

PROPERTY OF NEWFOUNDLAND
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
PLEASE RETURN



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 15

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Monday

19 June 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, before we have Orders of the Day would you permit me to ask the House to extend sympathy to the family of the late Hugh F. Coady, who died over the weekend and was buried today. Mr. Coady was a former Clerk of the House, and he worked with the various media, as an announcer with CBC and UOCM, before he graduated from Dalhousie with his Law Degree. I think it would be appropriate if we sent a message of sympathy to his family.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition. The Opposition House Leader, I am sorry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
No. offence.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, we, of course, on this side of the House would like to be associated with the remarks of the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. I recall having some association, not close but some association with Mr. Coady when I was Speaker, a decade ago now I guess, and he was always considered to be a valued public servant; certainly a well-respected individual in the Province, and certainly a

well-respected Clerk of the House. We would like to be associated with any message that Your Honour might send on behalf of members.

MR. SPEAKER:
The Chair will deal with it appropriately.

Before dealing with the routine of the day, I would like to rule with respect to the point of privilege raised by the hon. the Opposition House Leader on Friday, June 16.

I have given careful consideration to the points made by the hon. member. I have also examined the relevant Hansard containing the record of the various exchanges that have taken place on this issue. I conclude that no prima facie case of breach of privilege has been established, mainly for two reasons: Firstly, I have determined that the questions and answers were at cross purposes. The questioning seemed to be leaning towards whether there was a Minute of Council, and the answers seemingly to deal with the policy on ferries. If the hon. members will look at Hansard, they would see that there is a very distinct cross-purpose all the way through, and that the questions really lacked precision and the answers accordingly were of the type when a question lacks precision.

But, more importantly, I rule that there was no prima facie case, based on the opinion by experts, that a point of privilege cannot be based, or cannot be made on the premise that a member misled the House. It could be a point of order, but it is certainly not a point of privilege and I refer hon. members specifically to Maingot, and Meingot is certainly

regarded as an expert. Meingot on Parliamentary Privilege in Canada, page 205. Based on this authority and others, I would rule that it was a dispute between various hon. members with respect to matters of fact.

But I do want to say that I do consider it a serious point of privilege, and I would certainly caution hon. ministers, in particular, when we are dealing with questions, to ensure that we give them serious consideration and, by the same token, to members asking the questions, to make sure that their questions are precise and that they elicit precise answers.

o o o

MR. PARSONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PARSONS:
Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to ask the Legislature, because of happenings over the weekend, to send letters of congratulations to Joy Burt who shattered three national and commonwealth records over the weekend. Certainly Miss Burt does herself proud for Newfoundland and Labrador. Also, in the same competition Basil Simpson and Walt Forsey did very well, as well. Also, Mr. Speaker, as it pertains to congratulations, I think that congratulations are also in order for Terry Humber who was drafted by the Los Angeles Dodgers. I think this is a first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

That is Frank Humber.

MR. PARSONS:
Frank Humber. I am sorry about the first name, Your Honour. I think this is a first for Newfoundland and Labrador, and I think congratulations are in order. I would ask the hon. House, under your direction, Sir, to give unanimous consent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. GULLAGE:
We, too, Mr. Speaker, would like to add our support to both those athletes. The motion by the hon. member to send congratulations to both Joy Burt and Frank Humber, who are outstanding athletes in the Corner Brook - Bay of Islands area, we would very much like to support and make unanimous the motion by the member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
While we are at it, I am sure the minister and the member for St. John's East will agree to include Albert Anstey, who just won the National Dart Championship and is seeded third in the world right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall my statement in the House last Thursday in which I outlined in some detail measures being taken by my department, in co-operation with the Fishermen's Union and the private sector, to help alleviate the cod glut in areas where processing and freezing facilities are currently engaged in the caplin fishery.

At that time, it was felt that the initiatives announced would be adequate to look after surplus cod landings. However, it has since become evident that additional measures will have to be taken. Fishermen in the Southern Avalon area were reporting large landings of cod last week, substantial quantities of which had to be discarded because of the processing plants inability to handle more product.

Mr. Speaker, after discussing the problem extensively with the private sector and many of the fishermen affected, it was agreed that additional measures are necessary to cope with this problem.

Last Friday evening, officials of my department concluded arrangements with Newfound Harvesting Limited to have their freezer trawler, the **Polar Storm** dispatched to St. Mary's Bay for the purpose of buying directly from the fishermen their surplus cod landings.

The **Polar Storm** has the capacity to process up to 60 tonnes of cod per day with a holding capacity of approximately 700 tonnes. The fish will be dressed (head on,

gutted) for distribution to processing plants. The **Polar Storm** will be available for a two week period and any extension beyond that period will require the mutual consent of Newfound Harvesting Limited and the Department of Fisheries. The prices paid to fishermen will be union negotiated and the location of the vessel will be determined by the Department of Fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, on Saturday afternoon I visited the Southern Avalon area, including, of course, St. Mary's - The Capes, and talked to a number of fishermen, all of whom appeared to be reasonably confident that the initiatives taken by my department and by the private sector, and the union, would be very beneficial towards handling surplus cod landings in their area.

