million? Would he confirm that is the case, first of all?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. RUSSELL:

I do not know what site the hon. member is referring to, Mr. Speaker. He is poring these vague questions and comes out with no specifics whatsoever. If he has a specific site and specific information and specific evidence, then I will be pleased to review it.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Nothing is very vague about an indication to the minister of which he should be aware.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

MR. SIMMONS:

This is unbridled harassment!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The hon. member is on a supplementary, but he gets up and starts making a statement. There should be no preamble whatsoever on the second supplementary to a question that he has already asked the minister. He gets up and starts making statements, and here we have other members of the House who have not had an opportunity to ask a question. The hon. member is just abusing the rules of the House again.

MR. SIMMONS:

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Shameful! Challenging Mr. Speaker

as he always does.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I think we understand there should be no preamble to a supplementary. Certainly to a final supplementary there should be no need for any preamble whatever. So I would ask the hon. member just to pose his question.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister how in the name of everything that is sensible can he stand here this morning and say that he is not aware that there is such a site in Northern Newfoundland? How can he suggest that there is vagueness in a projected million dollar cost to clean up a site that has not been secured, that his officials scurried out of, that they have not alerted the people down there about people who are berry picking all around the site, day in and day out? If he wants me to name the site, yes, the site -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I thought it was a perfectly good question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member has asked a question and he continues now to make a statement.

MR. SIMMONS:

I am not finished the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, then, the hon. member's question is too long.

The hon. member should just ask a question. This is a final supplementary.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

After no preamble, now it has to be short questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The member for Fortune - Hermitage just got up and challenged your Honour. He got up and looked at the Chair and started to challenge with a comment Your Honour's ruling.

Now we cannot allow this to happen. The hon. member has all the freedom in the world to ask questions - original questions, supplementary questions, and all the rest - but when he turns to the Speaker and starts to dispute a ruling of the Speaker of this House, then he is undermining everything that this House is all about, and he should not be allowed to get away with it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

He does it all the time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Name him! Name him!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, I did not quite get that understanding from the comments that were made by the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage. But I am now going to recognize the hon. the member for St. John's East.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the short time remaining in Question Period, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin) to follow up on a discussion we had some weeks ago in the Estimates Committee. Could he inform the House of the situation at the transition house for battered women in Lab City, which is operated by women on a volunteer basis, whether the minister is able to give an undertaking that more monies will be provided than was allocated in the budget that was brought down some months ago?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to recognize the question as probably one of the most legitimate ones that was asked here this morning. I also want to recognize the fact that it was probably the first question asked here this morning that Your Honour did not have to call a member to order and explain the rules of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question is indeed legitimate. There were allocations made as it relates to the house in Labrador. The group

of people down there are having some difficulty as it relates to being able to operate with the allocation that has been made, and we are looking at the whole programme to see if and what can be done.

MR. LONG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My supplementary would be: In view of the fact that the transition house here in St. John's, Kirby House, which is located in my own district, has turned away in the last twelve months over 125 women with approximately 200 children involved, will the minister give an undertaking to review the situation at Kirby House to provide for basic problems, since police have advised that structurally the house needs work on the outside to secure it and make it a safer place? They cannot do it because of under-funding problems. Will the minister undertake to review the situation of the transition house in St. John's as an indication of the government's commitment to deal seriously with the problem of battered women in our society?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, this government has a great commitment to all social issues in this Province. I believe that that is evident when one looks at and makes assessments

of the budget increases that have taken place in this Province in the social departments, particularly since 1979. I can say to the question just asked, as it relates to my department, that no division in this department has received less funding one year than from the previous year. We are addressing it in a very serious way, Mr. Speaker, and as it relates to review of policies and programmes, that is ongoing within the department from time to time.

MR. LONG:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My final supplementary I would like to put to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, who is also the minister responsible for the Status of Women.

I would like to ask the minister: In view of the fact that all three government funded transition houses in the Province are facing severe difficulties in meeting the demand in crisis calls, will the minister responsible for the Status of Women begin to implement a public education programme to address the seriousness of domestic violence and violence against women in the home, as an indication of the seriousness with which this government views this domestic problem, this social problem? Will the minister give a commitment to an education programme?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That process has already begun. I have had discussions with the Minister of Social Services, and the Minister of Justice and Attorney-General as well, with regard to public relations, just recently, Mr. Speaker, we released a manual on conquering wife abuse, relying on various agencies to assist us in addressing this very serious problem throughout the Province, and indeed throughout the country. And our very thrust is one of education and public awareness, because we want to involve the total community, since it is a problem, Mr. Speaker, that most people in society do not want to sort of get in the middle of, because they feel most of it is domestic and they sort of take a 'hands off' approach.

So we are very much involved in that already, Mr. Speaker, and we were very proud, a few months ago, to release a manual that was prepared by my department, particularly by the Women's Policy Office, and Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women, and other related groups like that had input into the manual.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for Oral Question's has elapsed.

Answers to Questions  
for which Notice has been Given

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to the question asked

by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, Question number 153.

### Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 3, Concurrence Motion. The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir adjourned the debate.

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I adjourned the debate on the Government Services Estimates, I had made a few short comments; I agreed with the Chairman that the Committee had worked very well and I said that I would be commenting on the two areas I am responsible for, and the others in shadow positions over here would be speaking in their turn.

One of my two areas was Public Works and Services, and I would like to make a few remarks about that. One of the things we discussed in Public Works and Services was rental space - why it was necessary to have all the rental space we have in St. John's right now when the purpose of the new building was to move all government offices into one area.

Now, I got an answer, but I am not happy with the answer. I think that either there was an error made in planning that building, or government has grown too fast, or they are maintaining departments outside when there is no need to. So there will be more questions coming concerning rental space.

The other thing I am concerned

about on rental space is that I feel that there might be some contravention of The Public Tendering Act. We questioned this, but I think there are still some questions to be asked on rental space.

My concern about public tendering is twofold. In the first place, we find that there are exceptions to The Public Tendering Act. There are over 500 government agencies which have to report exceptions to The Public Tendering Act. I feel the Department of Public Works and Services should be able to have some mechanism in force whereby all those government agencies, which are supposed to report exceptions to The Public Tendering Act, will report. A classic example that comes to mind is a written question that was put to the Minister of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing concerning the purchase of his car.

The answer that came back was yes, they had purchased a car for him. It had been done by telephone; Newfoundland and Labrador Housing had phoned around to two or three dealers, got prices of cars and then decided to buy one because, as he said, the other two did not have the car in stock with the specifications that he wanted. This, to me, would seem to be the very way I would purchase a car, or any other member in this House, but it was not reported.

The important thing is, I say to the Minister of Health, that this was never reported as an exception to the Public Tendering Act. This is where what is serious about it, that it was never reported as an exception and it certainly was an exception. The other thing that is happening now in public tendering, and I saw it again in

the exceptions this month, is, for some reason or other, over the last few months, various government departments have decided that they are going to use section 3 2 (b) of the Public Tendering Act to cover many and sundry purchases.

I will just read what (b) says. It says, "Where the estimated cost of work or acquisition is equal to or less than \$30,000 and it appears to the head of the government funded body that in view of the nature of work or acquisition it is not advisable to invite tenders..." Now, that, to me, seems to be a way around it. As I pointed out to the minister in the Estimates this, to me, seemed to be a way of contravening or going around the Public Tendering Act. Because I notice in the exceptions for the month of April there were two more cars purchased for various ministers without going through the Public Tendering Act.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why are you picking on cars?

MR. GILBERT:

Why I am picking on cars is because they have, until this last few months, always gone to public tender. Right now they do not and I feel there are serious problems there, Mr. Minister, and I have not received an answer to the questions I have put to you. I fail to see how you can justify using the section of the Public Tendering Act I just quoted, 3 2 (b), as a reason for going around the system.

That, basically, would be my comments on the Department of Public Works. I could go on, but unfortunately I do not that much time left. So I would ask the

minister to have a look at the questions I asked him in the Estimates Committee, and then the other one concerning Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, which was certainly an exception to the act and was not reported. I would ask him to look into this, because it is serious and it is something that should certainly be addressed, because it seems to me a flood tide could start from this sort of an operation if it is not controlled.

I also feel that the minister should put something in force to ensure that all agencies which have to report exceptions to the Public Tendering Act, the 548 of them, do report. There must be some sort of mechanism that he can put in.

Now, under Transportation there are many things I can talk about. I will touch on some that I am concerned about. The first one is: In the budget there was only \$50,000 put in for local roads in Coastal communities on the South Coast and on the Labrador Coast. In my own particular district, in McCallum, the minister has admitted that his department did a survey which showed that at least \$100,000 was needed to put a road in fit for a wheelbarrow to go on, so that they would be able to take oil to the school in a wheelbarrow instead of having to take it in two buckets as they have to do now. That is a parochial concern, I guess, and anyone who has communities in their districts which are classed under this local service, \$50,000 is not enough and there should be more money put in there. When you take into consideration the fact that they could find \$78,000 to pave a road in Round Pond and they only put \$50,000 in to do those local

communities, there is something wrong.

Now, in the broad area of Transportation we started off this year by introducing a private members' resolution concerning the termination of the CN service in Newfoundland. This is still a serious concern of the Liberal Opposition and of all Newfoundlanders, I would submit. What arrangement is government going to make? They admit there are negotiations ongoing, but we are afraid decisions are going to be made for political reasons rather than rational, sensible reasons from which the people of Newfoundland will benefit.

Our contention has been that if CN is going to be closed out, there should not be a lump sum payment made as a final deal. The money that CN are now spending in Newfoundland should still be coming in to ensure the maintenance of this transportation system, otherwise, generations yet unborn are not going to be able to afford to pay for the transportation system in Newfoundland.

Why I point this out is, the information I was able to find on the ferry system in Newfoundland - the intra-province ferry system - in relation to the one in British Columbia, on which the Premier got up the other day and said, "Oh, in British Columbia there was no money put into the ferry system. This \$8 million is all that goes into water transportation in British Columbia. We were very lucky to be able to get the deal we did".

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you the real story. In 1977, British Columbia signed an agreement

whereby they were going to take \$8 million a year, pegged to the consumer price index in Vancouver, to go into the operation of the ferry system in British Columbia. That is now \$16.2 million a year.

Two years later, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland Government decided they were going to take over a system that was operated by the federal government. Now the British Columbia one was operated by the province, and this money that was going in was going to be a bonus to British Columbia because they were not getting anything before. But two years later Newfoundland signed an agreement whereby we were going to take something over that was fully funded by the federal government and guaranteed by the constitution, where it says they would provide coastal and other marine services, we took it over and we agreed to a five year agreement, starting off with \$1.2 million which expired in 1984 and then was renewed on a one year basis to 1985, and then on another one year basis to 1986. It was then up to \$2 million - it was pegged to the consumer price index in St. John's for the seven years it was in force - and then it disappeared. But the little difference between British Columbia, which the Premier did not point out, is the British Columbia money is still going up; there was nothing going in until 1977. The Newfoundland money, which was fully funded by the federal government up until 1979, was cut off in 1986, there was nothing coming. If that had carried on, there would be over \$3 million now coming into Newfoundland to help provide a ferry service for Newfoundland. But it seems that the federal government signed a deal with



British Columbia and they have now reached \$16.2 million. That is what they are getting.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. GILBERT:

In conclusion, British Columbia are getting \$16.2 million and the Newfoundland Government is getting nothing. So it is costing the Newfoundland taxpayer \$10 million to operate a service right now that, up until 1979, the federal government was operating.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, during the Consumer Affairs estimates, I made comments concerning the oil industry, in particular service stations and the home delivery of oil, and the fact that the marketplace seemed to be such that prices were pretty well fixed in the marketplace, particularly by area, and that whether by collusion or not, supposedly competing oil companies had similar prices in a given location, and my questions were whether this was something government should tolerate, with the only competition in the marketplace really being by way of gimmicks and giveaways; and the fact that we now have Come by Chance producing products for the marketplace, whether this would, in fact, make a difference to the competitive nature of oil delivery, whether it be gasoline to the service stations or fuel oil to homes?

