

PROPERTY OF NEWFOUNDLAND  
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY  
PLEASE RETURN



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 13

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush*

Thursday

15 June 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):  
Order, please!

### Statements by Ministers

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, as in years gone by the Province anticipates that due to the seasonal inshore migration of caplin and cod we will once again soon experience an oversupply of fish to our inshore plants. This 'cod glut' situation is further complicated by the fact that many groundfish processors are presently gearing up for the lucrative caplin fishery.

In an effort to alleviate the problems associated with this oversupply situation the Department of Fisheries intends to initiate a number of measures which should prove very beneficial to the industry during this period.

For example, we intend to give approval to a mobile processing vessel to purchase fish directly from fishermen during the glut periods. The **MU Northern Princess** will be made available to purchase fish and is capable of processing approximately 200,000 pounds of cod per day. The vessel will be initially located in St. John's. Efforts will be coordinated through The Newfoundland Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers Union and joint trawlers for the transport of cod to this vessel.

A Fisheries Monitoring Committee

has also been activated to address the 'glut' situation. This Committee will involve both levels of government as well as industry and its primary mandate is to address concerns of both fishermen and processors to ensure full resource utilization where possible. The Committee will meet on an ongoing basis during the peak landing periods.

In a further effort to alleviate any potential glut problems, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Fisheries will be issuing temporary processing licenses during 1989. The Monitoring Committee will be consulted before any such licenses will be issued. Groundfish processing licenses may be issued to companies for a specified period to conduct processing operations in facilities that were not previously licensed.

Mr. Speaker, as many members of this House are aware, the Department of Fisheries has established minimum processing requirements under The Fish Inspection Act which normally ensure that cod are either filleted or split and salted prior to export. In order to ensure that our fishermen have a market for their catch during inshore glut periods, the department may temporarily decide to withdraw these requirements for a limited period of time.

The Department of Fisheries through its network of regional offices throughout the Province, will maintain close liaison with fish processors, fishermen, and fishermen's organizations throughout the traditional "glut" period. Information desks at the regional offices will endeavour to match peak landings of fish with

underutilized capacity. Our Fisheries Offices at Harbour Grace, Wesleyville, La Scie and Marystown will be staffed by field representatives during Saturdays and statutory holidays should the need arise during the glut situation.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Fisheries has also provided a \$15,000 grant to the Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers Union to set up and staff an information desk to co-ordinate and monitor fish landings. This desk will be located in St. John's and will be maintained until the glut situation is over.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the measures which I have outlined here today will prove extremely beneficial to the fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador during this glut situation and will ensure that our fishing industry receives the maximum benefits from any oversupply situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me thank the hon. minister for sending me a copy of his statement, and let me congratulate him on the endeavours he has started. At least before we get into a problem situation, we see some positive moves towards

alleviating a problem that is just about to come upon us.

I do have some concerns, however, about the measures taken. Perhaps the phraseology is incorrect when we talk about cod glut, because it has been a while since we saw what we could call a real cod glut, when the cod, which was the basic fishery in this area for a number of years, would become so plentiful at this time of year that the plants could not handle it and we had to find some way of getting rid of it.

Plants cannot handle the cod now, but it is not because of the cod glut, it is because their freezers are blocked with caplin. We are getting, perhaps, something like the old merchant mentality. All the inshore processing plants, or at least most of them we have today, are there because they were set up to handle cod fish. Eventually they got caplin licenses, and as the caplin fishery has become lucrative the fishermen who for years depended on cod, and that would be the majority of our fishermen, have been shoved in the background during the caplin fishing season so that the plant operators can make a mint on caplin, and the people who traditionally fish cod find themselves without any market. It is that problem that we are trying to address here.

Some of the measures also concern me a little bit. There is a boat arranged for St. John's that can handle 200,000 pounds of fish a day. If there is any amount of cod fish at all in St. John's East and the Petty Harbour area, that will more than make up for the amount of fish that the boat can handle.

There has been a request in for a boat for St. Mary's Bay, and I understand, with some co-operation from the Department of Fisheries, that boat can and will be made available, and I hope it will.

The awarding of temporary licenses to companies for a specified period concerns me a lot, because I wonder if it is a way of doing through the back door what we were accused of doing through the front door a few days ago by my colleague on the left. Tonight at the Committee I will be asking in which areas these licenses will be awarded, to whom, and for how long. Will it be just to handle the glut, or will it be for a period of time? Because there will be quite a lot of difference there?

MR. RIDEOUT:

If the glut triggers them in, it is going to trigger them in and out.

MR. HEARN:

Exactly.

The establishment of minimum processing requirements we have, which have prevented the export of fish from the Province unless it is processed or semi-processed, might be a solution also, but we have to be very careful of that one, because, once again, if outside interests get their foot in the door, then they have ways of pushing the door further open, and that is taking jobs away from the Province. We cannot, however, listen to our own processors complaining about fish being trucked out if they are not going to buy it and the fishermen are suffering.

The monitoring desks that we have around the Island certainly, I

must say from my own experience, have a very poor record. I have yet to see very much success in them finding markets for fishermen. And the same can be said for the union, which certainly has not been overly productive in finding markets over the years. Now that they are directly involved with a desk of their own, maybe this will be of some help. But certainly in the past the fishermen were left to flounder, and their only recourse, I say to the minister, was the Department of Fisheries and their local members who, thank God, came through for them in most cases.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the copy of the statement. I congratulate him on the initiatives. We will be watching as they are implemented. I think there are some good moves here. However, several of them are open to abuse by outside interests, and perhaps by government itself if they are not monitored carefully.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Premier consistently appears to be preoccupied with decorum here in the House of Assembly, and in view of the fact that you cannot very well teach Sunday School lessons inside this

House and practice something else when you are outside, in view of the fact that the House consists of more than just the floor of this Legislature - in fact, the precincts of this House are equally as sacred - will the Premier today do the honourable thing and immediately apologize to this House for calling a member of this House a liar yesterday during a press scrum?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of **The Evening Telegram** and I think it is probably reasonably accurately reflects what occurred. I do not recall it being significantly different. I believe this is what was said, or the general context of it. The statement was made by the hon. member for Mount Pearl that the negotiations were in excellent condition, a deal was about ready to be made, and it was only my position on Meech Lake that stopped it. That, Mr. Speaker, is totally and completely inaccurate. That is wrong and inaccurate. I can state that categorically, that is wrong and inaccurate. You cannot or should not use the word 'lie' in this House, although I understand there are circumstances where it can be said. And perhaps it is even too strong a word to use outside the House. It is totally and completely inaccurate. Maybe he might even believe that and therefore that might change its character, but I believe him to be sufficiently well informed and he should not believe that. So I do not know what motivated him to say that, I can only assume it is politics.

I do not disagree with what the Leader of the Opposition is saying,, 'lie' is too strong a word, but you do occasionally get carried away a bit and make strong statements. It is totally and completely an inaccurate statement. If the former minister feels any better with my characterizing it as that than an 'lie', then I am happy to withdraw the reference to 'lie' and characterize it as a totally and completely inaccurate statement.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary, obviously, but before I put it I am sure that all members are pleased to recognize in the Speaker's Gallery at the moment a former Premier of this Province, Mr. Smallwood.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear! Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I did not see how **The Telegram** referred to it, but I did see with my own eyes the Premier on the electronic media last night use using the words that I just described. But the Premier in his answer, I think, gives leave to the supplementary.

In view of the fact that the Premier obviously becomes so

irritable and visibly perturbed when his method and approach is questioned by anybody, including members of this House, will the Premier tell the House whether or not he plans to hire a temperature control expert on the staff of his Office?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

No answer, Mr. Speaker.

I guess arrogance is now showing through again. Maybe the Premier would like to respond to this. In view of the fact that the Premier has now had five or six weeks of on-the-job training, can the Premier tell the House when he intends to replace visible arrogance with understanding, and red-faced irritation with patience when dealing with the people in the government and running the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No answer.

MR. RIDEOUT:

He has got the Kitchen disease. He has been hit with the Kitchen disease.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask a supplementary along the same lines but I appreciate the fact that the Premier has withdrawn that comment. I point out that The Evening Telegram report, I think, was reasonably accurate. I use

his own quote, Mr. Speaker, - in that statement, so it is more about the person making the statement than about whom it was being said, and I will leave it at that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

Just to confirm the situation, Mr. Speaker, I will table an excerpt from the minutes of the meeting of November 18, of a technical committee and the statement of Mr. Bernier that I quoted here yesterday. It is just an excerpt. There is nothing in there of any confidential nature, so I have just taken an excerpt. But just for the records of the House, just to show who is telling the truth in this situation, Mr. Speaker, I table that.

I refer the Premier to the Editorial of The Evening Telegram and I congratulate The Telegram. I think they have given a well-balanced report today, and I refer the Premier to the last paragraph that says, "Mr. Wells has to be prepared to put aside any private qualms that he might have about this or that constitutional arrangement and go to the bargaining table with Mr. Bourassa or any other Quebecer. Developing Labrador may be the key to this province's future."

The Evening Telegram editorialist, Mr. Speaker, is entirely right. I point out to the Premier that the people of this Province will judge whether or not he is telling an untruth in this House or am I. I ask him now, in view of the judgement laid down by The Evening Telegram, which represents the opinions of the people of this Province, will he

now change his position on Meech Lake and go back to the bargaining table with Quebec in good faith?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier,

PREMIER WELLS:

Let me do a couple of things to deal with the matters as the hon. member dealt with them. The document he tabled is probably an accurate statement. I referred to the discussions that took place during the meetings and commented on the things that had occurred. I acknowledged that, I never denied it. As a matter of fact, I described it first in the House. What I was talking about is the complete breakdown of any action since December, demonstrating there are no active talks, no deals just around the corner, and it is clearly established.

Now, the other comment that he has made about Meech Lake. Let me say at once the editorial is the opinion of the individual who wrote it, not the opinion of the people of the Province.

MR. WINDSOR:

We will see.

PREMIER WELLS:

I do not know who wrote it. It is the opinion of the editor.

MR. WINDSOR:

Yes, your former colleague.

PREMIER WELLS:

I am prepared to give the answer if they want it to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, when the former government was in power they raised the question of using Meech

Lake to bargain. The former minister wanted to use Meech Lake to bargain and his Cabinet colleagues turned him down and said, no, it was not to be used to bargain. And they were right in that decision, it ought not to have been used to bargain anything. That was the formal decision taken and minuted in council at the time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINDSOR:

You cannot produce anything.

PREMIER WELLS:

I will produce the minute if that is what is required. It is there. It is clearly stated. The minister's representation is there and the decision of government is clearly there as well, that it would not be used for that purpose.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the editorial referred to by the member suggests a particular course of action. I disagree with the comment that it should be used to bargain in this way. I do not disagree with the comment that one should go with open mind and negotiate and bargain. I have already stated clearly the position of the Province and my personal position in that regard, and it remains to be that. That is the extent to which the editor's comments are not founded on actual fact. That was clearly the position I have taken and that remains the position, but I will not bargain kilowatts of power for constitutional principles.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has now brought forward another untruth, that my position was that we should bargain Meech Lake. That is not what I am advocating at all. What I am saying is that the Premier in his statement has seriously taken away from the possibility of completing a good contract with Quebec, a good deal with Quebec because of his position of Meech Lake. No, we should not bargain it, but neither should we destroy any opportunity of developing one of the last great resource potentials of this Province because of his short-term goals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, you should never sell your soul for the right to live in a room for one night. You should think about the long-term future of us and the people who are not yet born in this Province.

MR. WINDSOR:

Surely the hon. gentleman contracted too far in 1965.

MR. WARREN:

That is right. How much money did he get out of it?

DR. KITCHEN:

That is an awful remark to be made in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal and

Provincial Affairs. Yesterday he was good enough to provide this House with a copy of the capital funding for the Province for the upcoming year. On June 7 he made a statement in this House to suggest that there was \$50 million in capital works projects to be spent this year. Rough totals on the projects for yesterday were about \$43 million. So I ask the hon. minister is there another list?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, the member is quite correct, there was \$43 million on yesterday's list. There is another \$7 million that has been allocated to various things that have to be done in the Province, such as regional servicing authorities, a prime example, where legislation has to be brought before the House to set up those authorities. If those amounts were presented to the House in the list we would, in fact, be obligating a lead community for the amount of money involved, so I thought it wise not to bring that before the House until the legislation for the regional servicing authority was, in fact, adopted by the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

A brief supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to see a list of what



the hon. member proposes, but it is my understanding of The Municipalities Act now that there is legislation in place to set up regional servicing authorities, or regional governments. If that is necessary, the regions themselves can decide now. It is a fact now that the new government or the minister is going to shove this regional government down the throats of the people of the Province right now?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I clearly stated I am talking about regional servicing authorities, not regional government. And in fact the legislation is not complete. Even if it were complete, in the cases I speak of we have to have the agreement of the towns involved to enter into that legislation, enter into the regional servicing authority in that particular region. Until we get that agreement from the towns involved, the regional authority cannot become operative.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Does the minister plan to hold, as it states in the act, public hearings to deal with these regional authorities and regional servicing groups? I would imagine it would be similar to regional governments. In the act now, I believe it states that public hearings must be held and considerations be given to the regions. Is that what the

minister plans to do?

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of anything in the legislation that provides for public hearings to set up regional servicing authorities.

MR. WINDSOR:

Read the act.

MR. GULLAGE:

I have read the act and I have not seen it. It is required for other dealings, such as amalgamations and boundaries and so on, but I have not seen anything in the act speaking specifically to regional servicing authorities. I will check it out, but I have not seen anything in the act.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health (Mr. Decker). Mr. Speaker, I think we all realize that the number of nursing clinics along the Labrador Coast in particular are very short on staff, and particularly nurses. It is very difficult for the nurses to carry out their duties, twenty-four hour service, when there is only one nurse in a community. Would the minister confirm that there are sufficient funds allotted in this budget for the hiring of an extra twelve

nurses for the Regional Grenfell Health Services?

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will know that in the Budget Speech, which we announced some time ago, we put in funding for forty-five nurses - thirty-three could be nurses and the institutions have discretion as to whether they would use nurses or nursing assistants for the other positions. Specifically as to whether they were twelve allocated to the Labrador Coast, I cannot answer that question because the Labrador Coast is administered by the Grenfell Association, and the Grenfell Association, or the Grenfell Health Services District as it is now called, were allocated a reasonable number of the nurses and they have the discretion as to where they allocate them. I am sure I have every confidence they will allocate them where it is most appropriate for the area.