I note now that we do have, in

fact, Come By Chance products available on the Newfoundland market and I wonder whether these will be available to all oil companies rather than just to a select firm. We do not seem to have received any answers on that. I realize that the owners of Come By Chance are free to market their product as they wish, but given the situation at the time, where a government asset was transferred over or sold to a private firm, I would have thought part of the mandate of taking that over would be that they would supply the product to the Newfoundland market on an equal basis, to all oil companies, to allow free competition in the marketplace. I wonder whether that will, in fact, be the case, or will they try to market their product ultimately through one group of service stations which they might consider acquiring.

The other area in the Consumer Affairs Department that I expressed concern about was the increased fees that were included in the budget for vehicles, birth certificates, the registry and, in particular, increased fees for housing. The registering of mortgages, as an example, causes great difficulty for new home buyers, indeed for all home buyers but in particular new home buyers, who are purchasing their first property unaware that even though they negotiate a mortgage, before their property is settled, before the transaction is final, another shocker will come to them in the addition of up to \$1000 of extra fees which are strictly fees levied by the government, part of the transaction, of course, levied before the sale is complete. I do not know why we continue to increase fees of all sorts when in fact we should not be using fees,

whether it be fees for registration of property or fees for vehicles, or any other sort, licenses and so on. When all we should be doing is trying to cover off administration costs, it appears that we are making money on these particular areas, money, I suppose, that is spent in other areas of government. But I would hope that the mandate of Consumer Affairs is simply to increase fees only when it is necessary to balance off costs in that department.

I made comments concerning the retail sales tax, the fact that we have, needless to say, the highest tax in Canada, 12 per cent, and whether the government would consider or had, in fact, done any studies showing the impact of reducing that tax down to 8 per cent, the Canadian average, and whether freeing up those dollars for the consumer to spend in other areas, might mean a stimulus to the economy and to business, the retail sector and all sorts of business, so that recovery of the dollars normally collected by way of the extra 4 per cent could still flow into the government revenues, but even moreso, by way of a stimulation of the economy with the reduction down to the Canadian average of 8 per cent.

It might be considered a daring move on the part of government to make that reduction down to the Canadian average, but the government has really given no evidence that a stimulation to the economy by way of the reduction could, in fact, be more beneficial than leaving a 12 per cent tax in place which now is a complete disincentive to the economy, a disincentive to business, in particular the retail sector, where we hear stories of more and

more people purchasing goods out of the Province, taking advantage of lower sales taxes. It can hardly be considered a stimulation to our economy when people are purchasing elsewhere.

So it is a self-defeating 12 per cent tax and I would like to see government provide some evidence that a reduction would not be more beneficial to the Province and to the economy than continuing to hurt both the business sector and the retail sector, the entire gamut of the business community, and hurting, of course, ultimately, the consumer.

In the area of housing I noted that government has now decided to pass down costs to the municipalities -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, if I might be allowed to continue.

Government has decided to pass down even more costs to the municipalities. Normally used to a 75/25 sharing arrangement between the federal and provincial governments for non-profit housing, as an example, you would hope that the 25 per cent provincial share would not be passed down in some form to the municipalities. But as we have seen in other areas of government, the junior level, whether it be municipal in the case of provincial below the federal level, seemed to be taking an ever increasing burden, and the further down you are on the scale the higher the burden you take.

Are we, as a government, deciding that we will pass down all costs,

wherever possible, to the municipalities? It certainly seems that way from my example of non-profit housing, where municipalities are being asked to share in the normal 25 per cent cost to government, 75 per cent being the federal cost. Why would they pass that down to a junior level of government in municipalities that can certainly ill afford to take on those costs, especially when you look at the numbers of municipalities in this Province, and heaven knows we have probably more incorporated government per capita - I am sure we do - than any other area of Canada. And the government has now mandated that all of these communities, no matter how small, be self-supporting by way of property tax. The burden on the Provincial government of supporting communities, as it did in the past, by way of water and sewer services and other servicing, infrastructure, is being taken more and more away from the Province and passed down to a junior level of government.

Knowing that government is doing that, to continue to do it in the area of housing on top of the servicing problem they already have, to provide adequate services to the communities they try to govern, seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to be totally wrong. And I would hope that it is not intended to be the policy of government to follow this through in the future by way of other cost increases to the municipalities, moreso than we have seen in this current budget.

The government announced a Newfoundland Stock Savings Plan. My final comment would be that I would hope that this would be an example of how government can get involved in helping consumers

participate in government, investing in their own Province. And I would hope the dollars derived by way of public subscription to this tax-credit programme, when it is finally put in place, will see a stimulation in business, and a lot of the businesses being carved out now by ACOA and not permitted to take part, will be allowed to participate, and I speak of the retail sector and manufacturing sectors, in particular, which are not allowed to participate in ACOA, and that, in fact, the government will have a broad enough mandate that the Newfoundland Stocks Saving Plan will be available to all consumers, and that businesses that are allowed to participate and take advantage of these dollars and the investment that will be put into their companies will have a broad enough spectrum that they represent all areas of the economy and not just a confined and defined area, as we seem to see with ACOA and the resulting complaints of: Why can my business not participate? Why can my firm not participate? Why can I not draw dollars down from ACOA to employ people in my industry versus a narrow number of industries that seem to be acceptable to ACOA.

I would commend the government for the Newfoundland Stock Savings Plan and Venture Capital Tax Credit Programme, but would like to see it properly implemented and become an example, perhaps, to the way government can help the economy be stimulated by way of encouragement across the entire spectrum of business and not confined as ACOA seems to be.

Mr. Speaker, those will be my comments. I would hope that, in

future sessions of the House, a lot of the questions I put to the ministers involved will be subsequently answered and that future budgets will address some of these concerns, particularly in areas where I see the consumer bearing an ever increasing burden for government expenses, expenses which are normally considered as services and should not be used as revenue. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing.

MR. PEACH:

I understand my colleague, the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications, wanted to comment on some of those. If I could just take a couple of minutes, I want to answer a couple of questions the member for Waterford - Kenmount posed as it relates to the non-profit housing programme which has, I guess, caused some problems with the arrangement we have at NLHC and the city.

Just as a matter of note, this past week I met with the Deputy Mayor, who is on the Housing Committee, and discussed this problem further. I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we are following this up, and the Deputy Mayor, Mrs. Duff, agreed that she and her staff at City Hall would follow it up as well to get some clarification on other jurisdictions.

But, Mr. Speaker, just to comment, in April of last year the Corporation's Board of Directors ratified a policy in which we designated municipalities who wanted to take part in the non-profit housing programme that was signed in the global agreement, and if municipalities

wanted to become directly involved, they would cost share our 25 per cent. And I guess there are probably a number of reasons for it, realizing, of course, that St. John's is a little different, however, I would have to admit. I am sure that there are not very many municipalities which could become involved, other than St. John's, Mount Pearl and probably Corner Brook, and I am not sure of the extent of what would happen if we threw this open, free for all, to all municipalities in the Province. I am sure the Minister of Municipal Affairs would probably have everyone knocking on his door, because the municipalities would have to get approval to borrow to take part in a programme like that, whereas St. John's is a little unique in that they have a concern, and I think they should. As a matter of fact, I think the City of St. John's does have an important role to play in housing. They have demonstrated that over the years, and I think they need to be commended for it. But I think they should really continue to participate in this one particular programme.

I think the problem the member has is, why should the City of St. John's have to take part in 12.5 per cent sharing of this non-profit housing. If we look at 1986 - 1987 and prior to that, in that particular year we had twenty-six new Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation units allocated to the City. NLHC shared with CMHC 100 per cent of that; the city put no funding into it. Prior to that, CMHC footed the bill. In 1987 - 1988 we approved and allocated twenty-six units to the city, and these are the only units cost shared by the

city, ourselves and the feds. So they are paying 12.5 per cent, we are paying 12.5 per cent and the feds are paying their 75 per cent.

Now 1988 - 1989 allocation is there. We have not agreed on that, and hopefully the Deputy Mayor, myself, and whoever else, I guess officials in City Council, will be able to come up with a resolve to that over the next short while. Since 1986, I suppose, we have put 110 social housing units, infills, rental supplements, in the City of St. John's at no cost to the municipality.

Just as a final comment, without taking up the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, I know the member is very much concerned with the housing needs of the city, and when we consider the population of the city, there will always be a great demand. I think it is probably a reason why we as a corporation should be involved in housing; I do not know what would happen if we were not there. I fear to think what might happen to rental rates. It is probably our setting of rates that has stabilized the rental market in St. John's.

Also, of course, we have a land bank around the Cowan Heights area, in particular. If we had not done that, I am sure many developers would have speculated and gobbled it up and sold it at exorbitant rates. So we probably have helped to stabilize it.

Just as a matter of interest, the Province of Prince Edward Island are not involved. The Province of Alberta are involved, yes, in the cost-sharing arrangement. They are involved in the cost-sharing arrangement on operating losses.

So for seniors they are on 70/30, for families they are on 70/30. So really we are in the 30 to 10 per cent range, which are the figures the Province of Alberta has given to us.

The Province of Quebec is involved as a municipal contributor. Now, there is 10 per cent cost-shared from any municipality on the operating losses in the Province of Quebec. That is what has been told to us by our officials who contacted officials in that city. Just as a matter of interest, in 1987 the percentage breakdown in Quebec was the feds paid 62 per cent, the province paid 28 per cent and the municipalities paid 10 per cent.

In Nova Scotia, yes, they have sixty-six municipalities which share in the operating loss. Now, obviously they have probably had the same problem and the question is, what do you do if you throw it open? So, obviously, they have designated certain municipalities which can take part in the non-profit housing programme.

New Brunswick, no, British Columbia, no. But I think we should note that in the Province of British Columbia the City of Vancouver does take part in the non-profit housing programme under this global agreement. Saskatchewan, yes. In 1986, there were twenty-five municipalities which agreed to cost-share up to 5 per cent of the initial cost of capital construction. The Yukon, no. They are covered under the Native People's Agreement. Manitoba, no. They do not cost share. The North West Territories, no. And in the rich Province of Ontario, the municipalities do not share.

I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are provinces in Canada which do have some of their larger cities, like Quebec City, Quebec and Vancouver, British Columbia, part of the non-profit housing global agreement, the 75/25 arrangement, in which they have designated through some formula how they would want to have the municipalities involved.