I am sure the member will also be glad to realize that in the federal agreement just recently signed there was \$2.1 million in that for clinics along the coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:  
Of course, we anticipated that and for that very reason we put some planning money into the budget so that we can do some planning for the clinics along the coast, which, as the hon. member knows, are badly in need of them. I know

how difficult it is for one nurse to be on duty, Mr. Speaker, along the Labrador Coast. It is not fair to the nurse and it is certainly not fair to the people who live in these areas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a new question for the Minister of Health. Mr. Speaker, on June 1 I asked the Minister of Health if he would check into the abusive use of the medical aircraft that is operated by the Grenfell Regional Health Services. Mr. Speaker, as quoted in The Evening Telegram - I will table it, Mr. Speaker - "Mr. Decker replied that if it was the way the PC Government was abusing taxes, that answer came up on April 20. 'After April 20 you will not find that misuse of government funds.

I would like to ask the minister, would he advise if he has taken any action to curtail the abusive use of the Grenfell Regional Health Services medical aircraft?

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

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, the member did get up and make some very serious accusations in this House as to how Grenfell were using their air services. He could only have been referring to things that might have happened while his administration was in power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

I assured the member that if - I specifically said 'if' and Hansard will bear me out - if his administration was abusing the tax money of our people and allowing Grenfell to abuse the money for air services, it would not happen after April 20. I am glad to say today, Mr. Speaker, that I stand by that. There will be no abuses in the air services.

Now, I did some checking with the Grenfell Association and also with my own department. I have been advised that the policy is that the plane is there for carrying patients from one point to the other; the plane is also there for carrying medical staff throughout Labrador and around Newfoundland. When a plane leaves St. Anthony for St. John's or Montreal or wherever, on an emergency mission with a patient, whether or not that plane, on that particular trip, has two or three people, or whether or not it is fully loaded does not really make too much difference, the plane is going anyway. So the policy is that when the plane is coming in with one patient and an escort or two, whatever the case may be, if the plane is going to make the trip already, then the staff who work with the hospital are given the privilege of coming in on that particular trip.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not unreasonable, in view of the fact that it is not easy to recruit staff to work in Northern Newfoundland and Labrador. I know it is the best place on earth to live and work, but everyone does not share that opinion. So it is an incentive to the staff, and I

think it is a good one. However, we have to be careful that it will not be abused. We do not want them to make the trip especially for taking the staff around. That is not the intent. It is for a medical emergency, a medical reason, Mr. Speaker, and when this is done, then the staff are allowed to ride on it. Personally, I do not see any great problem with that on the condition that the plane is going anyway. But if the hon. member said that when they were in power they used to allow the planes to fly all over God's creation without any regard as to whether there was a patient or not, well, that is his problem. It will not happen with this administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister very much for his answer. I will table a letter dated June 7, Mr. Speaker, addressed to the hon. minister - I believe this government was in power on June 7 - and it says the Grenfell Regional Health Services plane came in to St. John's with several nurses and staff who came to go shopping.

Now, Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman do the honourable thing and supply the flight logs from May 28 to June 5 on the Grenfell Regional Health Services flights from St. Anthony to St. John's and return? Would the minister table the logs for those flights?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Table the letter.

MR. DECKER:

No, there is no need to table the letter. I received the letter. It is from an A. Simms in my district.

As I pointed out in answering the second question, obviously the member did not listen to my answer, if the plane came in on June 7 - and I have no doubt that it did - it came in for a medical reason, and the nurses are staff who are working with the Grenfell Association up on the Northern Peninsula. And, as I said, when the plane is going to come in to St. John's anyway, if some of the staff want to come to St. John's to go shopping or to go to a dance, that is their business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HEWLETT:

Coming to St. John's on a wing and a tear.

MR. DECKER:

Absolutely! No big deal. But, Mr. Speaker, where the corruption could come in would be if the plane were taken specifically to bring in a crowd of nurses who wanted to go shopping; now that would be abuse. But if the plane is coming anyway to carry out its mandate, that of bringing in a patient, it would have come regardless, whether you had one person on that plane or whether you had eight people on that plane, the plane would have come in anyway at no extra cost. It seems to be perfectly logical.

Now, if this House or someone is going to direct my department to advise Grenfell that they can no longer carry their staff around, I will do that, if that becomes the thing. But I will warn the people of this Province that it will be much more difficult to attract staff for Northern Newfoundland and Labrador if we do not put some little extras in, for example, the privilege of travelling on the plane.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is like a wing and a tear, t-e-a-r, Mr. Speaker.

Let me ask the minister another question. In the same letter, Mr. Speaker - I will quote before I table it - it says that one female from Roddickton, a previous employee who has not worked for the Grenfell for almost a year, came to St. John's to help her husband with his apartment. Now, Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman tell us the name of that person who was a former employee of the Regional Grenfell Health Services Board who came here on this mission plane to St. John's to help her husband to get into his new apartment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I honestly do not know what the member is talking about. The letter, which he has there, did not name any person.

He referred to a former employee of Grenfell. Now, the letter said former and he applied it to a person in Roddickton. So they are just playing guessing games. I have no idea who the member is talking about. He is probably making some -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. DECKER:  
Maybe the member could tell us why it was that on May 2 he and D.N. Peters took a government helicopter at the price of \$640 per hour for two hours to go on a visit, when he was not in the government. It was during transition. Maybe he can tell us what that is all about.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
My final supplementary is to the minister. Would the minister, again, table the logs of those particular flights between May 28 and June 5? Finally, would the minister also confirm that many patients that come out to St. John's for medical attention, when they are released from the St. John's hospitals on occasion have been given second choice over staff and other people going back to St. Anthony?

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

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that. Like the hon. member, I have probably heard that being said. I am not aware of it having

happened in the last month or so that I have been minister of this particular department. I belong to the Northern Peninsula and I have heard that said from time to time, but I cannot prove it and I doubt very much that the hon. member could prove it, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Check it out.

MR. DECKER:  
How could you check it out? I do not know how that could be checked out.

MR. WARREN:  
The logs of people flying.

MR. DECKER:  
People who fly on the plane, that is in the log. That is no big problem. Oh, I know what the hon. member is getting at. I have used the Grenfell plane. My wife, who is an employee of Grenfell, presently employed by Grenfell, is entitled to the same benefits as anyone else. She has used that plane over the last four or five years that I have been fortunate enough to be a member of this House. Oh, that is the dirt the member is trying to get at.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:  
Now I know what the hon. member is getting at. Mr. Speaker, my wife -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. DECKER:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I hear hon. members shouting. This is Question Period. If hon. members want to follow up with a question I will recognize them, but I will only recognize the official person that I have recognized. Other people, if you have questions, please wait and you will get recognized.

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

I did not know that was the kind of slime the hon. member was after.

Mr. Speaker, my wife, proudly, is working with the Grenfell Association. She is proud to do that. She has been working with them for years and hopefully will work on with them for years. She, too, is entitled to that policy. I have not taken advantage of it myself since I became a member of Cabinet. I have been advised that maybe I should not do it. Maybe sometime I will, because I, too, am entitled to it. If the thing is not viable, I will not. I will not be taking the plane to make a special trip.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to direct this question to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I was very shocked last night to learn in the Committee of the Estimates on the Department of Health that the Province-wide mammography screening program that was committed to or announced by the previous government is now on hold, or under review, which, I take it, is a euphemism for being

on the back burner, and that there will be absolutely no money in the Estimates this year for that very vital program.

Now, in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that medical experts across Canada agree that routine screening for women over fifty, and periodic screening for women at high risk - and by that I mean people who have breast cancer in their family or who are showing early signs of breast cancer - that 90 per cent of these cases can be cured by early detection, that these women do not have to die.

And, in view of the fact also, that in this Province at the present time, we do not have state-of-the-art equipment in any hospital - St. Clare's Mercy Hospital has just recently received a commitment and has equipment on order, but there is no state-of-the-art equipment in any other part of this Province - would the Premier undertake to commit the necessary funds for this very vital project?

MR. RIDEOUT:

They demanded it when they were in Opposition.

MS DUFF:

Well, I did not know that because I was not here.

But this program is vital to the health of the women of Newfoundland, and the money is there, because we are showing a projected surplus. So, would the Premier commit to replace that money in that budget in the Department of Health?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know that everything that the hon. member said is accurate. I do not know the full answer or explanation to the thing, but I will take her question as notice and give her the answer tomorrow.

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

A supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker, in December, 1988, the national Department of Health came out with a very significant study which put to rest, once and for all, the question of mammography screening, which is a relatively simple procedure, showing that the benefits far outweigh the risks, and that this whole situation of not being able to have access to early detection for breast cancer causes a tremendous amount of unnecessary anguish to women in Newfoundland. Why does the Premier or Government of this Province give such a low priority to that very vital program? It is not unheard of. It has been asked for in other programs. We are spending \$683 million on Health this year. Why was no priority given to this program in this year's Health Estimates?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I tell the hon. member again, I do not know right at this moment the answer to the question she raises, I do not know

that all of her premises are correct, but I will check and I will give her the full answer on the total matter tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question Period has expired.

### Notices of Motion

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions pertaining to the Advancing or Guaranteeing of Certain Loans made under the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could revert to Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees? There was a lot of noise. You said that, but the first thing I heard was Notices of Motion. I have some documents I would like to table.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree to revert to Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is agreed.

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to, first of all, table some MCs that were precommitments. These precommitments were necessary for a number of reasons: Some of them had to do with the ordering of text books ahead of time, and all that kind of thing, and some of them had to do with the Department of Development and Tourism, where there had to be pre-commitments in terms of some marketing and so on.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Special Warrants.

MR. BAKER:

Special Warrant, yes.

I already mentioned the Department of Education. There were some supplies that had to be ordered in terms of supplies for maintenance and equipment, things that are normally kept on hand.

The printing of Tourism literature has to be done ahead of time; the Department of Education for exam purposes, materials that had to be ordered ahead of time. The purchase of school text books makes up a very large amount of this total. I would like to table nine Minutes-in-Council having to do with precommitments of funds.

Also, Mr. Speaker, this, like the previous one, is to meet certain requirements that are in legislation. I would like to table forty-one Special Warrants,

basically the Consolidated Fund Services. I will just note some of them for hon. members.

The Consolidated Fund Services, there is about \$14 million that had to do with severance pay, the voluntary early retirement plan, and that kind of thing.

There is about \$2.6 million in warrants having to do with guarantees that the government gave, but never did bring to the House of Assembly, and companies have since defaulted on the payments and the amounts were paid. Some of these amounts, Mr. Speaker, I should point out, were protested by the Comptroller General at the time, so that is about \$4.5 million in warrants.

The Executive Council has \$960,000 in warrants, and most of that is related to either overruns in the offshore negotiations, professional services. The severance pay in relation to the much-heralded change of command between Premiers Peckford and Rideout, there is a little over half a million dollars for that.

There are a number of Finance warrants here, Mr. Speaker, totalling over \$4 million, and just about all of these are in relation to Newfoundland Enviroponics, the greenhouse.

There is about \$3.5 million in Special Warrants for Development and Tourism. One that I would particularly like to note is \$3 million that is required for an interest subsidy to the Marystown Shipyard. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in previous years this subsidy was always paid by Special Warrant, but this year we have done it properly because it is an anticipated, known



expense and should never be done by Special Warrant, and we have put the amount in the budget as it should have been done for years.

Fisheries has warrants totalling almost \$14 million, \$13.9 million, and some of the amount is a write-down on loans, the Fisheries Loan Board, about \$3 million of it. But there is an amount in here, Mr. Speaker, of \$8 million that relates to the Eldorado Seafoods and those operations.

I believe these were Special Warrants obtained back in September, October or something of last year. I am not sure exactly about the time, but I could look and see. So that is \$8 million there. Forestry has only one warrant here which is pretty straightforward. Cone collections, an excellent year for cones, so they had to collect their cones while the going was good.

Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development has eight warrants of about \$7 million, and these are, again, fairly straightforward. One of them was an additional amount that is kind of bothersome, an additional amount of \$2.5 million for Newfoundland Farm Products beyond what was expected in terms of having to subsidize Newfoundland Farm Products.

Again, there is another small amount in here relating to the greenhouse, relating to Sprung, which had to do with paying the pointsetta growers.

There is Career Development and Advanced Studies, an extra \$6 million for funding MUN.

Culture Recreation and Youth, pretty straightforward, standard

overruns. There is one thing I would like to point out here, Mr. Speaker, the new funds of \$1.2 million for the Rabies Eradication Program that is included under this Special Warrant.

Education, having to do with teachers' salaries. There is a Special Warrant needed because there was a larger increase than expected in teachers' salaries.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And an extra pay period.

MR. BAKER:

That was another thing, but the extra pay period cost about \$14 million. This is about \$4 million, I think.

In Health, there were five warrants totalling about \$20 million. Mr. Speaker, in Health there are so many open-ended programs that there is not really much possibility of control in the expenditures there, simply because the programs are open-ended.

In Justice about \$2 million, a couple of warrants. The final ones are in Labour, having to do with, I believe, the extra hearings that were necessary because of the dispute between the fish unions and this cost an extra couple of hundred thousand dollars over and above what was expected.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is a total of about \$80 million in Special Warrants. Some of them, as I pointed out, are standard, normal procedure and will be proceeded with in the course of events by this government as the last government did. Some of them, I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, were totally wrong, done improperly, and the Comptroller General was fairly active in

pointing this out and, in fact, apologized for some cases where amounts slipped through that should not have slipped through, and I would like to say that that kind of Special Warrant, Mr. Speaker, and the kind of MCs that are issued and never brought into the House, will not happen again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

Answers to Questions  
for which Notice has been Given

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

MR. EFFORD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On Yesterday's Order Paper there was Question No.8 which asked me, as Minister of Social Services, for, "An itemized list of expenditures for any office equipment, personal equipment, furnishings and photographs purchased for the Minister's Office since May 5, 1989."

I would like to table this, Mr. Speaker, but in doing so I would have to highlight a couple of things in order to show why I did have to spend a small amount of money in my office. In the Department of Social Services, the Minister's Office in 1988-89, the former Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin) spent this money: High-lite framing, \$1,268; filming and developing, \$1,000; lapel pins, \$900; Christmas cards, \$1,000; camera, \$897; dictating machine, \$1114.40; bookcase, \$190; microwave oven, \$240; and filing cabinets, Mr. Speaker, \$872.

Since becoming Minister of Social Services I had to purchase filing cabinets because I could not find the ones that were formerly purchased.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:  
They were gone, Mr. Speaker, so I purchased filing cabinets to do the necessary filing I have to do as minister, \$654.00, and general office supplies that I needed to put in the filing cabinets and filing pins and so on, \$111.00, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:  
Also, Mr. Speaker, on yesterday's Order Paper there was a question to ask the Minister of Social Services to lay upon the Table of the House the following information: "An itemized list of travel expenditures incurred by the Minister, his Executive Assistant or any other member of the Minister's personal or Departmental staff who may have accompanied him since May 5, 1989." To explain to the House, Mr. Speaker, last weekend I travelled to Stephenville, Friday and Saturday, and during those days I had six meetings. I worked until Saturday evening until 6:00 o'clock. My airfare was \$391.20. I had no accommodations; my wife who was out there on other business paid for the room and I stayed with her at no cost to the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I stayed in Corner

Brook. By business was in Stephenville and Stephenville Crossing where I had my meetings Friday and Saturday. I did not rent a car. A very good friend of mine loaned me his car and I travelled with no expense to the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

And, Mr. Speaker, let me compare a trip taken by the former Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin) who cared so much about the poor starving people of this Province, a European trip to Norway to see what impact oil flowing out of the taps of Newfoundland would have on the lives of social services recipients.

MR. RIDEOUT:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. gentleman cannot take the House on his back, Mr. Speaker. You would not know but he owns the place, after his leader always talking about decorum and all that kind of stuff.

MR. EFFORD:

You do not want to hear it.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Sure we want to hear it, Mr. Speaker. We will be equally as interested, Mr. Speaker, in hearing the twelve month totals when the hon. gentleman gets twelve months in office as well. Then we will compare apples and apples and not apples with oranges.

But, Mr. Speaker, the question on

the Order Paper was specific. The question did not ask for information prior to a certain date. The question asked for information from May 5 to a certain date. Now, Mr. Speaker, the rules are clear. The hon. gentleman cannot flagrantly abuse the rules and provide other information that we may at some time want to ask for. But the question was specific and the hon. gentleman should provide specific information, stop abusing the rules of the House and stop trying to take the House on his back.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To that point of order, the member has been asked on the Order Paper a question. The purpose for using the Order Paper to ask such a question is because normally these questions require longer, more detailed answers. The minister is simply providing some background to his particular answer. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is perfectly okay and I would certainly say to the Leader of the Opposition that if he cannot stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Government House Leader that, old man, you can bring on whatever heat you got because I can take it. That is not the point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

We listened to the hon. gentleman in his first response and, in fact, could have raised a point of order, but we did not. We let him go on and have a little bit of enjoyment. We do not mind that. We are big boys and girls, we can take it, too. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the question on the Order Paper was specific, it asked the minister for specific information as of a specific date and between specific dates. The minister has no right to try to amuse us for the rest of the afternoon going back for the next two months, three months before that, three years before that, seventeen years before that, twenty-five years before that. Let him give the specific information that he was asked for, then we can all laugh at it, and at some other point maybe the heat may come up again.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order.

I would point out to hon. members that Written Questions basically adhere to the same rules as Oral Questions, and hon. members should not raise points that are argumentative, but answer the question precisely. I ask the hon. gentleman to do that.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I apologize for having to point out the fact that the European

trip cost accommodation for one week, \$1,496, entertainment, \$441; meals, \$660; laundry, \$107; airfare, \$3,067, while the people of this Province were starving, Mr. Speaker. And I would like to table that, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It is a long road that has no bends. Wait until you go to Europe.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I want to table answers to questions put to me by the hon. Opposition House Leader.

Question number 26 - "An itemized list of travel expenditures incurred by the Minister, his Executive Assistant or any other member of the Minister's personal or Departmental staff who may have accompanied him since May 5."

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to table the answers to that question. The total out of town travel for myself and my Deputy Minister to Ottawa for a combined cost of \$1,800, using regular air and rather inexpensive rooms in Ottawa.

Also, Mr. Speaker, they asked me to table information, a list "of expenditures for any office equipment, personal equipment, furnishings and photographs purchased for the Minister's Office since May." The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, except for a few pencils, pens, and paper

clips, is zero.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, again with respect to similar questions put by the hon. the Opposition House Leader, the answer to question Number 18, the total amount "of expenditures for office equipment, personal equipment, furnishings and photographs purchased for the Minister's Office" - Department of Development - "since May 5," is \$1,749.49, with a complete and itemized statement attached.

With respect to question Number 21, the total amount of travel expenditures incurred by the Minister, his Executive Assistant, members of the departmental staff of the Department of Development since May 5, 1989, is \$4,066.99 and I attach a complete breakdown of that, and what it was used for. This compares to \$223,600 by my predecessor for a year, which says that we are well below the average, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

DR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an answer to a question put to the Minister of Education by the hon. House Leader asking for an itemized list of expenditures made for equipment, personal equipment, furnishings and photographs purchased for the Minister's Office since May 5. I want to inform the House that no such purchases have been made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:

Order 2.

MR. SPEAKER:

Committee of Supply.

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am beginning to say myself, Mr. Speaker, not again. So I know members opposite must be saying it ever more so.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

But they are not leaving.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, they are not leaving because the recess period has not been authorized yet. They should take it immediately after Question Period.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing, we talked about decorum so much in the House and other things. The Premier said the other day, in the little spat that

we had, that it was a reflection on the person who said it moreso than the person who received it. I think we witnessed here today something about the quality of people giving answers as well. But, of course, the Minister of Social Services has not changed. He has changed in every other way since he became Minister of Social Services but getting down in the mud, he has kept that characteristic with him. He has lost a lot of his fight but he is still very, very capable of getting down in the mud.

To think, Mr. Speaker, that I really had him on the hook over the Private Sector Employment Program when I was minister. I do not think I was too decent. I think I did the right thing for the integrity of the program. But I would not tarnish his name all over the Province, so I let him off the hook, and then we see what he tried to do here again today. As the Leader of the Opposition told him, it is a long road that has no turns and some roads have turns that are sharper than others.

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

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

MR. EFFORD:  
It is not normal for a member on either side of this House to threaten another member, but I want to say very clearly, while I will ask for His Honour's ruling on that, if the member opposite have anything to say about the past of this Minister of Social Services, please tell it to the general public. I have nothing to be ashamed of in my past and I will not have anything to be

ashamed of in my future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
If he had said he has nothing to be proud about in his past, then maybe we would have agreed on this side, but I do not want to get into a bit of a spat.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I thought the hon. gentleman wanted to speak to the point of order. There is a point of order and I have to address it. I did not hear the hon. member make any threat, but the hon. member knows he is not supposed to make a threat. If the hon. gentleman made a threat I am sure he will do the honourable thing. Other than that, I rule there was no point of order, just a point of difference between two hon. gentlemen.

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. TOBIN:  
Tell us about the stoves.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I apologize if I made a threat. I guess what I should have said to the hon. minister is that he will be under very close scrutiny by the Opposition as he attempts to fulfill his ministerial responsibility.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
We are not going crawling around

in basements.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is right. We are not going down in basements crawling around all hours of the night to try and get things on this minister, as he tried to do with this minister. We are not going to do that, because, of course, after the budget of a couple of weeks ago we cannot afford to buy batteries for the flashlights.

To hear that Minister of Social Services get up in this House today and try and personally attack the former Minister of Social Services who, he said, was supposed to be concerned for the underprivileged and the social assistance recipients of the Province. Just last week he said he was going out in the clothes closets of the social assistance recipients of the Province trying to get back used clothes to recover his \$8 million that he wants back from them. That is his concern for the social assistance recipients of the Province.

One of the lowest increases in the social assistance budget ever in the history of this Province came in under this minister since he became Minister of Social Services. That is what we are dealing with, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to refer back, if I could, Mr. Speaker, and talk for a moment about the first month of performance of the new administration.

MR. WARREN:

The first report card.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, the first little report card on what they have done.

They have raised gasoline taxes in this Province, Mr. Speaker. They have added to the financial hardships of students at our post-secondary educational institutions by increasing the tuition fees by 10 per cent. They have eliminated the Private Sector Employment Program which created 3,000 jobs in this Province last year, \$7.5 million put in by the government and \$7.5 million by the private sector of the Province. They have eliminated that, Mr. Speaker, and indeed, did away with approximately 3,000 jobs in this Province.

They have discriminated against children who develop faster than others. The same age children, one bigger than the other, one has to pay taxes on clothing, the other does not. They have done that, Mr. Speaker.

They have initiated the closing of two hospitals in the province, Mr. Speaker, another thing of which they should be very proud, cutting out 110 jobs. Three thousand jobs under the private sector and one hundred and ten by closing out fifty-three hospital beds on the Burin Peninsula, when throughout the campaign they preached about opening more beds.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

No mammography program.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is right. No mammography program. No funding for that, when, as an Opposition, they demanded that this government bring in a program to address this very, very serious problem and health crisis for women of the Province. They were right in demanding that this government do that. Here they come back, they take over the power of this



Province on April 20 and no provision in the budget for a much needed service for women of this Province.

Of course, there are a couple of things that make you wonder about this government's priority for the women of this Province. The mammography program is one. The elimination of the Occupational Integration Program for Women is another. No money in the Occupational Integration Program for Women this year. A first-year program and all they provided for it is \$250,000 for carryover projects that carried over into the new fiscal year. So that should tell you, and it will tell the women of this Province, just how important women really are to this new administration. They do not mean anything, because two very, very important programs have been eliminated. This was a very, very progressive program, the Occupational Integration Program for Women, devised in consultation with the Provincial Status of Women, devised in consultation with the Women's Policy Office. Where is the Women's Policy Office gone with the new administration? It is another office and another division that is nowhere to be found.

And, of course, we all know that part of the government's problem is that when they took office they fired very experienced and very competent top civil servants. Most of them, like any new government, are themselves very inexperienced, and you rely on your best civil servants to give you advice and to develop your budget and programs. But what did this government do? It fired the most competent civil servants, who have worked for years in this Province.

MR. TOBIN:

And individual packages have cost over \$1 million.

MR. MATTHEWS:

And individual severance packages will cost in excess of \$1 million.

MS VERGE:

Do you mean that for one?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, just for one.

MR. TOBIN:

There were two people who accepted close to \$1 million.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is right. That is what is happening. Of course, all these details will become clear -

MR. TOBIN:

Two people for \$1 million bucks each.

MR. MATTHEWS:

- over the next number of days, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, being as guilty as anybody else in this House of badgering back and forth and disrupting on times, again there seems to be five or six different conversations, and of course I know why that is.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Clyde has left, has he?

MR. MATTHEWS:

The teacher has left the classroom. He did not grant recess but he left himself. And I understand that because he is a very busy man and he has meetings and other business of the Province to deal with. But as soon as he goes through the door, as soon as the signal comes that the private



elevator has gone down, then the whole attitude and behaviour of the members opposite change.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Some of them, not all of them.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Not all of them.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Phil Warren is there, Rex is not back.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Some of them are very good, but I must have to say -

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Murphy goes off his head.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I normally would not interrupt the hon. member, but he seems to have lots of time, so I am just going to make this comment. He commented on order in the House, conversations going on, and that is absolutely true. I have noticed it myself and I did not get up because sometimes you detect that an hon. member wants silence, and I believed that the hon. member for Grand Bank did not call for silence. Had he called for silence, I would have done so. But that has been the procedure. If some members want silence, but I have observed over the years that the hon. member for Grand Bank does tolerate a little bit of bantering, and I apologize.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, as usual, your observations are correct and your observations are spot on. No, I do not want silence because, as I said just a few short days ago, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to be absolutely

silent in this House of Assembly, if we are not going to share humour, then indeed we would have found a use for the hospital beds that will be closed in Grand Bank and St. Lawrence because they could set up a psychiatric ward for the fifty-two of us, and I sincerely believe that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Old soccer injuries.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Old soccer injuries, yes, take care of a few of them as well.

And, Mr. Speaker, speaking of soccer, I must say to the Minister of Finance that manys a time since the Tuesday that he brought in the Budget document, I felt like taking that document and slogging it as high as I could, Mr. Speaker, like we used to kick the old soccer ball. The higher you slogged it more the crowd used to roar one time. It had nothing to do with the skill of the game. But if ever a budget deserved a slog, is this one.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Make sure the minister is holding on to it.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I want to refer to somethings that were said about previous budgets in this House, and I would like to refer to Hansard of April 12, 1988, when an hon. member of this House spoke on the budget and he said now people are always happy when a budget does not slap increases and taxes on people, which we all agree. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect the MHA and the member I am referring to is Your Honour. I hope I have permission to use this and I hope I am not

doing anything unparliamentary by referring to this Hansard. And he goes on further to say, 'Lo and behold to the government in this Province that increases further the retail sales tax in this Province or, Mr. Speaker, the income tax, both of which are the highest in Canada. So, Mr. Speaker, we cannot go around applauding the government and commending the government because they did not increase retail sales tax, or because they did not increase income tax.' Now that is talking about the last budget; not this Minister of Finance's budget.

'Let us get rid of that attitude in this Province. We have reached the limit! And I say that because the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech said that we were not the highest taxed people in Canada. So I think it is very, very important, again, to point out the contradiction that has existed between this party, when they were in Opposition, and now that they are in government. "There can be no more increases in the retail sales tax. There can be no more increases in the income tax." That was the position of the Liberal Party just a year ago. "We are already the highest taxed people in Canada with respect to retail sales tax and with respect to income tax, Mr. Speaker. We are the highest taxed people in Canada. That is irrefutable.

"So how can a party who believed last year -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Is it backupable?

MR. MATTHEWS:  
No, it is not backupable. The thing that has been most backupable since April 20 is the

hon. minister himself. Of course, you cannot back him up much more because he will be out in the corridor, and I am sure that the Premier -

MR. A. SNOW:  
He is not getupable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
There is not much get up in him. You would not pull him up with a block and tackle. But I am sure the Premier is having thoughts about backing him up a bit more. I do not mean standing behind him for support, I mean probably even giving him a seat in the Common Room, because he will fulfill just as great a purpose out there as he has served since he brought in his Budget Speech. I just wanted to point these few things out, because I think it is important that we know what was said by the members of the now government. It is very, very important that we know this. The same hon. gentleman, who is now leaving the Chamber, said, "I wish I could get on the government side, I wish I were on the government side, I tell you I would do something about these problems." That was said last year. The MHA for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) said that last year in reacting to the Budget Speech, right from the Hansard of April 12. "I wish I could get on the government side," then I would change all that.

MR. WARREN:  
He has changed it all.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
A real change he was talking about. We saw a real change on June 6. On June 6 we saw a real change in this Province - \$95

million additional taxes. That is a real change. There is no question we saw that. Personal income tax up 2 per cent, corporate income tax up 1 per cent, 10 percent on tuition for students. Electricity rates in this Province will increase by approximately 14 per cent in the next two years because of actions by this government. A real change, no doubt. The Private Sector Employment Program, 3000 jobs gone, a real change. Now, the people from Little St. Lawrence, around the boöt of the Burin Peninsula to Garnish, have certainly experienced a real change. They know that when this Premier went through preaching on the Wells Express he preached real change, and he has given it to them in spades.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Anything in that water?

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, there is nothing in this water, Mr. Speaker. I am sure if there were anything in this water the Minister of Social Services would be over and have my glass before now. He would drag it across the House. There would be a tug of war over the glass if he thought there was something in there - more than water, that is.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman that I have great respect for on the other side, the President of Treasury Board, known to us now as Bt Baker, as you all know, said some interesting things about last year's budget as well, the day before the member for Bonavista North talked about it, on April 11. He said, "I think that is the tone that was used in the budget." He was talking about the minister. He said, "He was surprised that it was being said

all around this Province that we are the most heavily taxed people in the country."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What?