I appreciate the concerns and I can assure the hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount that over the next week or so we will be, as I did commit to the Deputy Mayor of the city, sitting down again with their people at City Hall, and if there is some other arrangement we feel we can work out that would be beneficial to the city but not harmful to other municipalities in our Province, I am quite open and willing to do that, Mr. Speaker. I hope that will address some of the concerns of the member for Waterford - Kenmount. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, in addressing the Concurrence Debate on the Government Services Committee this morning, I want - where are all the ministers, Mr. Speaker? I want to point out a few things to the Minister of Transportation this morning. Where is he? Go out and get him, will you?

MR. MATTHEWS:

I am not your flunky, though.

MR. TULK:

I understand the hon. gentleman is nobody's flunky. He is coming.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about

a couple of issues that pertain to my district and pertain to the Department of Transportation, and the Department of Transportation happens to fall under the Government Service's Committee.

Mr. Speaker, there was a decision announced in the budget, the decision was made some three or four weeks and probably months before, it was probably made before the minister went to Change Islands and Fogo Island, which it was - it is not probably at all, it was made. He went down to Fogo Island and Change Islands, the bright and shining new Minister of Transportation, holds a meeting with them and makes the people down there believe that he is a wonderful young fellow, not bad at all, a man you can talk to - he is a man you can talk to. It is what he does after you talk to him, after you have a chat with him, that is the problem.

Anyway, he goes down and makes them believe that they could talk to him and that he would listen. Two weeks after, he allows the government to come in here and chop an essential service to both of those Islands. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation had to know when he was on Fogo Island that the decision was going to be made. Otherwise, the Premier wrote that budget in the same manner that he does everything else, overnight, in a flash. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the minister a few facts about Fogo Island, and I want to tell him what the 2,000 people on Fogo Island asked me, their member, to tell him on Sunday, when they came out to demonstrate against this decision.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that there are other people in this House who

have the same types of problems with ferries that I have. Your Honour might well wipe his brow, because I understand that he is having a few problems with the Minister of Transportation himself in regards to St. Brendan's.

MR. DOYLE:  
No. No.

MR. TULK:  
He is not?

MR. DOYLE:  
No.

MR. TULK:  
We will have to report that to the people of St. Brendan's, that there are no problems with their ferry. I am glad to hear there are no problems with their ferry. Let me point out to the minister why he should reconsider his decision. The minister, I take it, is combining the boat services because he figures there is going to be a saving. That is the only logical reason that he would do it, that there is going to be a saving. Otherwise, he would put one boat on Change Islands, in the member for Lewisporte's district, and he would put one boat on Fogo Island. He assumes there is going to be a saving.

Yet, the minister is now telling us that he is going to station one of the swing vessels, one of the vessels they use when other boats are on dry dock, stationed on Change Islands, in case of an emergency. Now, the minister went kind of blank the other night in the Estimates Committee when I looked at him and said, are you going to put a crew on? Obviously, he had not thought that through.

You know, you come from down in

that area, that if you put a vessel in a certain place, if there is an emergency the boat will not get up and move on its own, the minister is going to have to provide a crew. Now, does the minister know how far it is from Change Islands to Farewell Head?

MR. DOYLE:  
I have been on the boat.

MR. TULK:  
You have been on the boat? How far is it?

MR. DOYLE:  
I have made that trip.

MR. TULK:  
How far is it?

MR. DOYLE:  
I could not tell you how far it is off the top of my head. I have gone between Change Islands and -

MR. TULK:  
How about three miles? Would you agree it is three miles?

MR. DOYLE:  
About that.

MR. TULK:  
Yes, it is slightly over three miles.

The Minister of Transportation is now going to save government the cost of fuel between Change Islands and Farewell Head, that three miles of water. That is what he is going to save if he takes the action he says he is going to take. Because if you put a swing vessel in Change Island, it is going to be there tied up to the wharf, and it must have a crew if it is going to be of any use in anything that arises of an emergency nature.

MR. DOYLE:

We have a couple of people out there.

MR. TULK:

A couple of people - what!

MR. DOYLE:

We have a few people out there on standby.

MR. TULK:

Where are you going to get the crew if the boat has to move?

MR. DOYLE:

I will get up and answer your questions.

MR. TULK:

I wish he would, because if this minister does not have to provide a crew for that boat we have been waiting for him for a long time, the second coming - if he could do that, and I doubt that he can.

Mr. Speaker, let me say something else to the minister, and I want him to consider this very seriously, because the hon. gentleman, as I understand it, comes from a somewhat rural area of this Province. Last year Fogo Island Co-op shipped \$16 million worth of fish product on that ferry. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about \$16 million like you and I get paid in this Legislature. Those are not new dollars that you and I get paid, they are taxpayers' dollars, dollars within the Newfoundland economy. The Minister of Transportation has to realize that those dollars are new dollars, and the government has to realize that. They are new dollars that would not have been in this economy unless you had a Fogo Island there. Now, if you take a multiplier effect of 2.5, what we are really talking about is the

worth of the fish to this Province and to the Canadian economy, which is something like \$40 million for 5000 people. Now, if the minister wants to take the 5000 people - it is not 5000, it is 4700, but for round figures we will say 5000 - and divide them it into \$40 million, per capita every man, woman and child on Fogo Island is contributing \$8000 per person to the Newfoundland economy. I would suggest to him that there are few areas in this Province contributing near that amount to the Newfoundland economy, very few, yet, he decides that he is going to go down and take a very basic service, a road - their boat is a road as Mr. Speaker knows; the boat to St. Brendan's is a road, the boat to Change Islands is a road, the boat to Fogo Island is a road, the boat means a road - away from the people of Fogo Island. That is what he is going to do. He originally intended to station the boat on Change Islands, but we got him to change his mind a little bit on that. He muddle-fuddled around with that and changed his mind a little bit, but essentially he is taking that road away.

I suppose you could get angry with the minister; the old pork barreller who used to be in Municipal Affairs is now the pork barreller in the Department of Transportation, because he just made a decision, I suspect, with the encouragement of his friend and colleague for Lewisporte, that great and outstanding member for Lewisporte who will not stand up for the people of Change Islands about their ferry, who runs and hides and tells me that I should give her a chance.

I suspect he made a certain decision in the last couple of



weeks - the announcement was made a couple of weeks ago -- about a road that serves both the people of Fogo district and the people of Lewisporte district, and I am talking about the Gander Bay/Lewisporte loop. I suspect old pork barreller made a certain decision, at the request of his friend for Lewisporte. He started to do a bit of paving on that road, Mr. Speaker. It is amazing! Do you know where the pavement ended? Where would you suspect, Mr. Speaker? I only know of one other place in this Province where it happened, and that was in Trinity North, when the now the Minister of Municipal Affairs was Minister of Transportation, Do you know where the road ended?

MR. BAKER:  
Right at the line.

MR. TULK:  
What line?

MR. BAKER:  
Between the Tory and Liberal districts.

MR. TULK:  
Ah, ha! The hon. gentleman guessed it. I wonder how? It must be from experiences of the past. The bit of pavement he is putting down there came up to - it is drawn on the map - the district boundary between Fogo district and Lewisporte district, in spite of the fact that the section of road that is going to be most used by school kids and everything else is in my district, is in the district of Fogo. Now, I do not know what the hon. gentleman thinks he is going to do with that. Is the Minister of Transportation foolish enough to believe that the people of Fogo district are going to defeat me

because he cuts off a bit of pavement at the boundary of my district? Does he believe that? Well, I have some news for him. You cannot buy the votes of the people of Fogo district, and you cannot bribe them and blackmail them into voting against a member they happen to like. Neither can you buy them, bribe them or blackmail them into voting for a member they do not like, namely the member for Lewisporte.

MR. DOYLE:  
Plus, you are very modest.

MR. TULK:  
Of course, I am modest. I should have been up here saying this eight years ago. It took me nine years to get it out. And I say to the hon. gentleman that if he wants to take the taxpayers' money of this Province and play politics with it, if he wants to do that to try to get the minister of whatever he is over there now re-elected and me defeated, if he wants to play pork barreller instead of being the Minister of Transportation, then I say to him, go right ahead, you go right ahead and put pavement in Lewisporte district, use every cent you have - I believe it is \$39 million this year.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Not any more. It is forty million.

MR. TULK:  
Forty million dollars. Use it all in Lewisporte district and it will not work. Because, I say to the hon. gentleman, you cannot buy votes in this Province.

I understand the Premier is on his way to Whitbourne to make a big announcement. Well, that is another district. If he thinks he is going to take it by going out

there and making a few announcements, I say to the hon. gentleman he is throwing good money after bad.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister of Transportation the people of Fogo Island produced \$16 million worth of new fish, the Fogo Island Co-op has a payroll of \$6 million, and it costs those people \$400 more per tractor trailer load of fish to get across that service than it should. He has increased the rates tremendously in spite of the fact that on January 16 of this year he made a statement - not in this Legislature because he does not do that, he makes them outside - saying that he believed that the Gulf ferry service should be treated as a road and that you should pay no more than it would cost you to drive that ninety miles.

MR. SIMMONS:

Did he say that?

MR. TULK:

Oh, yes. He said that. But he cannot take that principle that he believes in so strongly with the federal government and apply it to his own people. He cannot do that. Instead of that, every April 1 up she goes again. It now costs \$170 to get a tractor trailer across the seven miles of water - seven miles of road and get it back - \$170 for a tractor trailer.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is cheap.

MR. TULK:

Cheap! Cheap, he says! Cheap, says the Minister of Career Development, the layoff minister. He says that is cheap. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. gentleman that if we are going to

develop this Province - I say to him that transportation is very important, he has a very important portfolio - then the hon. gentleman has to start looking at where the real action is, and the government has to start looking. It is not enough for him to go down and be nice to Change Islands people and Fogo Island people and think he is going to smooth over their feathers by having a few little meetings with them. That is not going to work. The economy will not improve by doing that.

I say to the hon. gentleman that what he has to do is start looking outside the overpass. Instead of spending \$22 million on what they call on Fogo Island now a cucumber farm, take some of that money and divert it into places like St. Brendan's, into places like Change Islands, and, of course, into one of the most productive areas in this Province, Fogo Island.

Now, I know what the minister is going to stand up and say. He is going to stand up and say, 'I am going to meet with them.' By the way - I wonder if the minister is listening? - he stated in the House the other day that he had already set up a meeting with the people of Fogo Island and Change Islands. Well, I would like for the minister to tell those people when the meeting is, because they do not know about it yet. I am not going to say that the minister misled this House, that would be nonsense. He says he has a meeting set up with the people of Fogo Island and Change Islands.

The former Minister of Health knows how important it is to those people to hold regular meetings to discuss with them. He was a very good Minister of Health for Fogo Island. As a matter of fact, he

was highly respected down there. But I can tell this Minister of Transportation that if he does not change his attitude and eh does not change the way he deals with the people of Fogo Island and he does not put back the road that he took from them, when he moves on to greener pastures, as the hon. gentleman for Exploits has moved - I am not sure if it is greener pastures, but he has moved - he will not have the same kind of respect that that hon. gentleman has.