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is what the President of Treasury said. He said, "In actual fact, we are just taxed on the average or slightly above the average in this country." The Minister said that he had a study on that. I could go on for ten hours on that one," he said for ten hours," but seriously, if I have been giving the wrong impression to the people of this Province, I want to correct it.

"He said, "I would seriously like to see the kind of study that was done on the taxation in Newfoundland that would reach the conclusion that we are 102 per cent above the national average," - slightly above it. "I would really like to see it." The President of Treasury Board at the time thought we were much heavier taxed than 102 per cent of the national average. But, in the Budget Speech,, which he had a lot of input into, on June 6, I would suggest that he had a lot more input into it than the Minister of Finance, he makes a statement and says that we are not -

DR. KITCHEN:

Boring.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Pardon. Did you say boring? You did not say boring. Old getupable, old backupable, old backslider.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No get-up-and-go left in him at all.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Too bad. Thirty days into a mandate and he is out of gas. Of course, if he wanted to go to the pumps and try to get a bit more gas, I do not suppose that he can afford to pay for it. He cannot buy it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You have plenty of gas.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes. There is a lot of gas over here. And there is going to be more gas.

That is the other thing, of course, they have whopped it to the old consumers on gas. You soon will not be able to afford to buy cabbage, Mr. Speaker, because you will pay tax on the gas that comes out of that when you boil it in this Province. You soon will not be able to afford to have a Jiggs dinner in this Province. So I just say these things, Mr. Speaker, so that we can demonstrate the contradiction that exists in the minds of those now in the government, from the Premier down. The biggest Walking Contradiction in the history of Newfoundland and Labrador is this Premier. He preached freedom and balance. Yes, freedom and balance alright, off balance he should have preached.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Fairness.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, fairness. There is some fairness. I would like to say to the Minister of Social Services, he has only been sworn in for how long?

AN HON. MEMBER:

A month.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, one month. We will see how you will be judged by the people on your performance. We always called him the Old Crooked Stovepipe on this side, Mr. Speaker. The Old Crooked Stovepipe, and I would say now that the Old Stovepipe has gotten very hot over the last week or so, very, very hot.

MR. TOBIN:

Tell them why we call him that.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, I am not going to bring that up. I am not that kind of person. I would not bring it up, I would not mention it in the House why we call him an Old Crooked Stovepipe. All I would say is this, that I would suggest why in the last month or so that he brought in that statement today, outlining that he has only spent a couple of hundred dollars and how he got a loan of a car out in Stephenville and slept with his wife.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is a penetrating insight into the obvious.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, I do not mean that. But she had a room and he stayed with her, and it did not cost the government anything. That is great. That is being very prudent, and I applaud that. But I would say the reason the hon. minister is doing this is because he learned such a hard lesson in the past perhaps, and he knows 'I had better stay on the straight and narrow or else I will be brought to task.' So he going to try to demonstrate to the House just how prudent he is going to be

on his travel and his expenses and other things. That is what all ministers are doing. If that is the case, that is fine, but we will see over the next three or four years what happens to travel expenses, entertainment, and other things.

MR. FLIGHT:

Over the next fifteen years.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Well, no. I will not be around here after three or four years. I am going to take advantage of the voluntary retirement program that you would not give to the health care sector. I can do that. Now I will be under great pressure from the 8,000 voters in the district to stay on, but I will probably relinquish that responsibility and say, "No, go and elect someone else."

MR. TOBIN:

He is going to run federal, boy.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, I am going to run federal.

MR. TOBIN:

I will be his campaign manager.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Oh, my God! No, do not take it that far. I never wanted to run in politics to be defeated.

MR. TOBIN:

You will not be, either.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No. I will not be.

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad the Minister of Health has left his seat because I wanted to have a few chats with him and say a few things, how he fell out of the sky on the Burin Peninsula yesterday. Airwolf got nothing on him. He

dropped out of the clouds over St. Lawrence Hospital. He said to the pilot, "Now, find the biggest dust spot in St. Lawrence, and do not shut down the props, keep them going. Get as close to the hospital as you can and make the dust come up so that I can get out of the helicopter and get in the hospital so that nobody knows that I am here. If they think someone is here, they will not know who it is." That is what happened. He kept the props going all the while he was in. And, of course, chop, chop is very appropriate for the minister as well. That is what he should be called, the Chop-Chop minister, because he closed up two hospitals down there.

After the people down there realized who it was and what had happened, and they explored the details, one of the most hilarious things about it was that the minister was carried in over the threshold of the U.S. Memorial Hospital by the mayor, like a groom carrying his new bride. He took him in his arms and he carried him over the threshold and said, 'Mr. Minister, look at this fine structure. How can you honestly close it down, it was so well-built by the Americans, a memorial to the heroics of the people at St. Lawrence and Lawn? How can you close up this hospital that was given to us by the Americans in recognition?'

Just last year we had a big anniversary where most of the survivors of that disaster came to St. Lawrence and shared with the people for about a week or ten days. It was a very, very emotional event because the Americans came back to say thank you once again to those who had saved their lives, those survivors and rescuers there. That is what

that hospital - means to St. Lawrence.

Of course, it is very nice to see the former Premier here today in the Gallery as I say this, because he was the Premier of the day, of course, who accepted that gift on behalf of the Province and on behalf of the people of St. Lawrence and Lawn. He was there to actually receive that gift for the people and, of course, made the commitment on behalf of the government of the day to operate the U.S. Memorial Hospital in St. Lawrence. It is quite ironic to have the former Premier here today. It is very good to see him, but it is ironic to have him sit here, the man who received that gift on behalf of the Province, and then to see another Liberal Premier in this administration make a decision to close it down.

I am sure that they will reconsider that. I am sure they realize they have made a mistake and they will reconsider and hopefully make a decision that will be acceptable. I was hoping the Minister of Health would be here because I am quite interested to have him update us on his flying visit to the Burin Peninsula. We will have more to say on that, I guess, tomorrow when he is in his seat.

Talking about travel and being prudent and other things, I expect the Minister of Development will be doing much more travel than he has done in the last month. I am sure he is getting used to his department and he will be going all over the country and the world trying to develop the Province. I am sure he will. That is part of his mandate. That he only had a percentage of the former

minister's travel in his first month is understandable. I am sure he had to be briefed and he has a lot of responsibilities. I would say perhaps the reason a lot of them have not done more travel is because the House of Assembly is open and they are under strict orders from the Premier not to move too far away. 'Do not move to far. Stay close to me.' That is what the Premier has told them. Your first responsibility as ministers is in the House, so do not go travelling too much now. Watch out come the middle of July. The middle of July I would say there will be a cool down draft on the Province from the props that will be going one way and the other, up and down to Labrador, the Northern Peninsula, down the South Coast, from helicopters.

MR. FUREY:

Myself and a friend are going to Norway?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Do I want to go to Norway? I would not go to Norway for the world. No, I would not go to Norway. I am not interested in going to Norway.

But it raises other questions, because I thought I heard in the media the other day - I am not sure but I thought I heard or read somewhere - that the Minister of Social Services had gone to the Yukon for a conference.

MR. EFFORD:

That is information is included.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Oh, is it? How much did that trip cost?

MR. EFFORD:

About \$2200.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Twenty-two hundred dollars. You never breathed that.

MR. EFFORD:

You would not give him a chance.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Oh! That is what you call being very selective, I would suggest to the minister. That is selective information. You were very selective about what you tabled and displayed for the member before you.

MR. EFFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the information on the airfare was tabled in the House of Assembly today because that is the only information that was available as of today. The information on the meals and the accommodations will be tabled when it becomes available. The airfare was \$2289 return from the Northwest Territories where I attended my first Minister's Conference. It was very clearly stated on the tabled information I gave to the House of Assembly today and I will bring back that comparison to the meals with the former minister and my own meals that I had in the Yukon of which 75 per cent was donated and I did not pay for, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. TOBIN:

I would like to speak to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. TOBIN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Minister of Social Services that all his expenses may not be ready yet, and we will accept that, but the one thing we will not accept is that he attended the First Ministers' Conference.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No, you would not want him at a First Ministers' Conference.

MR. EFFORD:

(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is quite all right. I accept the hon. minister's apologies, but I got worried, because when he came in earlier today he sat in the Premier's chair.

MR. EFFORD:

You should have written a letter (inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

The thing about that, though, is you kind of made us believe that what you tabled today on your own expenses was complete, and obviously it was not.

MR. TOBIN:

John is one who was never known to

have respect for (inaudible), so you do not have to worry about it.

MR. MATTHEWS:

When I raised that point I honestly did not know what was in the information.

MR. EFFORD:

You should have read it.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, because then I would have asked the question earlier. I would have embarrassed you more if I had read it. But these are the kinds of things that happen. Because the press have now reported, I would think, that the Minister of Social Services only spent this much to date when in essence the Minister of Social Services spent more. He has spent more than he has tabled in the House today, and that is not being complete, it is being very selective in the information you have given.

MR. TOBIN:

Not being truthful.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Again, that is a little bit deceiving, is it not? But, of course, we are used to deceit, Mr. Speaker. The people of the Province are becoming more and more accustomed to it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They had seventeen years of it.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Oh, yes! They had seventeen years of deceit when that party over there was in Opposition. Is it like I told someone the other day, seventeen years of criticism has not even translated into a single month of good government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

It has not translated into one single month of good government, seventeen years of criticism and suggestion by the other side. What has happened with this administration since it has taken power is very, very disappointing. And, of course, the people have the real change 47 per cent of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians voted for, and we witnessed that in this Budget document presented by the Minister of Finance just a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few other areas I would like to mention before I conclude my comments on the Budget, namely, recreation and sports facilities and needs around the Province. That is very, very important, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

Were the recreational facilities done by need?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, they were done by need. They were duly done, legitimately approved and met all the conditions of the program for recreation facilities in three regions of the Province and the Premier tore up the cheques and said, 'You are not getting them.' That is what happened.

I wish the Minister of Health were in his seat today, because there is something I believe in very, very strongly, and that is that we should put greater emphasis on sport and recreation in our Province. It is so hard to convince governments, whether it was us when we were in government or you now in government, and governments in other



jurisdictions, of the importance of having people participate actively in some form of recreation or sport. Because it will have an effect on Health Care budgets in the future. It is preventative spending, in my opinion. It is kind of hard, because I know government is scraping for dollars today the same as we were when we were in government, and the government after them will scrape for dollars, but it will be money well and wisely spent if we tried to put greater emphasis on it. And I say to the Minister responsible for Sport and Recreation in the Province, who is sitting in his seat right now, that if we could increase the money spent in that particular area, Activity Division, or whatever it is now, it will reap dividends for this Province in the future.

We all know the health care budgets are going to grow totally out of control, and one way to address that is to get our young Newfoundlanders and Labradorians more fitness-conscious, to be able to provide them with programs and facilities where they can actually participate regardless of what community or region of the Province they live in. If we can do that and instill in them strongly enough the benefit of regular exercise, we will reduce the health care bill for this Province by millions and millions of dollars in the future. And I say to the Minister of Health that we will reduce the health care bill for this Province by millions and millions of dollars in the future. And I say to the Minister of Health and to the Minister responsible for sport in the Province - the President of Treasury Board is in his seat, and I hope that the Premier is

listening - that I do not think there is any better way you can spend money for the future. It is important for today, but with the health care pressure that is going to come on to us, if we can have healthier, fitter Newfoundlanders we will keep the health care expenditures down in this Province, and that is the way to do it.

Now, of course, we will not accomplish that if regions in this Province which duly deserve them and have met the criteria of the regional recreational facilities program are denied their facilities, as this Premier and this Administration has denied the three areas in the Province which did meet the criteria, when the decision had been made by the previous administration to fund them. But you will not do that if you go about your business as you have gone about it in the last three or four weeks.

The other very important part of the economy I want to touch on briefly, Mr. Speaker, is, of course, the fishery.

The President of Treasury Board somehow cannot get the connection between sport and recreation and having fitter Newfoundlanders and talking about the province's most important industry. He cannot understand how that ties into the budget debate. He cannot understand; he shakes his head, he is bewildered. He says why is he up talking about the fishery? Why would you talk about the fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador if you are talking about the budget and the economy of the Province? Why would you do that? It is only the most important industry in the Province. Thousands of Newfoundlanders employed, turning

millions of dollars into the Newfoundland economy, and that is why I want to talk a few moments about the fishery. The fishery in this Province, both inshore, offshore and deep sea, is in very serious trouble as we all know, and it is going to have very drastic and devastating effects on the economy of this Province over the next six to ten years. Very tough decisions have to be made, and I am sure they will be made in the long term interests of the total fishing industry of this Province.

And what I pick up around the Province more and more, more than any other time, is that people involved in the industry are more receptive, and I mean those employed in the industry, the trawlermen and the fish plant works, particularly those two groups. They seem to realize more and more, and it has taken a long time for it to sort of sink in, that the industry is really in the trouble that it is in. I think they are willing, and more and more of them are becoming willing weekly, to sort of take their share of the responsibility for overcoming this very serious problem. I have heard some trawlermen say, Maybe we should not fish for as long a period of time. I have heard plant workers say, If it comes to this, then maybe if we work six or seven or eight months of the year as opposed to ten or twelve, it may be what we have to do for the long-term benefit of the industry.

What I am saying is that I feel there is more of a receptive mood amongst the total fishing industry for dealing with this very serious problem of the decline of our fish stocks. And it is long overdue.

Of course, it is very, very hard to impress upon people who depend upon that very industry for their livelihood, whether it be the trawlerman who is going to catch less fish because the stocks are down or he is not going to fish as often, or the plant worker who has less fish to process and, consequently, will be on unemployment insurance longer. Their earnings are going to be down. We all know what has happened to the inshore fishery over the last number of years. There has been a big decrease in the landings and so on, and these people's incomes are going to be drastically affected in a negative way. I think we have come to a point in time in this Province where everyone is more receptive to dealing with it, from the government to the Opposition to the people directly employed in the industry. If we are going to have a Newfoundland and Labrador, particularly a rural Newfoundland and Labrador, then the proper decisions have to be made now, when the time is right and the people are more receptive.

But in saying that, and looking at the President of Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance, it is going to make their jobs more difficult as well. And that is why I said a few days ago that for a government to come in on June 6 and project a \$5 million surplus in current account is being totally unrealistic. I see some members saying, 'Oh, Bill, sit down.'

There is one thing that will clearly demonstrate it, and that is time. We will let the budget face the test of time. And, as I said the other day, as sure as this is a bad budget, and that is pretty sure, the current account

deficit is going to come in.

AN HON. MEMBER:

This is the best budget since 1949.

MR. MATTHEWS:

The best budget since 1949. What is frightening about that is that he believes it. It is very frightening, for that man to think that.

As I told the President of Treasury Board the other day, he is smiling for one or two reasons. I would expect that as we get our financial and economic reviews throughout the year -

DR. KITCHEN:

(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

Let me say to the Minister of Finance who has spoken again for about the fourth time since the House opened, once when he gave his Budget Speech, that I hope you are right, I hope you do have a \$5 million surplus - no, that is not true. I do not want you to have \$5 million surplus. A balanced budget is what I want, because I would like for the Minister of Social Services to get a bit of pluck in Cabinet and try to get some more money out of the \$5 million surplus for the poor of the Province, the crowd he is now out trying to get back \$8 million from. Or I would like to see the Minister of Education try to get a few more dollars for the University, for the capital needs over there. They only gave them \$2 million so they cannot do the additional classrooms over there.

We all knew over the last three or four years, and we know going into the next four or five, that there is not adequate accommodation for students at the University. This

government should have made a decision to put more money into the capital requirements of the University so that they could make some arrangements over there to accommodate students and ease the pressure.

I know the Minister of Education is an honest man, and I am sure that neither he nor the President of the University is satisfied with \$2 million for capital. And when the minister speaks one of these days, I would like him to tell us what happened to the capital priority list that was submitted by the University. They had a priority list of a number of projects: lack of space was one, the animal care facility was very, very high on the list, and there were two or three others.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What?

MR. MATTHEWS:

The animal care facility.

The hon. gentleman says, what? Yes, what? That is very, very important because of the research dollars that go into the University. If they shut down the animal care facility as it now is, then the millions and millions of dollars that are going into the University, and consequently into the Province in research money, is going to be cut off.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

And that, as well.

Besides the damage it is going to do to the University, it is going to damage the economy of the Province.

I am not sure what amount of money is going into the University for research now. I should know it, and I will remember it before the day is over, but it is a significant amount of money.

These are the kinds of things the \$5 million surplus could have been used for: To help the students, you may have used it to not increase tuition fees at all, or increase them by 5 per cent instead of 10 per cent. That is the kind of thing the government could have decided to do, and that is what you were elected to do. It is no good trying to say we could not do it because of what you fellows left us. You have \$5 million, we hope, that you will have left going into the next fiscal year, so why do you not use it for some of these crisis issues?

MR. EFFORD:

What about the cucumber mess?

MR. MATTHEWS:

The cucumber mess has been dealt with, and you are still projecting a \$5 million surplus. You cannot bring up cucumbers the rest of your lives, no more than I can bring up stovepipes the rest of my life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

It does not get you anywhere and it does not get me anywhere.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Like Churchill Falls.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Like Chruchill Falls.

MR. TOBIN:

That program is gone out now, the federal government does not have

it anymore.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Talking about a mess, what about the \$800 million in Churchill? The cucumbers would not stand up very long against that.

MR. MATTHEWS:

There is no point in doing that, we do not accomplish anything.

I am talking about the \$5 million surplus you are projecting.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Do no ever think you are nuts to talk about a former liberal while the Minister of Fisheries sits there.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

The Minister of Transportation is a former Tory. We throw him out. We did not want him.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You could have used the \$5 million surplus wisely.

MR. TOBIN:

The Minister of Finance is a former President of the PC Party of Newfoundland.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

We had to get rid of him too.

MR. MATTHEWS:

The Minister of Finance is getting bored, Mr. Speaker. And it is very difficult for me to continue with four or five other people talking.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

He is working too hard.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, they could have used \$5 million more for the fishery.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

The Minister of Finance is working too hard trying to figure out that formula.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I will go down and check the (inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

You will never be there. You do not have to worry.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, they may have used the projected surplus of \$5 million for the fishery. They were very, very proud to announce in the budget that because of the crisis in the fishery they get \$500,000 -

AN HON. MEMBER:

500,000.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I think it is \$500,000 they are putting into the Department of Fisheries because of this very serious problem in our most important industry. A half million dollars is superficial, Band-Aid treatment. I hope when the Minister of Finance gets up to speak, he will say all the things he is mumbling over there so that we all can hear them and they will be recorded in Hansard. I hope that happens.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

He will not get up.

MR. MATTHEWS:

He should be recorded in this debate, because with this budget and his performance since, it will be the last occasion on which he will be recorded as the Minister of Finance for the Province. These will be the last few days where he will have a chance to get up and say something sensible.

MR. TOBIN:

He brought in one budget.

MR. MATTHEWS:

He brought in one budget and it will be his last. I hope he rises in his place and has something to say about it all; about how he can justify what he did to the people of this Province by inflicting \$95 million in additional taxes on them, \$300 per man, woman and child in additional taxes in this fiscal year. That is what he did. That is exactly what he did.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How many times have you said in the last three days?

MR. MATTHEWS:

How many times have I said it in the last three days? A good many times, but not as many times as I am going to say it in the next 365 days.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

You will never live it down.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Because it is important that the message gets out as to exactly what you and your government have done since you became the government of this Province. Instead of having a \$5 million surplus, we could have taken it and given it to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. We could have given it to her so that she would have a reason to be known as the Minister of Employment for the Province. Today she does not have a reason to be known as the Minister of Employment. She should be known as the Minister of Layoffs. Layoffs and Labour Relations, that is what she should be called - 3,000 jobs out of the Private Sector Program, laying off staff in the Employment Services Division.

You have to question the minister and the Premier and ask, Why did the Premier put Employment in the name of the department when all he has done since is cause layoffs? And the minister has caused layoffs. They have done a great job in layoffs, there is no question, and I am sure you are going to see many more.

You can twist anything, you know, to your own advantage, and the biggest twister is now back in his seat. The biggest twister, the Minister of Health, is now back in his seat. He went around the Province saying he was going to open up more hospital beds and he has cut out thirty or forty already. Make no wonder he told the helicopter pilot to keep the props going when he went to St. Lawrence and landed on the biggest dust pad he could find. When the people saw the dust they said, My God! we are being struck by a twister. And they were right. It was a twister. I know of no person in this world who could twist what he went around this Province preaching and put it on paper for the people of St. Lawrence to read. I tell you, if he had not gone to St. Lawrence and fell out of the clouds in the airwolf machine like he did -

MR. DECKER:  
Will the member permit a question?

MR. MATTHEWS:  
No, I will not permit a question.

MR. DECKER:  
Just one question.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
No question. If he had not fallen out of the clouds in St. Lawrence and kept the dust going so no one could see who he really was - they really thought it was a twister,

and they were right. They said it was the first time ever in the history of St. Lawrence that they saw a twister. Lawrence. Maybe the kind of twister they were talking about had something to do with what he said earlier about going to the dance. Maybe he was saying, 'Let's twist again like we did last Summer.' Maybe that is what it was all about. I do not know.

MR. DECKER:  
Will the member permit a question?

MR. MATTHEWS:  
No. But, I will tell you, if they had known you were coming, you would have had a dance in St. Lawrence yesterday.

MR. TOBIN:  
And next week.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
That is right, and next week. Whoever the alternate Minister of Health is, he could have been busy over the next two or three weeks, or maybe longer.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
And they had a few questions.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
they had a few questions, yes. I do not know where they would have put him down there, but they would have found a place.

MR. DECKER:  
Will you permit a question?

MR. MATTHEWS:  
No, I am not going to permit a question. You are the minister. You are supposed to get the questions and answer them.

MR. WINDSOR:  
You are supposed to have answers.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You are supposed to have answers. How many times today were you asked questions and you could not answer them?

MR. DECKER:

You never asked a question.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You say from your place what you want to say, I will hear you and react accordingly, but I am not giving up my time.

MR. DECKER:

I want to ask your colleague from Burin - Placentia West what his opinion is on what we are doing in Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I know what this gentleman's opinion is.

MR. TOBIN:

We made the announcement during the election campaign.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is right. I did not want to bring that up. I know his position, and I know what the position of this party was when in government: We would fully open the regional hospital at Salt Pond and keep the other two hospitals open. That is what our decision was. It was the same as our decision was in 1987, keep the two cottage hospitals open. We rejected the recommendations of the Royal Commission on hospital and nursing home costs, and the Nycum Associates Bed Study Report. As a government, as I told the Premier the other day, we had the right to do that, and you as a government do not have to accept the recommendations of a royal commission or an enquiry.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What happened to Markland?

MR. MATTHEWS:

What happened to it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You tell me what happened to it.

MR. FLIGHT:

And what happened to Botwood?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who closed it?

MR. MATTHEWS:

We closed it when we were the government, and for all the right reasons. As I asked you today, do you know why the hospital in St. Lawrence is still there? The Minister of Health did not know when he closed it down.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

And he does not know how it got there. He has no idea.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You wanted to keep them to get you re-elected.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I did not need two hospitals to get me re-elected. I will tell you what you have done by taking them away. You have elected me for life.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

And I will tell you something. I would rather have the two hospitals open and be defeated.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Oh, my God! The old chicken is starting to batter over there again. And he is not even in his seat. As an hon. member told him, you are not allowed to speak unless you are in your own seat.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Two down. He flew the coop.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, that is right. The old chicken wing! Broke one wing off the people of Bell Island. As I told him the other day, he cracked a wing off them. Now whether he went to Knickerbockers to put it in the batter or not, I do not know.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

He is going for another one now, is he not?

MR. MATTHEWS:

He is going for the ribs over there now. He is going to bust the ribs out of them. And he is into pizzas. I have heard that in the next election he plans to use the pizzas like frisbees. That is how he is going to go about his district to try to get elected.

But for that gentleman over there to speak from a seat that he is not even allowed to speak from, when he took away a ferry from the people of Bell Island. Two ferries were announced by this Party when we were the government, two. Materials were ordered by the Marystown Shipyard, there were letters of intent. This member, who was elected to represent the people of Bell Island, bowed down to the Premier and the Cabinet and said, "I do not care if you take one of them away. I do not care. What does it matter now? I am elected. When we get close to the next election, we will promise them the other one and that may

get me re-elected." I do not think that is going to happen. I think he will be fully winged by then. He will be the one winged in the next election, not the people. But that is the kind of thing we see happening over there. That is another good example of job creation. The Marystown Shipyard could be building the two ferries and keeping more people employed. But, of course, that is not a priority of yours either.

These are the kinds of things that have happened since you took power. Very, very positive things have happened in the Province, as I have said. Everything is taxed to death, everything - \$95 million additional taxes.

MR. TOBIN:

Read that. That is going to be a racket.

MR. MATTHEWS:

"The second Bell Island ferry is not cancelled," Wells says. Is that what he is saying?

MR. TOBIN:

Read it all.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I do not have time to read it all.

MR. TOBIN:

It is important.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Oh? When was this, June 15? "He added, 'There is going to be a second ferry for Bell Island, but at this moment the government has decided it is not going to have the Marystown Shipyard build it right now.'"

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!



MR. MATTHEWS:

"He said, 'It is possible that decision could change next year.'"

Now, there is one of two things going on here. Is it the question of where it is going to be built that is the problem? Is that the problem, where it was planned to be built? Is that what is causing a little more communication between the Premier and his friend Robert Bourassa? As a result of trying to get something going, I suppose he will probably have a few boats built in Quebec. Is that what we are about to see, I wonder? Is he going to put our own people out of work and have them built in Quebec?

MR. WINDSOR:

Is that how we have to make up for Meech Lake?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Maybe Meech Lake. There may be something surface over the next number of months to show exactly what is happening. When the Premier gets a chance, I would like him to say if where the ship was going to be built was the problem. Is that the problem, that he did not want it built in Marystown? Can he stand in his place and say that it is not needed for Bell Island?

MS VERGE:

Where else is there in Newfoundland to have that kind of boat built?

MR. MATTHEWS:

I would not know if there is another place in Newfoundland to build that kind of boat. I am not sure. I am sure the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation could tell where they might build it elsewhere. But, then, of course, he did not know the

decision had been made not to build it this year.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

He said there was no decision.

MR. MATTHEWS:

He said there was no decision, but, of course, no decision means that he did not know if it was going to be built or not. Indeed, there was Minute-in-Council issued on May 23, or May 27, and three times since that date the minister stood in his place and denied that there was a Minute-in-Council issued.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

He dozed off in that Cabinet meeting, I suppose.

MR. MATTHEWS:

He stood in his place three times and said that there was no Minute-in-Council issued dealing with that issue. The Premier has said on two occasions that indeed there was, and gave the date yesterday. So how can you have the Premier saying one thing and the minister saying another? Were they in the same room? As someone said, the minister was either absent or he fell asleep.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

He dozed off, I guess. Working too hard.

MR. MATTHEWS:

He could have dozed off. He works eighteen or twenty hours a day. He told me that the other day, and I believe him.

MR. GILBERT:

I am a good minister.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, you sure are. You are a good minister, no doubt! You will not be a good minister for long, that

is the problem.

MR. GILBERT:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Pardon? He sits and moans and groans and you are really not sure what is coming out of him. He does not look up. You know, it is like when you knock on a door in an election campaign and you try to identify your support. You are trying to identify your support when you knock on the door, and there is one sure way of knowing they are not with you, when they come out to the door and they look at their shoes. You do not have to go away from the door saying, 'That is doubtful or they are with me.' They are not with you when they look at their feet and will not look you in the eyeballs.

MS VERGE:  
That is because they feel guilty.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
They feel guilty. They cannot really tell you, 'Bill, I am not for you,' or 'Dave, I am not voting for you.' Now, that minister, who is sitting in his seat this last week continuously looking down at his desk, has that same kind of guilt written all over his face. He wants to get up and tell the truth and apologize, but he is really not sure what the consequences might be. It is a little bit too late. He knows he has himself boxed into a corner. It is sad, but then, I suppose, I see smiles on the faces of some of the other gentlemen over there. I wonder why they are smiling?

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
They are delighted.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I think some of them are delighted. They cannot believe their luck so early, that they just might get called up to the Eighth Floor and be offered a job with Works, Services and Transportation. Look! Some of them are beaming over there.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
And they are delighted with the Minister of Finance.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
They are absolutely delighted that the Minister of Finance, when he brought in this document, that same night admitted to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that he did not understand the formula that compared the tax burden of Newfoundlanders to the other provinces of Canada. He did not understand it, yet he slapped a \$95 million tax rate on the people of the Province. They could not believe it! I am sure they rubbed their hands with glee. Make no wonder you are laughing over there. I would laugh too if I was in the backbenches of the government over there, because I would know I would soon get a call up to the Eighth Floor, if I had either bit of salt about me at all, if I was worth my salt, and be offered a job by the Premier. That is what is going to happen over there in the next three to four weeks. There are two or three of them going to go. They have to. The Premier cannot tolerate it. Because besides being inexperienced, they have demonstrated total incompetence by admitting to the people that they do not know, they do not understand. That is what has happened.