Now, I would like for the minister - I think my time is just about up - to stand in his place and do one of two things, either give some very rational, very good economic development reasons why he has done what he has done, or otherwise stand in his place and say that he is going to let those ferry systems revert to their original condition and indeed improve that condition.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:  
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir has presented a number of questions in the House today, as he did at the Estimates, many of them extremely valid. Sometimes it is very easy to sit in the

sunshine and talk to the man in the shade. It is very easy to sit in a well made boat and tell the other just where to wade. 'It is easy to tell the toiler how to carry the pack, but you never know the weight of his load until you have carried his sack.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:  
Under no circumstances would I like to denigrate your remarks or your questions, because they are valid. But one thing you must remember is that the Government Purchasing Agency is a department full of complexities. And because it has been so full of these complexities over the years we have made great strides, giant strides to try and change the course in a little way. In other words, take smoother waters as we chart from going from A to B, or port to port, as you have a nautical interest.

That has been done. Recently you have, with justifiable cause, made some comments, and I would say not unkind criticisms about the purchasing of motor vehicles. Not unkind, they have been factual. We have honestly admitted it and published these facts, letting everyone, not alone in the government but anyone who wishes to show an interest, in the exceptions of The Public Tendering Act. If you cast your mind back to the ages you have been in this House, you will realize that it has improved in steps, just the same as every government all over the world will improve in these steps. It has not gone down it has gone up. Because the assurance has been given to you in Answers to Questions that it is our intention in the government,

and in the Department of Public Works and Services, to give you assurance - of course, no one is infallible - that all efforts will be made to comply in every respect with The Public Tendering Act.

The Public Tendering Act, a remarkable document, was brought in by this government for the first time in the 400 years of history of government in our Province. It has to be acknowledged, really, as a progressive and innovative way of looking after public monies. Since November of last year we have been publishing Exceptions to The Public Tendering Act. And I know they will be published from here until time and eternity. Except the act is changed this will be so. And I think that you will find that each and every month, hopefully, there will be a progress report and we will give you less opportunity to be critical of the department.

But you and I know, and so does everyone in this House, that you can only stumble when you are in motion, you fall otherwise. And I think that we in the Department of Public Works and Services and on this side of the House, or government, we have, in essence, yes, stumbled. That is human. We would be infallible, we would be godlike if some little thing did not happen. And you must remember that the act leaves a certain degree of liberty for practical business purposes, and I know in talking to you you understand what practical business is.

Under \$5,000 we do not have to tender, but it has been the policy of the Government Purchasing Agency to try and get a price. Between \$5,000 and \$30,000 is discretionary, but, again, in most

cases they have asked for a price. The exceptions are when there is a pressing emergency, that is number one, and a pressing emergency can exist. The word emergency seems to be a cant word in this House during the last few days. It was almost like playing a tape of the music **Perpetual Motion**.

It is quite obvious when there is a single source of supply, that supply can only be purchased from one company, one organization. I think it is quite obvious to each and every one of us, and to you Sir, above all. Because who would you try to get a special part for one of your Lincoln Continentals from? It is like asking: Who would you choose to be tenor in a quartet? Your obvious answer would be a tenor, of course. You would go to a Ford dealership to provide it. You would not go elsewhere to replace the parts.

So, these are things that we have to do in all government agencies, where there is one source of supply. Obvious ones are the vaccines in the Department of Health. Certain pharmaceutical products can only be bought from one drug company, other ones are in the computer services, where they have to select special type of hardware to fit in to their computer system.

And I believe that software, likewise, has to be brought from one source only. Beyond that, I do not think there is much to say on the public tendering system, considering the amount of money that we tender for each year. Last year it was almost \$112 million. And even God said, that those who are perfect can fall seven times a day, or sin seven times a day. Anybody is able to

pick out three or four exceptions to The Public Tendering Act.

You mentioned in a very offhand way about our leasing of space, and I think I have answered that quite well in my reply.

The amount of lease space in St. John's up to December 31, 1985, was 428,000-odd square feet, at a cost of \$4,693,000 per year. Leased space as of March 31 of this year was 276,800 square feet at a cost of \$2,700,000.- almost \$2 million less. So that is what the west wing of the Confederation Building has done. If there are more questions, Sir, I would be delighted to answer, and I know that you can see the logic of my argument. And I thank you for your challenge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to have too much to say in this debate, but looking at the lineup of the departments covered by the committee, I would be remiss, I suppose, in my duty and responsibility to my constituents if I did not get up and make some reference to the condition of the roads in my district, the need for water and sewer services so badly lacking, and, of course, other matters that affect the people that I have the honour to represent.

But let us start off, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Public

Works is a man I have a lot of respect for, and he knows that, talked about logic, and all that. I have never yet, Mr. Speaker, been told by the minister the logic of some of the things being done by his department. I know he is not responsible, because he has only recently assumed the mantle, but I raised in the House during Question Period a month ago, some of the statues that now adorn the grounds of Confederation Building. And I know it is not a big issue to talk about \$25,000 or \$30,000, and in terms of a huge budget, it is not all that important, but it does make one wonder, Mr. Speaker, just where the government's priorities are when you see money being spent on creating half a whale - I still cannot figure if the whale is coming or going, if its emerging or submerging - that cost, I believe, \$25,000.

DR. TWOMEY:  
\$27,500.

MR. W. CARTER:  
That amount, \$27,500, would have provided water and sewer to a number of houses in my district.

Then, of course, we have other things. I am often wondering, and maybe the former minister can tell me, there is another statue or something adorning the grounds out here. I do not know what it is yet. It looks like a box kite. Maybe the present minister can tell us if it is supposed to be there, if it is part of the construction paraphernalia that goes with constructing a building, or what it is. Somebody said it is some kind of a statue to something or other. I cannot seem to put a handle on it.

The Minister of Labour, of course,

is relaxing and smiling, but I have occasion frequently to do business with the Workers' Compensation Board and, for the life of me - I am not, for a moment, suggesting that public servants should be expected to work in buildings and under conditions that are not in keeping with their position, but I am at a loss to rationalize the amount of money spent by the Workers' Compensation Board erecting that huge building on Forest Road and some of the tapestries and the adornments that are in that building. To me it is going a little bit too far when you realize that the cost of that building is coming out of the pockets of the people really, the employers and employees.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:  
Well, the employers pay it. I know that through my experience. Employers pay it, and, quite frankly, I get very little consolation out of knowing that some of the money that I have paid into that board and am still paying into it is being used to build a big ivory tower for a group of people who do not need it, and, quite frankly, do not deserve that kind of accommodation.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) a good investment.

MR. W. CARTER:  
It is not a good investment, Mr. Speaker. It is a building that is probably not functional for the private sector or for regular commercial use. To me it is a little much.

I can understand the frustration and the disenchantment of the

employers coming in here from Twillingate and other districts having to pay out good money to the Workers' Compensation Board and then to see where it is being spent. Mr. Speaker, I personally cannot accept it.

MR. BLANCHARD:  
We are saving money on that.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, the minister says we are saving money. Well, I agree maybe that the provision of a building would save money, but there is a difference in providing ordinary, regular accommodations and providing the type of accommodation that is being provided the Workers' Compensation Board on Forest Road. It is a state-of-the-art building. I doubt very much if the big executives in the big companies in Canada have better office accommodation. To me it is a waste of money and the people are paying for it.

I am glad to see the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doyle) is back in his seat, because, Mr. Speaker, if there are two things that have turned off the people of rural Newfoundland, if there are two single items that have had the effect of turning off rural Newfoundland in these past twelve months, it is the Round Pond Road project controversy, and the Sprung greenhouse. Now, we are not discussing the Sprung Greenhouse this morning, so maybe I can touch on Round Pond Road.

In my district there are approximately seventy miles of unpaved road, the worst kind of road you can possibly imagine. Over these roads travel people to and from fish plants. Fish is being transported over these

roads. If we make representation to the minister, we get the standard reply, that money is just not available. Yet, when they turn on their television sets and radio sets, they hear about the \$60,000 or \$70,000 or \$80,000 that was spent last year paving a road that goes nowhere, except to property owned by the former Minister of Transportation. That, in my view, is shameful.

Mr. Speaker, we all heard the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Young) when the Come By Chance refinery was being reactivated. We were led to believe that once that facility came on stream that the products that came out of it would be sold to Newfoundlanders at a price, maybe, more competitive than the price that we are now paying for gasoline and for petroleum products.

Now, I believe I read somewhere last week or maybe I heard on radio where they are now selling gasoline. Gasoline is now on stream from the Come By Chance refinery and that it is being sold to the distributors here in St. John's for the same price that they are paying for gasoline in Halifax.

I am at a loss to understand why it is that gasoline that is refined in Come By Chance cannot be sold at a cheaper price than gasoline, for example, that is refined in a refinery in Halifax or some part of Quebec. There is not the transportation, something that is most often than not used as an excuse for higher prices in this Province. Certainly in terms of the gasoline coming out of Come By Chance, if in fact they are now disturbing gasoline from that facility, transportation cannot be

used as an excuse for the high cost.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:  
One would have expected, Mr. Speaker, that gasoline coming out of Come By Chance, if and when it is coming out, would be sold at a cheaper price than that coming in from the other provinces and thereby maybe setting the stage for a reduction in gasoline prices across the board.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Like the cucumbers.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Like the cucumbers, yes. The cucumbers, of course, we know are being sold in the Province at a price considerably higher than the imported ones. That too is difficult to explain.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Gullage) this morning asked some questions about Churchill Park, Elizabeth Towers and the operations of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no justification whatever for the government retaining ownership of that apartment building, Elizabeth Towers. I find it difficult to rationalize why the government would retain ownership of the Linden Court Apartments, the Allendale Apartments, and other such semi-posh and, in the case of Elizabeth Towers, posh apartment accommodation.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not care who started it, two wrongs do not make a right. The fact of the matter is that that apartment building -- and on top of that, of course, now they are proposing an expenditure of \$4.5 million on that building, \$4.5 million. Surely, given the fact that that building is now catering to the elite in St. John's, that there is no justification whatever for the government retaining its ownership.

MR. REID:

We cannot get rid of it.

MR. W. CARTER:

The member says, we cannot get rid of it. Mr. Speaker, the more money they keep pouring into it, including the \$4.5 million that they are pouring into it this year, the more difficult it will be for them to recover what they have put into it.

I would strongly suggest to the minister that he now seriously consider calling tenders for that building, take the best price that is tendered and let the private sector then do what has got to be done with it because we all know that when the government is involved in doing anything of that nature, for whatever reason, the cost always escalates above and beyond what it should cost.

MR. DINN:

(Inaudible) because it is done by tender. (Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

Irregardless, whether it is done by tender or not, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of work will be done on that building that could be done far cheaper than the private sector. Therefore the private sector should be doing it. There is no

reason why with Elizabeth Towers, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing should be competing with private developers for luxury apartments or indeed for the semi-posh apartments that we now have in Linden Court and Allendale Road Apartments. These are a couple of things.

In Municipal Affairs, I do not see the minister here, but I can tell him now, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is here.

MR. W. CARTER:

-- oh, yes, I am sorry -- I can tell him now that we are suffering some very severe handicaps in my district and indeed in a lot of other districts in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, believe it or not there are places in my district -- and I hope the minister will listen to this and pay attention and maybe make a few notes -- I can cite a case last year where, and I will not mention the name of the community, but in a certain small community in my district an old lady was walking home one night, she lost her footing and slipped into a ditch in the road. Mr. Speaker, that lady was in such a state that they could not bring her home to undress her, they had to literally take off her coat on the back bridge because she fell into a pit of raw sewerage.