I am sure the Premier has already made a few phone calls and said,

'Get all the Cabinet to write up their resignations, because you will never know when I might phone three or four and march them over with them in their pockets.'

The member for Exploits is back there and he cannot wait. He is conferring now with his NTA colleague and I am sure they are saying, 'How much will we have to fight for in the next budget, Roger, for the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, or should we just put enough in the budget for a few boxes of kleenex for when we have to go out to the branches of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and brief them on government's offer? I would say, Roger, we are going to need a lot of tissues then.'

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Oh, I am not bringing that up. You are bringing that up.

So that is going to increase the deficit next year. Perhaps that is what the \$5 million surplus is in there for.

MR. R. AYLWARD:  
They had better put that in their pockets and hold on to it.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) Labrador.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Yes, well, if it all went down to Labrador and you brought in a balanced budget, I would have no problem with that either. But for so many ministers over there to agree to let the government bring in - not the private members because they had no control over it, they had no input into the budget, none whatsoever, but how

the ministers, who have so many important needs for every department of government, could allow the Premier to ram a \$5 million surplus down their throats, is absolutely amazing, and with the poor of this Province needing so much.

The Minister of Education needs so much, the Minister of Fisheries, who should not have accepted just a half million dollars to deal with the impending crisis in the fishery. It should have been \$5 million, and that would not have been enough. And on and on it goes.

The Minister of Employment and Labour Relations has \$2 million in her budget and she really does not know what it is there for. Is it for training, education, or is it for employment? That is the question the minister is going to have to answer on that particular subhead with \$2 million for social assistance initiatives. That is the question. And is there any real need? And why did the Premier name the department Employment and Labour Relations, when all they have done is cut out jobs in the private sector of the Province and in that very department, in Employment Services Division? These are very, very important questions.

Five million dollars could have created 2,500 jobs in the Private Sector Employment program. With \$5 million from government and \$5 million from the private sector, you could have created 2,500 jobs. But you would rather come in and say, 'We have a \$5 million surplus in the document rather than create 2,500 jobs in this Province. That tells me something about the priorities -

MS DUFF:

Where is the heart?

MR. MATTHEWS:

I do not know. Ron Pumphrey used to say, 'Put a heart in City Hall', but I tell you, there are not too many over there.

MR. TOBIN:

Last night she said in the Committee that there was 80 per cent patronage.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, for the minister to make the statement, 80 per cent patronage! Right now, the concentration of population in this Province, as much as some of us do not like it, still happens to be in St. John's and the Avalon Peninsula. A lot of us do not like that, but that is how it is.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How did that happen?

MR. MATTHEWS:

I do not know how it happened. They populated faster than the rest of us, I suppose.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Multiplied faster, yes.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Or a lot of us left the outports and came in here. There are a number of reasons. Maybe the rest of us got into birth control before the townies did, I do not know. Of course, we all know it is the seat of government. But the point is, for the two years the Private Sector Employment program was in effect, when the applications were made available, people from the Avalon Peninsula lined up at the desk of the Employment Services Division and filled out their applications.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

It being Thursday at 4:00 p.m., I want to advise hon. members of the questions for the Late Show. The first question is from the member for Torngat Mountains, stating his dissatisfaction with answers provided him by the Minister of Health in relation to Grenfell Air Services.

The second question is from the member for St. John's East, stating her dissatisfaction with answers to questions provided the Premier, having to do with screening mammography, and she wants to debate same in the Late Show.

The third one is from the member for Kilbride, stating his dissatisfaction with answers provided him by the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, concerning municipal capital funding for this year.

These are the three questions.

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying, the reason why I think the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations is confused is because the private sector is stronger on the Avalon Peninsula, because this is the population base, for most part, of the Province. And over the last two years, most of the seats in the Avalon Peninsula were held by Conservative MHAs. Well, now, that is all changed, and if the Private Sector Employment program was offered again this year, you would have the same kind of thing take place, that most of the

applications would come from the Avalon -

MR. TOBIN:

She does not want to hear. Look, she is leaving!

MR. MATTHEWS:

She does not want to hear, because she knows she made a false statement. Regardless of what government is in power in this Province, if you have a program for the private sector, most of the money will go to the Avalon Peninsula, because that is where the most people are, that is where the most businesses are, and that is where the most applications will come from. That is what it is all about. And for that minister to try to tag that program with patronage is false, because, as I said, for two years there was not one recommendation from the interdepartmental committee to Cabinet that was rejected. It did not matter what area of the Province they came from, they were approved.

MR. TOBIN:

There was one rejected.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I know, but that was after the fact. What I am saying is, there was no patronage in the program. It was a good program. If the minister were strong at the Cabinet table and she fully understood the benefits of the program, she would have fought to have the \$5 million that is in as a surplus for job creation in the Province. So there is no point in having an employment department anymore, there are no employees and there are no programs; private sector is cancelled, and occupational integration for women cancelled. That is the kind of situation we have, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks by saying that I really expect, at the end of the fiscal year, that we are going to see a significant deficit in current account in this Province. I would say it will be between \$30 million and \$60 million for sure. There will be a \$30 million to \$60 million deficit at least.

MR. RIDEOUT:

That means another tax grab next year.

MR. WINDSOR:

Yes, and Special Warrants along the way.

MR. MATTHEWS:

And Special Warrants will come.

That is the other thing I was going to say to the President of Treasury Board. It is fine to stand up in this House today and preach about how things were done before and how they are not going to be done in the future. Well, that is like we saw when they were in opposition for seventeen years, and seventeen years of criticism has not translated into one single month of good government. And you are going to find as you go on managing the affairs of the Province, what we saw in the election campaign, when the Premier went around the Province and preached all kinds that he has now backslid on and is not delivering. So for the President of Treasury Board to stand up in this House and tell us how things are going to be, well, I guess we will have to wait and see that.

But I think this government has made a crucial mistake, a critical mistake when, in deciding their plans and programs for this Province this year, they came up \$90 million short for what they

wanted to do and imposed \$95 million in additional taxes on the taxpayers of this Province to show a \$5 million surplus. And that is what they did! Spend the \$5 million. Give the ministers who need it badly the \$5 million for their departments. You will have a better Province for it, and you will serving the people the way you wanted to.

You could, of course, have staggered the deficit over two or three years, which probably the fiscal agents would not like too much. They probably would not favour that, but you, again, are the duly elected government of the Province and it was your decision. Mr. Speaker, with these remarks I conclude my debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Lewisporte.

MR. PENNEY:

Mr. Speaker, I am honoured once again to rise in this hon. House and represent the district of Lewisporte. For the past few weeks we have seen, contrary to the opinion of some of our hon. colleagues, an exceptional performance on the part of our new government. We have presented a very impressive Speech from the Throne, and a Budget that we are all very proud of. It has gotten good reviews from the business community, and members of the press have been very complimentary.

I would like to quote from page 1 of the budget. "While this is a Budget of restraint, it truly is a liberal Budget, bearing a strong message of hope and opportunity to every Newfoundlander and Labradorian. It signals a new and

fresh beginning." This is exactly what has been done. We have provided a new and a fresh beginning. Every area of concern to the Province, I believe, has been thoroughly addressed and I am impressed with the way the new Cabinet Ministers have handled their responsibilities, particularly evidenced at the Estimates Committee meetings. Any of us who have sat on that Committee would have to be impressed with the way the ministers have handled themselves.

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote one little section from the Throne Speech and it says, "We find ourselves increasingly beset by environmental problems at the local, provincial, national and global levels. It is a condition that must be addressed in order to prevent our children from being faced with a Province and world damaged beyond repair.

"For the sake of our health, enjoyment and safety, and for the sake of the generations of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that will people this Province into the next century, My Government will develop an effective conservation strategy and will discharge fully its responsibility to protect our environment."

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be part of a government that is prepared to make a statement of that sort. I would like to speak for the next few minutes on that topic, 'Environmental concerns'. Of course, under the topic of environmental concerns, one of the very first issues that must come to mind in this Province is the spray program and the toxic chemical fenitrothion. We have

heard the hon. member for Grand Falls accuse the hon. Minister of Forestry of not paying attention to the experts, not paying attention to advice and information that is available. We have also heard the hon. member for Grand Bank attack him almost viciously on the same topic. It is unfortunate that neither of those hon. gentlemen are in their seats, because I strongly believe that the both of them are just jealous.

We finally have a minister in that portfolio who has the integrity to listen to the advice, listen to the authorities, listen to all of the information that is available and make a good, strong, honest decision, one that we are all very proud of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PENNEY:

For the record, Mr. Speaker, let us look at some of the information the hon. the member for Grand Falls is stating has not paid attention to. I quote from a report entitled, Dispersal And Toxicology Of The Insecticide Fenitrothion Predicting Hazards Of Forest Spraying prepared by the Department of Environment, Fisheries and Marine Services: '1974 - trickled fenitrothion into a trout stream and compared growth and population densities of fish in the treated section with those in a non-treated section upstream. Five weeks later, numbers of yearling or older trout had decreased by 50 per cent in the treated section, while in the untreated section upstream the numbers had increased by 50 per cent.

An additional quote from the same

report under the heading **Conclusion:** 'There is usually a kill of non-target terrestrial anthropoids at the time of spraying and, since some of these are budworm predators, this kill is undesirable.' This is a report that was available to all previous ministers.

Another report is entitled The Effectiveness Of Bt/Matacil Against The Hemlock Looper In Newfoundland, 1985. Mr. Speaker, I will quote this one only to show the extremes that we could go to if we have no consideration for the environment whatsoever. The quote reads: 'Several types of insecticides have been tested for the control of looper population. Applications of arsenic compounds in the 1920s, generally reduced larvae numbers by 90 per cent to 100 per cent. Good coverage was achieved.' Then it states: 'Applications of DDT in Ontario in the 1950s.' Fortunately, our government is not prepared to look at those means anymore, we are prepared to consider the environment.

The next one I have here, Mr. Speaker, is entitled, Fate And Effects Of Forest Predators. The Newfoundland Experience' published May 14, 1986. From it I quote: 'Forestry officials should have been aware of an impending hemlock looper outbreak and yet took no action to have alternatives to fenitrothion. The renewed use of fenitrothion, if even a short time requirement, is extremely retrogressive.' These same reports were available to all past ministers.

The next one, Mr. Speaker, A Study To Monitor The Impact Of The 1985 Hemlock Looper Insecticide Spray Program On Songbird Populations,

and from it I quote: 'Singing activity seemed lower on all mornings after the spray relative to pre-spraying or controlled areas.'

Number five. A Study To Monitor The Impacts Of The 1986 Hemlock Looper Insecticide Spray Program On Songbirds. From it I quote: 'A total of 38.1 per cent of the songbirds collected after the fenitrothion spraying had potentially life-threatening colonesteron inhibition' - 38.1 per cent.

From the same report: 'Unintentional mortality of songbirds has been reported from fenitrothion use in forest insect control programs.' Mr. Speaker, for the information of hon. members who sit on the other side of the House, mortality means death.

From the same report under the heading Recommendations: 'In view of the measured adverse affect of fenitrothion applied at 210 grams of active ingredient per hectare and forest songbird brain colonesteron activity in this study, the Department of Forest Resources and Lands should continue their research and development of alternative forest insect control sprays, formulations and application rates.'

Number six. Proceedings of a Symposium on Fenitrothion - the Long-term Effects of its use in the Forest Ecosystems. This one is quite interesting, Mr. Speaker. 'Long term effects on fish numbers have been studied in one stream. In this single instance salmon eggs decreased during three years of spraying to about 25 per cent of the original

numbers.'

I have other reports. I will not quote from all of them, but I would like to at least refer to them by title. We have one entitled, Immediate Chemical and Toxicological Influences of Aerial Applied Fenitrothion and Amino Carbon - Selected Newfoundland Streams, 1977; Biomass Changes of Stream Fishes after Spraying with Fenitrothion, 1974; Forest Pest Management Institutes Stance on use of Fenitrothion Relative to its Impact on Songbirds, 1987; Information about the 1987 Aerial Spray Against the Eastern Hemlock Looper by the Department of Forestry; Hazards of Organophosphate Pesticides to Wildlife; and the list goes on.

Every single one of those reports have been available to every previous Minister of Forestry, and to the present Minister of Forestry. I am absolutely delighted that he has taken the time and has shown the integrity to listen to this, to read through the reports, to listen to the advice given by his experts, the people within his department, and has made the decision that we have heard announced here in this House. I am delighted. I am very proud of the gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. PENNEY:  
There is one other statement I feel I must quote, Mr. Speaker. It is called The Fenitrothion Review, by the Canadian Wildlife Services:

'We, therefore, conclude that the use of fenitrothion is questionable on the following grounds: Because, as a reduced



growth rate of nestlings under normal operational spray conditions when overswathing occurs, a variety of effects may result, including direct adult mortality, reduction or elimination of singing and territory defence, desultory incubation, nest abandonment, and reduced growth in development of nestlings. It induces a level of brain colonesteron inhibition that borders on unacceptability under normal spray conditions. Because overswathing probably cannot be eliminated, we feel that any chemical receiving extensive use in forest pest control operations should be safe to songbirds at twice the operational dosage rate. Fenitrothion clearly does not meet that criterion.'

I do not know what kind of evidence the hon. members were looking for, but I commend the stand that our government has taken.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said, 'For those who believe, no proof is necessary, for those who do not, no proof is possible.' I think that statement is very applicable in this case. God help us when our elected government ministers assume the attitude, 'We have our minds made up, do not confuse us with facts.' I am afraid that is what we have watched over the past few years.

The decision that was announced this year by our hon. minister to use Bt exclusively, was as refreshing as a breath of Spring, and it shows the integrity and the good sense of the minister and of our new Cabinet and of our new government. We must not allow ourselves, Mr. Speaker, to be dictated to by industry. Never again should we tolerate any

decision of government that is not for the good of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

There is another area of environmental concern I would like to address, Mr. Speaker. We have fought for years to have specific sections of our Province allocated as wilderness reserves.

These are areas set aside to be protected from exploitation, development and change. We have attempted to allow us to protect a small section of Newfoundland to be preserved for our grandchildren, areas that would be off limits to snowmobilers, and to people who wish to rape the country with ATVs. We have tried to get this done in the area that was to be known as the Bay du Nord Wilderness area. After ten years of attempting and having the area finally delineated to the satisfaction of most government departments and to the public, to environmentalists and to residents, it has gone to public hearings, the last of which were in 1988, and after ten years we have accomplished a provisional ecological reserve.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the key word here is provisional. That means provided somebody does not want it changed. That is sad. It means provided somebody does not want to go snowmobiling someday. The very fact that it is provisional means that the status can be overturned at any time without public hearings. The previous Premier, the hon. Mr. Peckford, stated publicly that that was because of differences within his Cabinet. We must now show the same degree of integrity in this decision as we have shown in some of the others, and we must take the final step and give this area formalized

permanent reserve status.