The former Minister of Health is aware of that case because, I think, if he harkened back, as the Minister of Mines said this morning, if he harkened back to about a year ago, I wrote him on the same matter in my efforts to make a case for some funding to provide a proper sewer system in that community. Those are the



kind of conditions that exist today in rural Newfoundland where we have raw sewerage in the streets.

Summerford, for example, is another reasonably modern, progressive, well planned little town in my district, a community of 1,400 hundred people. In fact I am going there tonight to speak to a graduation. Summerford has great potential for growth, lots of space, good people, but there are places in Summerford where you have to hold your nose, Mr. Speaker, when you drive past, where you have raw sewerage on the sides of the road. You have people there building good homes on which they have mortgages, in some cases, homes that will probably represent a large part of their future earnings in terms of mortgage payments, homes that have taken a large part of their savings as a downpayment. They are now living under conditions, and near conditions, that are hardly fit for human beings to live near.

We get up in the House and we talk about the need for water and sewage projects and we sometimes accuse the government, maybe, of playing hanky-panky or political patronage in terms of how they distribute the funds, but, Mr. Speaker, what we are is an exemplification of the frustration and the problems that are being felt by the people that we represent and are being passed on to us in the course of our visits to our ridings. It is a very, very serious matter.

We have towns like Durrell in Twillingate, again a modern town with a great deal of potential, where people literally have to bail out their septic tanks once a

year because of the soil conditions and the lack of proper drainage mean septic tanks are not functioning as they should. The occupants of the homes and the residents there have to bail out their septic tanks once a year and wheel it in wheelbarrows or put it in trucks and take it to the landwash and dump it. On top of all that, we have people who are drinking water from wells that in some cases have been dug by hand and the quality of the water, of course, for drinking, in my view, would be highly questionable.

MR. GULLAGE:

They do not have the property tax base.

MR. W. CARTER:

That is right. My friend for Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Gullage) reminded me that it is all very well to say that they live there and they should be contributing to these services, but the fact of the matter is that most of these small towns do not have the property tax base necessary to enable them to raise the kind of money needed to cost-share the installation or the provision of these facilities, so they are caught in a bind.

They do not have the tax base and because of the conditions that exist in their communities, they cannot get the tax base because it is difficult to encourage people to build or to establish businesses in a community, for example, where you do not have proper water and sewer facilities, or where you do not have proper road facilities. So it is a Catch-22 type situation or a chicken or egg situation.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER:

I conclude by saying, Mr. Speaker, that I would strongly suggest to the minister that he come visit the district sometime. I will be glad to take him through the district. I will be glad to accommodate him while he is down there, and I will treat him royally. I think he and I are very good friends and he knows that. He will see for himself the problems that the people of Twillingate district are facing.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to have a few words in these concurrence debates and to try to answer some of the questions that have been put forth by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) and the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), as well.

Just to elaborate a little bit on the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and his remarks with respect to the local roads and the fact that only fifty-odd thousand dollars is provided in the budget for local roads this year, I would point out to him that the \$50,000 that he makes reference to is not intended to undertake any great capital projects in areas in the Province that do have local road boards. It is not meant to

address that type of expenditure.

What it is meant to do, Mr. Speaker, is to provide a per capita grant to those areas that do have local road boards, a per capita allocation each year which this year is going to be increased 100 per cent. The per capita allocation to the various local roads boards around the Province is going to be increased by 100 per cent, which means it will go from the ten dollars that is allocated right now to local roads boards, ten dollars per capita, to twenty dollars per capita. As I said, it is not meant to undertake any great capital improvements in any area of the Province. It is meant to provide a token amount to each of these communities that do have local road boards.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, we do have capital allocations which are made available to communities that do have local road boards and that cannot satisfactorily undertake this work with the small amounts that are made available from that \$57,000. So we do provide funding in our regular capital programme in the department to help out those areas that do not have the means at their disposal to help themselves.

The hon. member, I believe, mentioned something, as well, with respect to the ferry systems and how the federal government are helping out some areas in Canada. He gives the impression that that same consideration is not afforded to the Province of Newfoundland, and that is not true, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. gentleman is throwing up a smoke screen in that regard, because the federal government does provide a subsidy each year

of approximately \$30 million on the South Coast in the Labrador Coastal freight and passenger service. That is a very, very significant amount, \$30 million, that is provided as a subsidy each year on the South Coast and Labrador Coastal freight and passenger service.

On top of that, the federal government funds 100 per cent the Petite Forte to Argentinia run which is funded to the tune of about \$520,000. That is provided 100 per cent by the federal government as well. The service between Jackson's Arm and Harbour Deep is 100 per cent funded by the federal Department of Transport, \$341,000. So that is an additional service that we receive each year.

He quotes British Columbia and what they are presently receiving from the federal government. Well, British Columbia got \$8 million back in 1977 and that will go to \$15 million of a subsidy per year in 1988.

The entire cost of the service they are providing is \$171 million a year in British Columbia. The subsidy that they will receive will be in the neighbourhood of \$15 - \$16 million, compared to -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) what?

MR. DOYLE:  
Have not you been listening? Sit down, and listen for awhile, instead of talking while I am talking. Open up your ears. I just got finished telling you, and if you had not been talking to the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), you would have heard what I told you.

I told you that the federal

government each year in Newfoundland spends \$30 million on the South Coast and the Labrador Coastal freight and passenger service. In addition to that, they also subsidize 100 per cent the Petite Forte to Argentinia run, which is costing in the neighbourhood of about \$550,000, and the Jackson's Arm to Harbour Deep run, which is \$341-

MR. TULK:  
(Inaudible) Fogo.

MR. DOYLE:  
I am not talking about the Fogo service. I am responding to the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir -

MR. TULK:  
Talk about Fogo.

MR. DOYLE:  
Yes, I will in due course. I am responding to the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert), who has made the statement that in Newfoundland, as compared to the Province of British Columbia, we are not receiving nearly as much as what they are, and I wanted to point that out.

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

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

MR. TULK:  
It is one thing for the hon. minister to talk about the coastal boat service, but the truth of the matter is, in 1979, as he knows, he negotiated -

MR. DOYLE:  
That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

- a deal which saw the Province -

MR. DOYLE:

He is just using up my time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. DOYLE:

That is not a -

MR. TULK:

- lose \$8 million.

MR. DOYLE:

- point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of  
Transportation.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, since the members did not get what I was saying originally, I will point it out again. For the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir to say that we are not receiving equal due consideration compared with the Province of British Columbia is, absolutely, untrue, because the federal government, again, spends \$30 million on the South Coast and the Labrador Coastal freight and passenger's service and they fund 100 per cent, as well, the service between Petit Forte and Argentinia, and the service between Jackson's Arm and Harbour Deep. Compared to British Columbia, we get \$30 million - \$40 million, and B.C. is currently getting \$15 million per year of a subsidy for a service that is costing \$180 million.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Province picks up the balance.

MR. DOYLE:

The Province picks up the balance, yes, I would imagine it does.

So, having dealt with that one, Mr. Speaker, we will move on now to some of the comments that was made by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). I must say I was very disappointed that we did not have more time in our estimate committee meetings to deal fully with the Department of Transportation because it is a very important and extensive department. We had only three, I believe, three and a half hours to deal with the many, many problems and it was not time enough to get around to every thing that I wanted to deal with.

I must say the quality of the debate was not what you would expect. But I will try to deal with some of the points that were raised by the member for Fogo with respect to the Fogo Island Ferry Service. This year we are, Mr. Speaker, making some changes to that service, and as I have indicated on many, many occasions, it is not meant at all to downgrade the service in any way. We will be having the same number of runs between Fogo and Farewell, and the same, if not, more runs between Change Islands and Farewell. Each service will be a dedicated one.

It will not be a three-point service, and I will ask that the people of the area give it a chance and see if it can work. We are convinced that it can work, and we will be monitoring very, very closely that ferry service between Fogo and Farewell, and between Farewell and Change Islands to insure, Mr. Speaker, that the best possible service is given to the people of that area,

that it is convenient, and that there will be no downgrading whatever.

I think that one of the main concerns that the people of those areas had was the fact that they did not feel there was going to be a second vessel made available to tie up in Change Islands and Fogo overnight. Well, we have given those committees assurances that that will not be the case. They will have a boat in the night on Change Islands and they will have the **Beaumont Hamel** available on Fogo Island every single night.

During the very busy time of the year between June and September, there will be a two-boat operation in effect and there will be an overnight of one of our swing vessels, whether it is the **Hamilton Sound** or the **Sound Of Islay** tied up in Change Islands to respond to any emergencies that may occur.

Mr. Speaker, I have already had a meeting, as a matter of fact. The hon. member has asked me when meetings are going to take place.

I trust now he will not be up in a few minutes asking me to repeat all of this again. He is talking to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). Well, I am only going to say it once and, if he does not want to listen, well, that is his tough luck.

MR. TULK:  
I will listen.

MR. DOYLE:  
I am going to tell him that we did have meetings lined up with the people of Fogo Island and the people of Change Islands. Already I have had the opportunity to meet with the people of Change Islands

only yesterday and to talk to them about what changes might have to occur.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. DOYLE:  
They seem to be and I certainly do not want to put any words in anyone's mouth, but they seem to be on the surface fairly satisfied that there will not be a downgrading. They will be attending a meeting this Sunday evening with officials of my department to go over in detail any changes which might have to be made. They are willing, Mr. Speaker, to meet with officials of the department on Sunday evening, this Sunday coming.

MR. TULK:  
When did you notify them?

MR. DOYLE:  
I have a Telex here if the hon. member would like to see it. They were notified a few days ago that there would be a meeting taking place, first of all, between officials of my department and the two ferry committees to go over any changes that might want to be made. I cannot seem to find a date on this. See if you can find a date on that? They are willing to meet on Sunday evening to go over the details of any changes that might have to be made.

MR. TULK:  
Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. DOYLE:  
Yes.

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

MR. TULK:

The reason I ask the minister for the date of the Telex is that, as I understand it, the news media yesterday, as a result of the question that I asked the minister the day before in the House, was carrying a story that the minister had said they were going to meet with the Fogo Island people. Yesterday I was told that several of the people who sit on that Committee, including the Chairman, who sits on the Transportation Committee, and including the Mayor of Fogo, had no idea that there was a meeting in place. Now I want to know if the minister has cleared that up. That was the point of my question this morning.

MR. DOYLE:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DOYLE:  
I am glad the hon. member asked me that question because we suggested to the Committee. We said, "This will refer to your Telex of April 28, 1988 concerning the integration of the ferry system. It is unfortunate, indeed, that your Committee is not prepared to meet with the Change Islands Committee and my department at the same time.

"However, my officials are available to meet with your Transportation Committee to discuss the details of the integration of the Fogo Island - Change Islands ferry service.

"Government's decision with respect to the binding of the two is finalized and discussions with your Committee will take care of operational details, especially scheduling.

"I personally will be unable to attend the initial meetings between your group and the department. It would be appreciated if a copy of the proposed agenda items could be forwarded.