To put this concern into perspective, Mr. Speaker, the little country of Costa Rica, with its very fragile economy, has wildlife reservations and parks and other protected areas that combine to make up 20 per cent of the country. That is 2,577 square miles, 20 of Costa Rica but less than 5 per cent of Newfoundland. Costa Rica has a population of 3 million. That is 3 million people living in an area of 20,000 square miles. Newfoundland has a population of somewhere in the vicinity of a half a million and an area of 39,000 square miles. If we were to include Labrador, we have five times the landmass of Costa Rica, yet they have 20 per cent of their country set aside as reservation, and we have less than 5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that that is totally unacceptable. In my presentation to this Hon. House on Opening Day, I quoted from an unknown source, 'We do not inherit what we have from our forefathers, we simply hold it in trust for our children.' I believe that to be very true. We must come to realize this fact immediately, before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Jim Bradley, Minister of Environment for Ontario, stated: 'Without environmental security there can be no economic security, and leadership is required to make this a reality.' I recognize this, Mr. Speaker, our government recognizes this, and I believe, for the first time in many years, we have the leadership in this Party required to make it a reality.

While the previous administration

has seen fit to preserve less than 5 per cent of our island in the name of wilderness reserves, it has, however, seen fit to restrict cottage development, on the other hand, in an area that exceeds 20 per cent of the island. Existing Legislation prohibits approval of commercial or private cottages within 8 km of any commercial outfitting camp.

There are currently in excess of 100 outfitting camps for fishing and hunting. I understand there are more about to be approved. Using the mathematical formula the area of a circle equal to Pi times the radius squared, we deduced that around 100 camps, we have 20,096 sq km. That is an incredible 19 per cent of the total area of this island.

That is if we use the figure of 100. When we accept the fact that there are outfitting camps in excess of 100, then we must accept the figure of somewhere near 20 per cent. I am not suggesting that outfitters have no place in the Province. Quite the contrary. They provide a very valuable service, and since 1964 we have watched the industry grow from infancy to maturity. But the time has come, Mr. Speaker, to assess our priorities. We must not blindly enact Legislation in the manner in which it has been done in the past. Fortunately, we have elected a strong, caring government, under the very capable leadership of the hon. Premier Wells. We will correct mistakes that we are not too late to correct, and we will ensure that the great Newfoundland wilderness we have left will be protected from all predators, from outside intervention to local, uncaring politicians.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I will like to borrow one more quote: 'Some see things as they are and ask why. Would to God all Newfoundland politicians could see things as they could be and ask why not.'

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Green Bay.

MR. HEWLETT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I realize there are only a few minutes left before we get into the Late Show, so what I might do for the remaining minute is just take an excerpt out of the speech I had in my mind, and it goes like this:

For a number of years, my predecessor in Green Bay worked to have a municipal park at Crescent Lake developed as a provincial park. This endeavour was heavily supported by the town council of Robert's Arm and the Beothuck Trail Tourism Committee. Last year saw the first expenditures on this facility as part of the provincial parks system. However, Mr. Speaker, as officials in the Parks Division can testify, the park was going to be different. This was going to be a model park in the provincial system; it was going to be a destination park, a park with showers, flush toilets and trailer dumping stations. It was already a prime site for water-skiing, powerboating, fishing, and was also in close proximity to excellent coastal scenery. Like the signs on the TCH, Mr. Speaker, it was really, 'Welcome to scenic Green Bay.'

The Rideout administration had committed itself to continuing development of this park.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. HEWLETT:  
When the Budget Estimates indicated the capital program for park development, I had hopes that the Wells Administration would continue with this park's development. However, Mr. Speaker, such was not to be the case. Just as I was shut out of the provincial roads program, just as I was almost shut out of the water and sewer program, we were shut out of the Provincial Parks program.

Park facilities that contain showers and flush toilets are things called comfort stations. When I asked the minister where these comfort stations were going, there are none for Crescent Lake Park, they are going to other parks in other places in the Province. My predecessor from Green Bay who, Mr. Speaker, was well known for a certain phrase "They stole the shop." Well, Mr. Speaker, they 'stole my park' and I adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

#### Debate on the Adjournment [Late Show]

MR. SPEAKER:  
It being 4:30 p.m., I call on the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

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

Today in the Question Period I asked the minister a question, if he was going to stop the abusive use of the medical aircraft that is operated by the Grenfell Regional Health Services. The minister left me with the impression that since he has become minister it has not happened, and that he was going to stop it. I think he left that impression in this hon. House on June 1.

So, Mr. Speaker, the minister received a letter from an individual. I do not know whether it is a constituent of his. I have no idea. I do not even know the name of the lady, only what is on the paper. In fact, the minister was the only one who mentioned the name of the lady. I even omitted it from the paper that I laid on the table of the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. Since 1979 I have said in this House, I have said it continuously, and I will say it again, that there has to be an investigation into the operation of the Grenfell Regional Health Services plane and the way that it is operating in Northern Newfoundland and Labrador. I have said that time and time again, and I still believe it has to be done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister, in answer today, when I asked him could he confirm that other people than medical evacuees or those who were accompanying the medical evacuees were on the aircraft, the minister said, and I quote, "I have probably heard that being said. I am not aware of it having happened in the last month or so that I have been minister of this particular department. I belong to the Northern Peninsula

and I have heard that said from time to time." So the minister has heard that himself, the same as I have. Hundreds of people who are associated with the medical services supplied by the Grenfell Health Services Board have heard it said over and over again, that the medical plane is not used to the best benefit or for the benefit that it is supposed to be used for. And the minister said he has used the Grenfell plane.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, he is an elected representative of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. He is being paid by the taxpayers of this Province. Why not, Mr. Speaker? I find it very disbelieving. I find it unusual that 30 percent, and I have documentation to prove it, and the minister has it too, of the travellers on the Grenfell Medical Services plane are non-medical passengers and they are given free rides. The minister has that documentation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, furthermore it has been recommended to the Grenfell Regional Health Services Board that this practice would, should discontinue. This practice should cease. Free rides should cease. This has been recommended by the Regional Grenfell Health Services Board.

So my question today to the minister was: Has he stopped the abusive use of the plane? And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman partially answered the question. I hope that the minister can get on his feet and say he is going to ask for a full investigation into the operation of the plane.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to get nurses or medical staff for the remote areas of Newfoundland and Labrador, I

think there are other ways to do it than giving free rides. I think there have to be other incentives in place for those people. If you are going to do it for the nurses or the doctors, to have free rides when they want to, what about all of the teachers in the North? What about all of the public servants in the North? They are all being paid by the taxpayers of this Province, and we have to put an initiative, a Labrador - Northern Newfoundland benefit package to keep them there to do the service. What about the underpaid people, the ordinary Labradorians and Newfoundlanders living up there making \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year? I think, Mr. Speaker, the people in the North have seen the Grenfell Health Services medical aircraft not being used to its potential that it should be used for, and I call upon the minister to make sure that he will do what he said he will do, and that is to make sure that the aircraft will be used for its intended purpose. And, Mr. Speaker, if the minister can do that, and at the same time I have asked him to lay on the Table a log of the aircraft during that period of time - he can lay it on there for the last ten years - why not? Then everybody can see for themselves who the 30 per cent non-medical people were. But, Mr. Speaker, it is in his department. I asked him to lay on the Table the log since he became minister, because he was the minister who said he was going to change it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said that he had a grave concern about it ever since 1979. Now the hon. member was a minister of the Crown for the last thirteen months prior to the election. And I cannot help but wonder why he did not take advantage of his thirteen months to have this matter investigated, but obviously it seems like -

MR. WARREN:

I got information about the plane and you have, too.

MR. DECKER:

Now the member will know that there is a limit on the number of hours that Grenfell can use their plane, both the ones on the Labrador as well as the Commander which flies in. There is a cap on it. He says that 30 per cent of the time is being used for non-medical reasons. Now I am not so sure that figure is correct or not. The report was put before my desk not very long ago, and I am not a walking encyclopedia, I am not an adding machine, I cannot remember the figures. But I believe that 30 per cent might just be a bit high. But I did notice over the past three years the trend has been going down, the number of non-medical who have been using the plane has been dropping off this last three years, if I can remember correctly, Mr. Speaker.

Now I already explained when I answered the question that as an incentive of enticing people to work in the North with the Grenfell, whether it be doctors or nurses or lab technicians or what

have you, one of the ways -

MR. WARREN:

Government employees.

MR. DECKER:

I was not aware of the government employee thing, but maybe that is part of it too.

- but to encourage people who work there they are allowed to travel on the plane when the plane is on a medical emergency or bringing someone into St. John's. Now that would make sense to me, Mr. Speaker. If the plane is flying normally she would have one or two patients I would think, the plane is capable of carrying eight people, so it could well be the case that it would have been a higher rate than 30 per cent travelling on the plane. But I am assured that the plane is not specifically flying for the sole purpose of carrying non-medical people. I am convinced that is not the case.

I am also aware of the danger of people who might invent a medical emergency for an excuse to take some people to St. John's. Now I am aware that that might be a problem. For example, Mr. Speaker, just prior to the last election I was attending a function in Main Brook - I drove up to Main Brook, it is part of my district - and it was the cross-country ski races, and an employee of the previous administration, not a minister, he was a civil servant, was also attending representing the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth. I had driven there, he pops in in a government helicopter. I immediately said, 'On what grounds did you use to use a government helicopter to come in here on a Saturday?'

'Well, the helicopter was coming in anyway', he said. I said, 'Well, why did it come?' Well, he did not want to tell me first so, I finally pushed him. 'Well,' he said, 'actually the helicopter had to fly in from Deer Lake to pick up some jawbones belonging to some moose.' So he took advantage and flew in on it. 'Well, "I said, "Look, I could have taken those jawbones in the back of my car and could have taken them back to St. John's on Monday morning for nothing." Now, that is the kind of stuff that does happen from time to time. I cannot blame the then Minister for Culture Recreation and Youth for that. He had no way of controlling that. Now, when you have this kind of a thing there is always the possibility that there could be abuse. That is why it will always be the responsibility of the administration to keep a close check on these things which can have abuse. The former minister sat in the Cabinet for thirteen months and must have kept his mouth shut because, whatever happened, they did not stop it, if there was any abuse there.

The member suggests that there should be other incentives. Not a bad idea. I have discussed that, Mr. Speaker. It might not only apply to Northern Newfoundland and Labrador. There is a problem recruiting certain specialists and medical doctors, general practitioners and nurses in certain parts of this Province. There might be other incentives that we can look for and I would not be adverse to looking at some other incentives to encourage people to work in the Province. However, in the case of this plane, it is already there. It was partly donated by the International Grenfell

Association, the Newfoundland Government paid for the other part. The Newfoundland Government paid for its operation. It is there to be carrying patients. If there is any abuse there, and if it ever comes to my attention, I will attack it without mercy. I will even go as far as to look and see if there is any abuse there. But if, Mr. Speaker, there is no abuse there, the plane is serving a very valuable function in that it does bring patients back and forth to Labrador, and I do not see anything wrong with employees of the Grenfell taking advantage of a free ride, even if, as I said, they want to come in to a dance. That is up to themselves what they do with their free ride. It is an incentive to help them stay. If we did not have that little extra perk, we would probably have to pay them out three or four times a year as another incentive, which would probably cost just as much money anyway, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:

I asked permission to speak at this time in reference to a question I had earlier asked on screening the monography program because I find myself totally dissatisfied with the answers, or I should say the non-answers that I was given to those questions. It is a matter that I consider to

be very serious.

The Premier, if I can paraphrase him, basically said he had to check and see if the statements that I made were true and then take the matter under review or advisement. If that in fact is what he said, it would lead me to believe that this whole issue of the screening monography program was not on hold or under review, as was stated by the Minister of Health, but was in fact not considered at all. Because if it was considered, and it was laid on the table as one of the priorities of this government in the budget, then I would think that the answer would be fairly simple as to what problems there were that caused it not to be funded. If that is not the case, and in fact it was considered and rejected, then my supplementary question was simply why was it not given a higher priority. So it would not have been difficult to get an answer unless I misdirected the question and should have directed it to the Minister of Finance, who is so intimately familiar with all the details of his budget. So I may have made a mistake; I am a rookie and perhaps did not know how to direct it.

The three statements that I did make, which the Premier has indicated he wants to find out if they are true, was, one, that medical experts agree that screening monography saves lives. I do not think that you need to be a reader of *The Lancet* or *The Canadian Medical Journal* to know that. I think you would find articles on that in *The Reader's Digest* in a doctor's waiting room. But there have been some doubters, there have been some people who felt that perhaps it was a risk, not that the screening

monography could not save lives but that there was some risk to that procedure on a province-wide basis.

Recently, in 1988, in December in fact, as a result of a major national study, the government has now declared definitively that the benefits outweigh the risks for women in the over fifty age category, and women at high risk. I think that study is in the hands of the Department of Health, was certainly accessible to the previous Minister of Health, and based on that he made, the commitment that he made to have this a province-wide program, and should certainly have been available to the Premier and the present Minister of Health.

I do not have time to go into detail about how terrible and how unnecessary a disease breast cancer is. It affects women but I am sure that had nothing to do with the fact that the hon. members opposite did not give it a high priority, because I am sure they all have wives and mothers and daughters, and probably I am sure that most of you have had experience with the horrors of this unnecessary disease. If you have not, I hope you never will. It is not a very high cost item relative to the \$638 million Health budget. I said there was no state-of-the-art equipment. Now there is equipment in the Province, but the equipment that we have is one of two kinds; one of them, the zerograph, which gives a better image, is inflexible and can only handle 12 a day, and that is not even touching the waiting list that we have of women who are already, for one reason or another, suspecting that they may have breast cancer and have to live with that,

knowing that if they leave it their chances of dying from it are an awful lot higher. The other method, the filmscreen, is not as accurate as it could be, and they do not always get a good image. There now is state-of-the-art equipment; it costs \$177,000 per unit and, with the addition of a breast lump locator, another \$60,000. you are talking about putting those fixed units in our regional centers, and a mobile unit, which is perhaps even more important for those women who have no access to screening mammography now.

You do not have to do it all in one year, we are only asking you to put that program back in your budget, put \$500,000 in your budget out of the \$5 million surplus you are budgeting for. I just quote Premier: "If we cannot accurately care for the sick, the disabled and the aged among us we have failed as a society, and we can take cold comfort in cutting costs and improving balance sheet."

I agree. I applaude the words of this budget. But I can tell you that the women of Newfoundland will take very cold comfort indeed. We had 60 die last year, statistics indicate that 160 will get breast cancer this year, and many will not even be detected without access to screening mammography. And it will be very, very cold comfort if you put your balance sheet ahead of a modest amount of funding in the Health budget to start this Province wide screening mammography program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.



PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, the question was asked this afternoon, and I merely wanted to take time to get the full answer. I have since gotten the full answer from the Minister of Health, to whom the question really ought to be directed to in the first place, and rather than me repeat and run the risk of not conveying it accurately, I ask the Minister of Health if he would give the full information.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises a very serious, delicate issue. I only wish her former colleagues realized just how serious an issue this is. Because if they had, the former Minister of Health on April 17, on the eve of the election, issued a news release announcing the mammography screening program, made a political announcement. On the 19th day of April, the day before the election - I am not sure; it may have been April 20, the day of the elections - the former Minister of Health did an interview with NTV and tried to make this into a political issue, tried to appeal to the emotions. That is the attachment they had to it. They were 17 years in government, Mr. Speaker, had all the time in the world to study this.

Here is the situation. Health and Welfare Canada indeed did a study and says it is a good program, and so it is. It has been discussed with the Deputy Ministers in the Deputy Ministers' meetings with Deputy Ministers all across Canada. It has not yet been discussed with the Ministers of Health. That is coming up in the

September meeting, I understand, Mr. Speaker.

MS DUFF:

You have plenty of (inaudible).

MR. DECKER:

If they do not want the answer, I will sit down. That is up to themselves if they do not want the answer. If they want to play politics with this, go ahead and do it, but this is a serious issue.

British Columbia has a pilot project in place. Ontario has pretty well a Province-wide mammography screening program in place. I am hoping that during our mandate, sooner rather than later, we too will have such a program in place. We are talking about mammography screening. Now this has to be made accessible to the women of the Province. If a woman, after self-examination or whatever, discovers she has a lump in her breast, she will make every effort to get to a mammography unit to have an examination done. She will travel 1,000 miles if she has to. She should not have to but she will do it. With screening it is much like the Christmas Seal with the tuberculosis epidemic that we used to have in this Province. You have to take the screening to the women. We want to bring into this Province a mammography screening program whereby we will make mammography screening available to all the women in our Province, whether they live in Nain or wherever. The member talks about a mobile unit. We might need two or three mobile units. We do not know that, Mr. Speaker. We intend to do that. But we will make that decision, not on the basis of the fact that we are in the middle of a general election, not on the basis of the fact that we can try to embarrass

someone, but we will make that decision after we have a rational study of it, until we know whether we should go into mobile units, whether we should have one, two or ten mobile units, Mr. Speaker.

I can advise the hon. member that she can rest easy, it is well under control, it is being looked into and, as soon as it is possible, it will be delivered to this Province and the women can be certain that that is being looked after. They can be assured of that. I am not saying whether it will be within this fiscal year or whether it will be within the next fiscal year, because there are a whole lot of other extremely important matters which were left over from the seventeen years -

MS DUFF:

That is not enough.

MR. DECKER:

Seventeen years. Then all of the sudden those small 'l' liberal things are on the scene. Look, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, we will do it and we will do it right and we will do it proper, and the women and the men in Newfoundland and Labrador will be thankful that they have a reasonable, rational government here who is looking after their health, including the mammography unit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I must say before I start that I had a lot of respect for that minister before he just answered that question. I must say it is a very serious issue he was talking about and he treated it rather casually. I lost quite a bit of respect for the man because of it.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, on to the issue, I did ask a question of the hon. Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs today, who I am sure will not give callous answers like the last minister did, Mr. Speaker. He is an honourable man. On June 6, I think, the minister gave out a statement that he had provided \$50 million for capital expenditures in the Province this year which would have been an increase in the capital funding, which is encouraging. We complimented him on doing that, which is a good thing to do. But when I saw yesterday that the budget came out around \$41 million or \$43 million, I note that it is not an increase, it is the same amount of money that was spent last year on the same problems that were there for quite some time before that. So there is actually no increase in this budget, which does disappoint me. I will congratulate the minister again on doing a fair job on what he did present.

He said today in his answer that the \$6 million or \$7 million that is left over is held in reserve for a regional servicing effort that he will try to bring into this Province in the near future. That effort he is going to wait until we get legislation put in place, which sounds fairly reasonable to me.

MR. WINDSOR:

He will not spend it this year.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

The money will not be spent this year, obviously, because he cannot be putting in water and sewer projects next Winter. It will be November or December before the legislation is approved, I would imagine, and there will be no regional servicing put in because of that delay.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure, and I will ask the minister to check it with his department - I was not in the department any longer than he was, so obviously he is as familiar with the department as I am now - but under The Municipal Servicing Act the minister says he cannot set up these regional councils now, or these regional service authorities now. Under The Municipalities Act, Section 3, it has some comments here on regions. I do not know but the minister could now set up these regions under this Act. It gives some direction: (a) that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and by order and on recommendation from the minister, subject to a feasibility study - which is one of my concerns - may conduct under Subsection 301, establish an area in the Province as a region.' It sounds fairly simple to me. If he established the regions he is interested in now, he certainly can have an authority to run these regions when he gets it established. The important thing in this, when it is covered under The Municipalities Act in my mind, is that included in this in Section 3.01, Subsection 3, 'There shall be a feasibility study conducted when these regions are being set up.' The powers that the minister can give this region, or the people who are going to run this region, 'Powers that may in whole, or in part, be designated under Section 3.04 are: To

construct the construction and operation of regional water systems' - I think that is his intention - 'regional sewer disposal systems - I believe that is a part of his intention - regional storm sewer systems, and regional solid waste disposal sites, including any facility designated in the order of a regional facility.' Under this part of the Act now there is no need to wait until October to set up these regional service areas that he wants. There is legislation in place now, I believe, I am not sure, I do not think the minister will do it but maybe the government themselves, seem to be wanting to set up these regional service authorities in a different way so that they can get around the feasibility study which allows public input which is very important in this Province. It was tried before and there was a lot of upset over a regional authority. I know some years ago when the Metro Board was set up - and I am fairly familiar with when it was set up, because actually my father-in-law was Chairman of it, or he was the second Chairman of it, I believe, and that was and is called today the St. John's Metro Board. Now, that started off as a regional authority, a planning authority mostly for outside the city of St. John's and fairly cheap to run, fairly reasonable to operate until it got to the point where it was bigger than most municipalities in the region. Now, it is on its way out because there is not a use for it. The region that it served is looking after its own. Now, just a few questions for the minister. I hope these authorities that he is setting up are not going to grow out of all proportion as the Metro Board did. People did not have a say who went on the Metro Board.

They could not elect the people there. They were being governed. That was a big problem and that is part of the reason why there will be no Metro Board if the minister makes a decision.

When the school tax tax authorities were set up initially they were small, efficient operations. Right now, I believe, it costs some \$3 million to run the St. John's School Tax Authority. The proposal that the minister is putting before us now, is this going to happen -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

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

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

MR. GULLAGE:  
Mr. Speaker, it is the intent of my department to set up, wherever appropriate, regional servicing authorities, not regional government per se, and certainly not an authority that would be patterned after the St. John's Metro Board. The intent is to have these regional authorities deal strictly with matters that are of a regional nature and that can be administered within a region by council representation from the councils that are tied into the regional authority. Those services, the hon. member has already mentioned some of them, would be services such as water, control of watersheds in some cases, recreation facilities, planning, garbage disposal, fire services and any other that might be appropriate for the region. It

is not my intent, or the department's intent, to create another level of government. In fact, wherever that has been done, in my conversations with ministers in other provinces, five or six provinces so far, they have found it to be a failure, whether it be a county system or whether it be a tier of government called a regional government per se. Ontario, as an example, is having great difficulty now with too many levels of government and are trying to dismantle at least one of those levels, so it is not my intent to follow that pattern. In fact, regional servicing authorities in this Province seem to be the appropriate way to go, particularly if we can identify areas where the co-operation is there on the part of the councils, and we have identified some of those areas now. I do not think it is any great secret where some of the obvious examples are. One would be the St. John's region; another one would be the Grand Falls - Windsor - Bishop's Falls region, which, using the second example, already has made some progress, some headway towards setting up a regional authority.

However, the legislation is not complete. In fact the legislation that we have so far really speaks to the idea of a regional government, and does not address adequately the need for regional servicing authority - there is a difference - as well as the fact that there has to be put in place an agreement between the member communities, that they will participate in such an authority on a per capita basis. That agreement is not in place in any of the regions of the Province to date. And I would prefer to have that in place prior to imposing an obligation on a lead community,

let us use Grand Falls as an example, with the greater population, because that is what would have to be done, for an obligation that we would put on them for debt. And until that is in place, until we have an agreement in place that will speak to the regional authority being responsible with its member communities for the debt that it would have to take on on a per capita basis, cost-sharing on whatever programs that this government is involved in with that authority, then until that is put in place I would not be satisfied to obligate the lead community for the debt that we would be putting upon them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Good. An excellent answer, Eric.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before we adjourn, I would just like to notify hon. members the only Estimates Committee that is meeting tonight will be the Resource Committee meeting here in the House at 7:00 p.m. and reviewing the Estimates of the Department of Fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER:

This House is adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 9:00 a.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

June 15, 1989

Answer to question No. 18  
Order paper 11/89 Wednesday, June 14, 1989

*Tabled by Hon.  
Minister of  
Development,  
15 June '89*

The total amount of expenditures for office equipment, personal equipment, furnishings and photographs purchased for the Ministers Office, Dept. of Development, since May 5, 1989 is \$1, 749.49. Attached is an itemized list which I will now table.

List of expenditures for office equipment, personal equipment, furnishings and photographs purchased for the Ministers Office, Dept. of Development since May 5, 1989:

(1) Post-It Notes and Hi-liters	\$ 71.09
(2) Installation of glass doors in bookcase	67.20
(3) Business cards	200.00
(4) Dictating equipment	1,411.20



Answer to Question No. 21  
Order paper 11/89 Wednesday, June 14, 1989

*Tabled by Hon. Minister  
Development 15  
June '89*

The total amount of travel expenditures incurred by the Minister, Executive Assistant and Members of Departmental Staff, Dept. of Development, since May 5, 1989 is \$4,066.99.

An itemized list is attached which I will now table along with the total of the previous Ministers expenditures for Transportation & Communications & Purchased Services.

The following is a list of travel expenditures incurred by the Minister, his Executive Assistant and Members of personal or Departmental Staff, Dept. of Development, since May 5, 1989.

(1) Minister

May 12 - to Deer Lake (One night)

Airfare & Meals \$440.00

(2) May 31 - to Montreal (One night)

Airfare, meals & hotel 947.00

June 8 - to Deer Lake (One day)

Airfare & meals 531.15

Executive Assistant

(1) May 19 - to Deer Lake (Three nights)

Airfare 356.00

(2) June 8 - to Deer Lake (One day)

Airfare 380.20

Assistant Deputy Minister, Tourism

(1) May 31 - to Montreal (One night)

Airfare, meals & hotel 918.00

(2) June 8 - to Deer Lake (One day)

Airfare 380.20

Deputy Minister

(1) May 31 - to Montreal (One night)

Airfare 713.00

(Answer to Questions)

Tabled by Hon.  
Minister of Social  
Services, 15 Jun '89

TRAVEL EXPENSES FOR R. JOHN EFFORD

Itinerary for trip to West Coast, June 9th - 11th

Airfare to Stephenville \$391.20

June 9th, 1989

A.M. Visit Stephenville Crossing Office

P.M. Visit Stephenville Office, Bay St. George Assessment Centre

Evening Visit John Howard Society

Returned to Corner Brook via borrowed car at no expense to Government

June 10th, 1989

Returned to Stephenville at no expense to Government

June 10th, 1989

A.M. Meeting with Bay St. George Employment Corporation  
Meeting with Stephenville Association for  
Community Living

4 P.M. Returned to Corner Brook for meeting with V.O.N.

No accommodations charged

No rent-a-car

No written report available

---

May 29th, 1989

Federal/Provincial/Territorial  
Ministers of Social Services Conference - Yukon

Airfare to Yukon \$2,278.00

European Trip - Glenn Tobin

Accommodations	1496.00
Entertainment	441.00
Meals	660.00
Taxis and Laundry	107.00
Airfare	3067.00
	<u>5771.00</u>

*(Answer to Questions)*

*Tabled by Hon.  
Minister of Social  
Services, 15 June '8*

SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

PURCHASED FOR MINISTER'S OFFICE (G. TOBIN)

1988-'89

Hi-Lite Framing	\$1,268.95
Film & Developing	1,000.00
Lapel Pins	900.00
Christmas Cards	1,000.00
Camera	897.00
Dictating Machine	1,114.40
Bookcase	190.00
Microwave	240.00
Filing Cabinets (3)	<u>872.00</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<u>\$7,482.35</u>

SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT  
PURCHASED FOR MINISTER'S OFFICE (J. EFFORD)  
1989-'90

Filing Cabinets (2)	\$654.08
Office Supplies	<u>111.88</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$765.96</u>

*Tabled by Hon. Minister  
of Education 15 June '89*

ORDER PAPER 11/89

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14TH, 1989

QUESTION:

MR. LEN SIMMS (GRAND FALLS) - TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION TO LAY UPON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

AN ITEMIZED LIST OF EXPENDITURES FOR ANY OFFICE EQUIPMENT, PERSONAL EQUIPMENT, FURNISHINGS AND PHOTOGRAPHS PURCHASED FOR THE MINISTER'S OFFICE SINCE MAY 5, 1989.

ANSWER:

THERE HAVE BEEN NO PURCHASES FOR THE MINISTER'S OFFICE FOR EQUIPMENT, FURNISHINGS, PHOTOGRAPHS OR OTHERWISE SINCE MAY 5, 1989, TO DATE.

*Tabled to Hon.  
Minister of Fisheries,  
15 June '89*

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES  
MINISTER'S OFFICE  
ANALYSIS OF TRAVEL EXPENSES  
MAY 5 - JUNE 14, 1989

Out Of Province

Ottawa - June 6 - 7, 1989

Hon. Walter Carter:

Airline Ticket	\$ 723.00
Per Diem (Meals)	55.00
Hotel	99.75
Telephone	<u>13.55</u>
	<u>891.30</u>

David A. Vardy:  
Deputy Minister

Airline Ticket	\$ 723.00
Per Diem (Meals)	49.00
Hotel	99.75
Taxi	40.00
Parking	<u>6.00</u>
	<u>917.75</u>
Total Out of Province Travel	\$1,809.05



Within The Province

Hon. Walter Carter:

May 21, 1989

Travel to Carbonear  
(Per Diem) \$ 42.00

May 28, 1989

Travel to Musgrave Hr.,  
Centreville & Wareham  
(Per Diem) 42.00  
\$ 84.00

Gerald Reid:  
(Executive Assistant)

June 9 - 10, 1989

Travel to Summerford  
(Per Diem \$79 x 2) \$ 158.00

Car Mileage 189.20  
\$ 347.20

Total Travel Cost  
Within The Province \$ 431.20

TOTAL \$2,240.25