"May 10, May 11, or May 12 are suggested as possible meeting dates. Would you please advise accordingly?"

MR. TULK:  
What is the date on the Telex?

MR. DOYLE:  
The hon. member can have the telex and see for himself if he can then figure out when it was sent. It was sent days ago anyway.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that this is 13 May and that there cannot be any meeting ongoing if this is the 13th and that says the 10th, 11th and 12th?

MR. DOYLE:  
Well, I do not know where to find the date on that.

MR. TULK:  
The time is past for that meeting. Today is the 13th.

MR. DOYLE:  
They refused to meet on that time so we had to re-schedule the meetings again. That is what I am saying to you.

MR. TULK:  
When is it now?

MR. DOYLE:  
What I am saying to you is it is on Sunday evening.

MR. TULK:  
This Sunday?

MR. DOYLE:  
Yes.

MR. TULK:  
Do they know about it?

MR. DOYLE:  
Well, we are not going to have a meeting if they do not know about it.

MR. TULK:  
Well, I do not know. You may try.

MR. DOYLE:  
What kind of stupid questions, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member asking? 'Are we going to have a meeting?' Yes. 'Do they know about it?' Well, obviously we are not going to have a meeting if they do not know about it. I think it is fair to say that they know about it.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to some of the questions raised by the hon. member as to whether or not a boat will be put in place on Change Islands and Fogo Island. I can indicate that, yes, there will be a boat put in place, a swing vessel, which will take care of Change Islands. Fogo Island will not be without its **Beaumont Hamel** in the night. That was the big fear that they had. Any possible emergencies that might occur will be dealt with.

The hon. member is asking why we are combining the two services if we are only going to be saving approximately \$250,000 a year. I think he asked that question. Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the things you have to consider, if you are going to provide a two-boat service, is to build an additional boat and that will cost in the area of about \$10 million, to build an additional boat to

serve the people of Change Islands.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I will sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Question! Question!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Are you ready for the question?

On motion, the report of the Government Services Committee was concurred in.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the President of Council.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, for the rest of the day we are going to move into Committee of Supply to continue the Estimates of Executive Council and Legislature.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is approximately thirty-odd minutes remaining out of the seventy-five hours, so we will conclude, at least, and use this remaining time in Committee of Supply on those two heads, Legislature and Executive Council.

I move Order 2.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, I believe there will only be about five or six minutes left at one o'clock. We more or less had some sort of agreement that at one o'clock we would stop the clock and use those five or six minutes rather than come back

the next day.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

We have agreed on that, and I appreciate the hon. member's co-operation.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

### Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The last time we discussed this I had a few questions and I raised some concerning Purchased Services in the Premier's Office, the budgeted amount and the revised figures that came in. The general sort of comment that I made was we go through the process every year of having a budget, but the ministers never live within the budget that is allotted for them. It is always revised. I asked what was made up in Purchased Services for the \$15,500, and, in the \$98,000 for Travel in the Premier's Office. I never got an answer to that.

Then, as I went down through the other ones, I had some questions.

Under Treasury Board Committee of Cabinet, 2.3.02.06, \$20,000 for Purchased Services. Maybe you could tell me what that is comprised of, because it has been -

MR. SIMMS:

What was that last one under Treasury Board?

MR. GILBERT:

Treasury Board, 2.3.02.06, Purchased Services, \$20,000 there. Then you go under Personnel Policy, 2.3.10.06 again. There was nothing in it last year, no budget, but this year you are budgeting \$7,000. What is in the Purchased Services there?

I asked about the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, his increase in that department, and they said it was because there was not a full minister for the year, it was a shared thing. So I will accept that.

Under Protocol, 2.4.07.06, Purchased Services, I followed that back since 1985 when we budgeted \$355,000 and we spent \$380,000. The next year we estimated \$230,00 and we spent \$384,000. Last year we estimated \$250,000 and we spent \$465,000. This year we are estimating \$243,000. So I would like to know what goes into the \$465,000 that is charged up in the Protocol account. That seems to be a lot of money that is spent and it goes over the budget every year. So I would like to know exactly what is the breakdown of this expense. Have you got it?

MR. SIMMS:

The last one I did not get. Sorry!

MR. GILBERT:

It is 2.4.06, Purchased Services.



MR. SIMMS:  
Under what head?

MR. GILBERT:  
It was estimated at \$250,000 and \$465,000 was spent. This year you are estimating \$243,000. So if we are going to go through the exercise of passing these estimates, there is not much point unless we are going to live within the budget. There is not much point in doing it. I wonder what is in it that made the rather dramatic increase there.

MR. SIMMS:  
2.4.06 under what head, are you saying?

MR. GILBERT:  
Protocol.

MR. SIMMS:  
That is Cabinet Secretariat or Executive Council, is it?

MR. GILBERT:  
Yes. Under that same heading, under Grants and Subsidies, 2.4.07 and 06.

MR. SIMMS:  
Professional Services, you say?

MR. GILBERT:  
Purchased Services. Then the next one down, Grants and Subsidies, there is \$10,400 estimated there for this year. There was \$10,000 estimated last year which was not used. So I wonder what the reason for that is.

DR. COLLINS:  
Which one is he in?

MR. SIMMS:  
I do not know. I cannot follow it.

DR. COLLINS:  
Would the hon. member just permit a question? Would you just read

out the heading number again?

MR. GILBERT:  
2.4.07 under Purchased Services.

MR. SIMMS:  
Yes, but what head though?

MR. GILBERT:  
2.4.07.06. Page 22.

DR. COLLINS:  
So this is under Executive Council, Protocol.

MR. SIMMS:  
Yes, but he is going from Treasury Board to Executive Council.

DR. COLLINS:  
Yes.

MR. GILBERT:  
Do not worry about it, gentlemen. I will come back to it. We have all morning.

DR. COLLINS:  
We have you straightened out. Carry on.

MR. GILBERT:  
Have you got that one?

MR. SIMMS:  
Yes.

MR. GILBERT:  
Page 23, top of the page, 2.4.08, Offshore Negotiations. In the budget last year we budgeted \$250,000 for Professional Services. You spent \$135,000. This year you are budgeting \$250,000 again. I wonder is that Peter Loughheed's law firm and Cabot Martin's? Is that where that would be in there? We would like to know.

That is about it. I can sit down now while you answer the few questions I have there.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

I have been trying to follow closely the questions the hon. member was asking. He must appreciate, or maybe he does not, maybe he not aware, but the briefing notes I have, of course, are broken down into the different categories. Under Executive Council you have the Premier's Office, Treasury Board, Cabinet Secretariat and all these other things. So I have been trying to keep track.

In the interim I had a chat with his leader and I got thrown off track there for a minute, so I think I may have missed one or two. If I have, I apologize in advance, and, as the hon. member says, he can rise again and certainly repeat the questions, as long as he does not attack me for not answering, but maybe he could repeat them again if I miss some.

The answers are fairly general anyway, or obvious, I suppose. He asked about the Purchased Services under the Premier's Office, I think it was. Purchased Services with respect to the Premier's Office, why was \$15,000 spent even though only \$7,000 had been budgeted. I believe that was his first question. He can nod or ignore me as I go through it, but I think that was his first one.

The answer to the question - I thought I had in fact answered that the last day he asked it - is that it is obviously for official entertainment on the part of the Premier, as he is aware, but it also includes, in this particular vote, maintenance agreements on an Olivetti electronic typewriter and

some other model machine or whatever it is. So it covers some maintenance and official entertainment.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How much was maintenance?

MR. SIMMS:

I do not know how much was maintenance. I suspect most of it was official entertainment, if that is what he wants me to say, but that is what he vote is for.

The other one, I believe, was Transportation and Communications for the Premier's Office, Travel. It was \$80,000 and it went to \$98,000.

MR. GILBERT:

Why?

MR. SIMMS:

Why?

MR. GILBERT:

Why? In the other minister's offices, the minister's travel and entertainment account we budget for, but it goes over all the time. He does not live within the budget. Why? If we are going to budget, why do we not budget it high enough so we know?

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Chairman, the answer to that question then, in a general way, if his general question is why, is that, first of all, it is not factual because it is not every minister's vote that goes over on travel; not every minister's Purchased Services vote goes over. The Minister of Mines tells me, for example, his did not and so on, and I am sure there are others.

MR. GILBERT:

Some do.

MR. SIMMS:

Some do, that is correct. And it is for the obvious reason that there is more requirement of the minister to travel to meetings or whatever representing the government or there is more call on entertainment expenses and so on. That is why it goes over. It is very difficult to say anything other than the fact that they did more travel.

We do try to stay within the budgets, and the departments, if they do go over, have to go to Treasury Board for approval of additional funding, and things of that nature. So, that is the general response I can give the hon. member. He may want further elaboration, and that is fine, too.

Then he went to Treasury Board, I believe it was, Purchased Services .06. We budgeted \$5,400 and spent \$12,000. That is one of your questions, I believe. That is official entertainment and advertising.

MR. GILBERT:

Could you say that again?

MR. SIMMS:

That is official entertainment for the President of the Treasury Board, and advertising.

MR. GILBERT:

How much was advertising?

DR. COLLINS:

We had to advertise for a President.

MR. SIMMS:

I do not have the breakdown of that \$12,000.

MR. GILBERT:

But you would assume that most of

that was entertaining.

MR. SIMMS:

I would assume that it was for official entertainment. The present Treasury Board did a lot of it last year obviously.

MR. GILBERT:

You are not going to do it this year, though.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Treasury Board travelled outside of St. John's seven times.

MR. SIMMS:

As a matter of fact, that is a very good point. The hon. member pointed that out, that that went up by \$7,000, but he certainly did not make much of the fact that while the President of Treasury Board had a slight increase in his entertainment and advertising vote, the fact last year he was budgeted for \$37,000 to travel, but he, in fact only spent \$18,000. So he saved \$20,000.

MR. GILBERT:

Excellent.

MR. SIMMS:

But the hon. member forget to mention it, I guess.

MR. GILBERT:

No, no. I did not see a reason to mention it.

MR. SIMMS:

So, that also does not jive with his earlier statement that all the ministers travel go over.

MR. GILBERT:

Entertainment, one or the other goes over.

MR. SIMMS:

Anyway, he will probably apologize when he gets up.

The other thing was, I believe, the member asked under 2.3.02 before that, Purchased Services, where there is \$20,000 budgeted this year and last year was a small amount. This is for Treasury Board Committee of Cabinet, the Cabinet committee of Treasury Board, like the Resource Policy Committee, and so on. There is a Cabinet committee on Treasury Board. It intends, at least, I intend to try to bring the Board around to different parts of the Province perhaps more than what was done last year to let people have an opportunity to speak to ministers on Treasury Board, to meet the people, take the government to the people, in keeping with the government's overall philosophy. I am not aware that members opposite have a real big problem with that. I am sure they agree with that.

So, essentially, that is what it was.

MR. GILBERT:

That will be entertaining when you take it and the travel is up too.

MR. SIMMS:

Not necessarily, the cost of meeting rooms and maybe equipment rentals for whatever the reason might be. It is just an estimate. We do not know if we will use it, or whatever.

MR. GILBERT:

The travel and entertainment in that department has gone from \$8,000 to \$50,000.

MR. SIMMS:

But last year, under that same vote, we budgeted \$3,000 and we spent \$3,000. So, there is nothing unusual. This year, we think we may do a bit more, we may try to bring the committee around

to more parts of the Province.

MR. GILBERT:

Maybe the people cannot afford it.

MR. BAKER:

Is there an election coming up?

MR. SIMMS:

That is an interesting question, Mr. Chairman. Is there an election coming up? Well, Mr. Chairman, let me put it to the member for Gander this way: If he is considering seeking the nomination in the federal riding of Grand Falls - Gander, or the other one, Bonavista - Trinity, Conception, he may wish to make his decision on that matter very, very soon. That is the best answer I can give the hon. member. He may want to do that.

If the hon. member is asking me if there is going to be an election, my only response is, I wish there was.

MR. GILBERT:

So do I.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Because what we have seen from the members opposite, the official Opposition, and I give them credit for it, by the way, credit where credit is due, they have, now, after the last twelve months, since their new leader came into office a year ago, now, they have finally been able to convince themselves that maybe they are an alternative. The member for Fogo even was so bold to predict 'We would win forty-five seats tomorrow, if there was an election.'

MR. GILBERT:

We would.

MR. SIMMS:  
Here is the point.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
(Inaudible) star candidates.

MR. SIMMS:  
That is true. But here is the point: If it has taken them one full year now to convince themselves maybe they are alternative, they will need at least that much time or longer to convince the people. The only thing I can say in response to the hon. member's question is that they will not have that much time.

MR. GILBERT:  
What about the questions I asked?

MR. SIMMS:  
I thank the hon. member for the question.

The other one the Protocol vote, let me just get to the Protocol vote.

MR. GILBERT:  
No, before that, 2.3.10.

MR. SIMMS:  
The hon. member does not mind if I jump to the Protocol one.

MR. GILBERT:  
Okay, as long as we come back.

DR. COLLINS:  
That is under Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. SIMMS:  
That is under Intergovernmental Affairs somewhere, is it? Here it is.

Last year the vote was \$250,000 and we spent considerably more than that obviously, \$465,000.

MR. GILBERT:  
Yes, and you did the year before and the year before.

MR. SIMMS:  
This year again we are budgeting down to \$243,000. What happens? That is the vote where you get requests. You will recall, for example, when the Leader of the Opposition and I spoke to the first bill, The Act To Amend The Remembrance Day Act. During debate on that, there were legionaries in the audience and we had talked about where we had assisted the Legion to attend -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Beaumont Hamel.

MR. SIMMS:  
Was it Beaumont Hamel?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Yes.

MR. SIMMS:  
Beaumont Hamel and so on. We assisted and do assist and have assisted the Royal Canadian Legion with a significant contribution to help them send their delegation of students, legionaries and so on to that particular activity. And, of course, there are numerous, numerous requests from recreation groups for national banquets that are being held in the Province. They always come to the government and ask the government if they would mind sponsoring a banquet. Generally speaking we are very happy to do that. Unfortunately, the money you budget is really only an estimate. We try to keep within it, but at the same time, we try to keep a social conscience and try to be supportive of all of these groups to the best of our ability, and that is the reason why the amount exceeded considerably, I admit, the amount

that was actually budgeted.

This year our intention is to try to keep even better control on it, if we can.

MR. GILBERT:

Yes, but could you table last year's list?

MR. SIMMS:

The Protocol vote itself, we will try to keep it strictly for protocol purposes. For example, the Ambassador to Egypt was here in the Province last week. A couple of ministers, I think, entertained him and had lunch or dinner or whatever and there were other activities associated with his visit. There were some costs. It came out of the Protocol vote.

What we are going to try and do this year is break down per department, give every individual department their own vote to address the requests that come for banquets, to address the requests that come from the Legion or whatever, those kinds of things will now be addressed to the individual departments, rather than to the President of The Executive Council.

MR. GILBERT:

That will make it harder to find (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

The President of the Executive Council does not want to be standing up here every year and saying, 'Well we overspent' and try to explain why. I think the ministers of the departments should have control over it and that is what we are going to try and do, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GILBERT:

Would you table that list for last year's expenses?

MR. SIMMS:

The breakdown of the Protocol expenditure?

MR. GILBERT:

\$485,000.

MR. SIMMS:

I will certainly take that under advisement and if there is no secret or no Cabinet secrets involved or anything of that nature.

MR. GILBERT:

You can black out the department, it is just the amounts we want.

MR. SIMMS:

I shall undertake that for the hon. member and see if I can do that. I do not see any particular reason for that.

MR. W. CARTER:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

On the Protocol, we have now a Director of Protocol at \$52,000 a year. I think Mr. Andrews the former member for Burgeo, defeated in the last election is the Director. Then we have a Chief Protocol Officer, Contractual. We have two now, one a Director of Protocol, \$52,000; and a Chief Protocol Officer Contractual, \$40,550.

I wonder can the minister explain the need for a Contractual Chief Protocol Officer and a Director of Protocol?

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. EFFORD:  
And who are they?

MR. W. CARTER:  
Yes, who are they?

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. member may have gotten it a bit mixed up. I think you have it back foremost. I think you mentioned that Mr. Andrews was the Director of Protocol?

MR. W. CARTER:  
Well, I thought he was.

MR. SIMMS:  
No, I do not believe he is. I believe the Director is Mr. Korbai, I believe. I think Mr. Andrews is the other contractual person. In any event, the reason for two protocol officers is very obvious, if you were down in their office. Perhaps, the hon. member, by the way, and I invite all hon. members to take the opportunity to go and meet with these individuals and ask them to explain to you their role because I can assure you that they are very, very busy.

For example, we have a visit this year to the Province by a member of the monarchy. Prince Edward will be visiting the Province next month, 7, 8 and 9 June. The Protocol office, in conjunction with some other people, are involved in the organization of that whole visit. That is, in itself, enough to consume the time of two people for several months.

Now, the hon. member was a minister of the Crown. He would have a better perception than most members because he was in the Cabinet. He would be very much aware, now, that this is not just a couple of people sitting around doing nothing. He knows there is a lot involvement in protocol. Every week there is an ambassador: From Egypt last week; the week before a minister was here from Norway with respect to the offshore; the Swedish ambassador was here recently; and the United States ambassador. The hon. member may not have a perception of that, but that is a fact.

There is so much positive activity happening in Newfoundland and Labrador, they are coming here from all over the world to find out what the prospects are and what the promise is for the future. When they come here, we treat them with a bit of dignity and we also show them the Newfoundland spirit, not as active as the Soiree '88 function the other night.

I am sure when Mr. Turner came to this Province last night, members opposite welcomed him with open arms.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:  
When a visitor comes, I am sure the Leader of the Opposition, who is a sensible gentleman on these matters, I am sure he will admit that it is appropriate, when those people visit your Province, that you look after them as best you can with the resources that you have. You have them for a meal, or whatever, and you might invite a few people to go along for the meal, those kind of things. That

is natural, normal stuff, and that is what the Protocol vote is basically used for.

Do you have some questions?

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Chairman, since we are dealing with the Executive Council I want to broach a question by virtue of the ministers and their staff in that particular department, which I believe is Treasury Board, Intergovernmental Affairs and the Premier's office. It is a question that, I think, applies even more widely.

It refers to a question of interest from the Liberal Party as well because, if you recall on the first day, they tabled, I think, twenty-two questions about what was happening with the minister's staff over there during the by-election in Windsor - Buchans. I have some real questions about that because the inference from the Liberals, in tabling all these questions, was that there was an abuse of this staff, or that there might have been an abuse of this staff. In other words, the President of Treasury Board's staff might have been out there doing political things in the Windsor - Buchans by-election; that the Premier's staff might have been doing political things and that the Minister of Intergovernmental's staff might have been doing political things out there.

I have a lot of confusion about that because, quite frankly, I am not exactly sure what the staff

are allowed to do. I think the reason it is important is because we have some staff members as well, we have a couple of secretaries and a part-time researcher, and we would like really clear directions on whether they are allowed to do political activities like getting involved with it.

Of course, the Leader of the Liberal Party also was involved with it since Robert Dornan who was a staff person for the Liberal Caucus was also out in Windsor - Buchans at that time and was, I would assume, involved in the activities that were going on with the election campaign. I think it is a question that I want some clear answers on.

Are the staff of the House of Assembly, and of all of the ministers, such as Executive Assistants, and so on, are they forbidden to take part in election campaigns or do they have a role in election campaigns? I would really like to know the answer to that because so far we are getting all kinds of conflicting statements on it.

By the way, the case of Robert Dornan who was an employee of the House of Assembly, I think, was incorrect. We know that he was there for about ten days during the election campaign, at the end. The Leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Wells), when asked, said he was not there working on a campaign, but was in fact there as an assistant to the Leader of the official Opposition.

The only problem was that the candidate in Windsor - Buchans was not the Leader of the official Opposition during that ten-day



time period. So he must have been there as the assistant to the then Leader of the official Opposition who was only there for two days, as far as I know.

So really what I am asking at this point is: Can we get some clear directives? Are there clear directives on the amount of staff, and on the things that the staff can do? I really do not know the answer to the question. I get conflicting answers. I get an indication that the Liberal caucus is concerned about it, otherwise I do not see why they would have put those questions on the Order Paper. If that is the case, that they feel they should not be doing it, then there seems to be some abuse on their part as well.

I do not know what to say to people when my secretary says, 'Can I go and work on this campaign for a couple of days?' I do not have an answer for it. I want some answers to those questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. LONG:  
Good question.

MR. SIMMS:  
It is a good question, I guess. I do not want to get into the question of the Leader of the Opposition's staff in Windsor-Buchans, for obvious reasons. Some of our staff were out there too. I understand the reason for the questioning is because the Liberals had a question on the Order Paper asking

MR. FENWICK:  
Where they were.

MR. SIMMS:  
I do not think they asked where they were. I think they wanted that information to find out what expenses may have been incurred. That is fair enough. I answered it. There were no expenses associated with my two political staff people. They stayed with their parents in Grand Falls. That is where they are from. They ate at their homes and all that kind of thing.

So that was the purpose for the question.

MR. FENWICK:  
Where they on salary at the time?

MR. SIMMS:  
Yes, they were on salary.

Then that brings me to your next question which is: Staff, are they allowed to participate in elections, for example, by-elections? If they are political staff, Mr. Chairman - I do not know if there is even a policy on it but it certainly has always been the practice - I do not think anybody has ever questioned it - if they are political staff, then they are expected to do political things. Obviously, a by-election is a relatively political activity or undertaking.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
It can become that, yes.

MR. SIMMS:  
Yes.

I do not know if we have a policy, but that has been the practice and I do not think anybody really has had a problem with it. If the hon. member has political staff or office - I know he had some people out there from the party. I do

not know -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

If I could have the hon. members' attention, I would like to pursue the point.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

I want to try to pursue a big point. I do not believe it has been an acceptable practice to use secretarial help, specifically to answer your question. Political staff, yes. Secretaries, I am not sure are political staff. As a matter of fact, many of them stay in the system after changes of government and things like that. So they are not usually held accountable as political staff. But ministers' political staff involvement, I think that is quite acceptable.

The overriding question here then, perhaps, not only as it relates to us parliamentarians and members and ministers, or whatever, the overriding question is a larger one that the hon. member has had on his mind for a long time with respect to the political activity, perhaps, of public servants.

I believe the Premier already indicated publicly a few days ago that we are working on a policy to address that particular issue, and I believe we will have it in place very soon. Hopefully it will be an acceptable policy, although any policy you bring in is bound to generate a bit of criticism, certainly from Opposition, generally speaking.

That is a broader question related

to the question of political activity of staff. But certainly my understanding is political staff of ministers or Opposition offices, or whatever, are certainly allowed to participate in political activities. The Treasury pays them, that is true. The Treasury also pays members and they participate in political stuff. So I do not think there is a real conflict, or anything. Maybe the hon. member has a conflict or a problem with that aspect of it, or perhaps he has another point that he is trying to zero in on.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a suggestion relating to Social Policy. Social Policy and Resource Policy Committees come under this heading.

MR. SIMMS:

Both Social Policy and Resource Policy?

MR. LUSH:

Yes.

So I want to make a suggestion to the President of Treasury Board in the hope that he can take this suggestion back to the members of the Social Committee in the hopes that they can pursue this as an active policy. Because, Mr. Chairman, without this policy this Province is going to be in deep, deep trouble. A solution to it will not be found unless the government pursues this particular suggestion that I am now going to make.

Mr. Chairman, I have been doing this for the past three weeks in my questioning to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in particular. It has been fragmented. My attack has not been uniform, because I have been getting in at the tail end of Question Period and just getting one question to the minister. Mr. Chairman, it is a very, very important suggestion, and I represent in making this suggestion the view of 300 municipalities throughout the Province and possibly in excess of 90 per cent of the population. It is not always that a member speaks on behalf of these large numbers, 300 municipalities representing over 90 per cent of the population of the Province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I refer to the lack of public services in this Province, particularly water and sewer and roads in the hundreds of municipalities throughout this Province. The problem is never going to be addressed adequately or effectively, if we do not get federal government participation. If we do not get federal government assistance than that problem is not going to be addressed. We are forever going to have a level of public services that is not comparable to that with other Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I was surprised when I asked the minister whether he had made any representation to the federal government for this very thing and the minister admitted that he had not. I asked the Premier, the Premier was rather elusive about it and said that it was done in the past, but, it did not indicate that it was being

done now.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this policy must be actively pursued by this government to get the federal government to participate in providing the people of this Province with public service.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

I just want to make that suggestion to the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Simms) that this becomes a policy of this government to take back to their buddies in Ottawa, their friends of the same political stripe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the member for Bonavista North. I want to commend him. He is one of those individuals from the Opposition who quite frequently, in a well-reasoned way, puts forth good solid arguments. He also puts forth reasonable questions, important questions. For example, yesterday, even though he got on at the tail end of Question Period, and he was complaining about that, he got national coverage on a question he asked the Minister of Education where he quoted the President of the NTA about young people who were fund raising. That got national coverage in the Toronto **Globe and Mail**, the member for Fortune - Hermitage knows that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Two years ago, I remember the hon. member, I am not sure if he was my critic when I was the Minister of Forestry, but he advocated more silviculture projects should be undertaken, and particularly in his own constituency. Lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, that very same year, and the member even thanked me for it, commended me for it, for acting on his suggestions. We undertook two or three projects in his district, a Liberal district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

So, I take his questioning very seriously. I can tell him, yes, we have made representation. The former minister went to Ottawa and met with two or three people up there on two or three occasions to try to develop a policy. The Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) was up there. All kinds of people were up there trying to get funding from the federal government, which they were forced to cut, I guess, to put in place an infrastructure programme.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have only got a minute left. I have to get this question in before I finish. I want to ask the hon. member, I want him to tell me sincerely, by a nod, because he will have time to respond publicly: Is he too seriously contemplating leaving provincial politics to seek the nomination federally for the Liberal Party in Bonavista - Trinity - Conception?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS:

He nodded. There was a little

small nod.

MR. SIMMS:

When he gets the appropriate opportunity he can either confirm or deny that story, as I know has happened in the past by others. But perhaps he can tell us. I think he would make an admirable candidate, by the way, for any party. He is a fine gentleman.

I gather, Mr. Chairman, time is expired, is it, five past one?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, I still have a couple of minutes, well in that case.

To get back to the question of municipal infrastructure. The hon. member knows full well, as everybody does, that we get hundreds of millions of dollars of requests, as I understand it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

\$160 million.

MR. SIMMS:

\$160 million this year. We are trying to be fiscally responsible, but at the same time trying to have a social conscience, which is not easy when you do not have the dollars.

DR. COLLINS:

'Len' your mother is on the phone.

MR. SIMMS:

I am trying to speak so they do not get up again, boy.

We have tried to contain our expenditures and said we are going to try and contain our expenditures. We have set our goal of \$25 million a year for a three year period. That is not

easy to attain and it may not be easy to attain.

DR. COLLINS:  
A great speech.

MR. SIMMS:  
But it is fiscally responsible to portray those kinds of initiatives to your - as the hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), who is the Finance critic would be very aware - to your fiscal agents. They see these things as an indication that you are trying to attack problems you have, like we have with the deficit.

DR. COLLINS:  
Fraser March is outside.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:  
We are about to vote on our estimates, if hon. members will be patient.

MR. BAIRD:  
You better hurry on, we are all going.

MR. SIMMS:  
Hon. members are not aware that if I sit down, then the hon. members over there will stand up. What is the difference? Anyway, that answers his question.

Is the time expired?

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Yes.

DR. COLLINS:  
Question. Question.

MR. SIMMS:  
Time is expired.

On motion, Heads 1.1.01 through 1.1.03, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Shall 2.1.01 carry?

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Chairman, I think it is agreed that we will just carry it without calling all of them. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Agreed!

On motion, the total of the estimates for Legislature and Executive Council, carried.

MR. SIMMS:  
I move that the Committee rise, report having passed the departments and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, that the Committee rise and report having passed estimates of expenditure for the Legislature and Executive Council and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:  
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed Estimates of Expenditures of the Legislature and Executive Council and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, may I just thank hon. members for their co-operation, by the way. That now finalizes the seventy-five hour allotment of the estimates and all members I think have worked hard to see the process work. We still have to physically pass the budget. That will take place some time in the future. We will not say when.

I want to advise hon. members that Monday and Tuesday we will be returning to the Meech Lake debate. It is the government's intention to pursue this as quickly as we can and to get a resolution to it one way or the other from this House so we will be persisting and putting Meech Lake on Monday and Tuesday.

On Thursday and Friday, I will have to wait until Tuesday afternoon to advise hon. members because it depends on the debate on Meech Lake. The intent would be to go on with Meech Lake, if it is not concluded, or get back to perhaps the budget and then get into legislation as soon as we can.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

If Meech Lake is concluded, we will get into the budget debate to try to pass the budget. Then the remaining weeks will be legislation.

Might I also just point out for the Leaders of the Opposition, in particular, and the NDP, I believe, Clerks have spoken to both mention Order 31, Bill No. 32, An Amendment To The Atlantic Accord Act, which is a very minor amendment, but because of a time problem, we have to try to put that through all three stages, if

we can agree to do that some time next week, perhaps Thursday or something like that. So we will have to do that obviously some time too.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion that the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, May 16, at 3:00 p.m.

**Index**

**Answers to Questions**

**tabled**

**May 13, 1988**

Hansen

**QUESTION 153**

Mr. Fenwick (Menihek) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Consumer Affairs & Communications to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

1. What plans the department has to promote the hiring of handicapped people in their department over the next year.
2. What funds have been allocated to help in programmes like this.
3. What funds have been allocated to make the department itself, and their programmes, more accessible to handicapped people.
4. Any other programmes that the department itself might have to help the handicapped.

**ANSWER**

1. None, all hiring for the Department is done through the Public Service Commission.
2. No funds have been allocated because all hiring is done through the Public Service Commission.
3. (a) No funds have been allocated to make the Department more accessible, as the Department is situated in leased accommodations. However, the landlord provides entry through the main entrance of the building and use of building elevators for access by handicapped people who wish to visit the Department.  
  
(b) Departmental programs are accessible to all segments of the population through telephone, written, and personal contact, upon which every attention is given to assisting consumers, including the handicapped.
4. As per note 3.(b) above.







## CONTENTS

FRIDAY, 13 MAY, 1988.

### Statements by Ministers

#### Provincial Parks Schedule for Victoria Day Weekend:

Mr. Butt.....	1886
Mr. Tulk.....	1887
Mr. Long.....	1887

#### Contract Awarded for Wood Chip Generating Station:

Mr. Windsor.....	1888
Mr. Baker.....	1889
Mr. Fenwick.....	1889

#### Encouraging Exploration by Teck Corporation:

Mr. Dinn.....	1890
Mr. Furey.....	1891
Mr. Fenwick.....	1892

### Oral Questions

#### Health Care:

Seeks explanation of Minister's statements that everything is normal when health professionals claim admissions are made only on an emergency basis. Mr. Wells, Dr. Collins.....	1893
--	------

The Administrator of the Health Sciences Centre said it is operating almost entirely on an emergency and urgent basis. Mr. Wells, Dr. Collins.....	1894
--	------

Ambulance Service:

Progress in funding the service to provide qualified drivers and a second attendant.

Mr. Efford, Dr. Collins.....1896

How much funding has been provided to hire second attendants and qualified drivers.

Mr. Efford, Dr. Collins.....1896

Claims half the amount provided in the budget went to pay off old debts, so gains have not been made in providing second attendants and trained drivers. Mr. Efford, Dr. Collins.....1897

Housing:

Suggests \$4.5 million not be spent to renovate Elizabeth Towers, but applied to the department's mandate. Mr. Gullage,

Mr. Peach.....1898

Suggests all NLHC units be put on the market to avoid competition with the private sector. Mr. Gullage, Mr. Peach.....1899

PCBs Cleanup:

How stored and secured. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Russell.....1900

Confirmation of an accidental discovery and spill of PCBs; cost of Cartwright cleanup. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Russell.....1092

Battered Women:

Seeks more funding for the Labrador City Transition House. Mr. Long, Mr. Tobin.....1904

Kirby House needs to be made more secure. Mr. Long, Mr. Tobin.....1904

Seeks public education programmes on domestic violence. Mr. Long, Mr. Matthews.....1905

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

Employment of the Disabled:

Mr. Young.....1905

**Orders of the Day**

Order 3, Concurrence Motion (Government Services):

Mr. Gilbert.....1906  
Mr. Gullage.....1909  
Mr. Peach.....1912  
Mr. Tulk.....1914  
Dr. Twomey.....1919  
Mr. W. Carter.....1921  
Mr. Doyle.....1926

On motion, Government Services Committee concurred in..1931

Order 2, Committee of Supply:

Mr. Gilbert.....1932  
Mr. Simms.....1934  
Mr. W. Carter.....1938  
Mr. Simms.....1939  
Mr. Fenwick.....1940  
Mr. Simms.....1941  
Mr. Lush.....1942  
Mr. Simms.....1942

On motion, Estimates of the Legislature  
and Executive Council, carried.....1945

Adjournment Motion.....1946