I believe the measures announced last Thursday and the statement I have read in this House today clearly indicate this government's commitment to alleviate the problems resulting from the cod glut situation presently affecting our fishery.

Given the fact that a reduction in groundfish quotas is imminent, this government is committed to a full utilization of all the fish harvested by our fishermen as well as that of the otherwise underutilized stock.

Therefore, we intend to do everything possible to ensure that no fish is dumped for the want of a market or the lack of access to processing and/or freezing capabilities.

I should add, Mr. Speaker, that the existing problem is caused not as much by the glut but by virtue

the fact that most of the processing plants, which would otherwise be involved in the processing or freezing of fish, are now being used for the purposes of freezing and processing caplin. Hopefully, once the caplin fishery comes to an end and the caplin have all been harvested and processed and frozen, things will get back to normal. In the meantime, this vessel should go a long way towards alleviating that problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a fair amount of understanding of the problem the Minister and the Department face, but I cannot help but recall that year after year, around this time of the year, when the hon. the Minister was over here, he would take great pains from day to day to lash out at the government of the day for failing to make adequate arrangements to handle excess fish during this particular time of the year. One of the things the hon. Minister was noted for in those days, in the days when he was here lashing out at us, was, 'Why cannot the Provincial Minister of Fisheries use his authority under the Fish Inspection Act to force processors in this Province to always buy and process a certain percentage of groundfish?' That is in Hansard, day after day, time after time, Mr. Speaker. Now the minister is in a position -

MR. W. CARTER:

No, no.

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is there, Mr. Speaker. I have looked at it on a dozen and one occasions over the last several years, the Minister over here demanding that the Minister of the day use his authority under the Fish Inspection Act 'to force the private sector, to force processors to buy a certain percentage,' was the way he always put it, 'a certain amount of groundfish, even though the caplin problem was on.'

We are pleased that there has been some arrangement made with the Polar Storm through Newfoundland Harvesting. This is nothing new. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when the previous administration gave a loan guarantee to Newfoundland Harvesting to help purchase this particular vessel, one of the conditions of that loan guarantee was that the vessel was to be made available during glut periods in all parts of Newfoundland and Labrador to help alleviate the glut. So I am glad to see that the Minister has taken up on an initiative we put there for him, but I cannot say that he has created any new initiatives since he became Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to present the following statement to the House of Assembly:

I wish to advise my Colleagues

- that effective today, June 19, 1989, Exon House has ceased to provide residential care to individuals with developmental delays. All persons who have lived in Exon House in the past are now residing in communities across the Province.

This marks the culmination of efforts, starting with the phase-out of the Children's Home in 1983 to eliminate the need for institutional placement for children and adults who have developmental delays.

Concurrent efforts have been made to develop community resources to allow for the re-integration of these individuals and continued community presence on behalf of others.

In this regard, the Department has established Residential Alternatives including Special Foster Homes, Co-operative Apartments, Group Homes and Developmental Maximization Units. Support services such as a Behavior Management Services, Early Intervention and Respite Services assist families in maintaining their members at home.

My Department has a commitment to developing the least restrictive alternative for individuals who have a developmental delay. Efforts will continue, Mr. Speaker, to enhance the quality of life for individuals and to ensure that community integration is optimal.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side are pleased to see that Exon House is

finally closed. We are pleased with the Minister's statement. It is something that has been going on for a number of years, that we on this side of the House can take a great deal of credit for, because we initiated this process.

It is right, Mr. Speaker, that Exon House is gone, and it is a credit to the former administration. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out one thing, though: These students who are developmentally delayed, as the minister says, will be or are in special foster homes and co-operative apartments and other things of that like across the Province, and we must be sure that this is in no way a cost saving move, because, Mr. Speaker, the intention here is to give better service to the developmentally delayed and the handicapped of this Province.

Already, Mr. Speaker, we have seen cutbacks for training and employment of developmentally delayed and handicapped people in this budget, so I would warn the government that this should not be just a move to get rid of Exon House to save money, this move should be for the betterment of the people who are most disadvantaged in our society.

Mr. Speaker, we welcome the announcement and we do hope that the government will make sure that the various foster homes, co-operative apartments and group homes will be properly funded and properly managed, with the proper type of support people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier. In view of the fact that in 1987 the Premier, then Leader of the Opposition argued that the former Minister of Health, Dr. Collins, should resign from Cabinet because of his interest in property that was then leased to the government, and in view of the fact that the Premier has admitted to the media that the present situation facing his Minister of Forestry (Mr. FLIGHT) is similar in all circumstances to the Dr. Collins' case, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Forestry has indicated publicly that he told the Premier of the existence of this set of circumstances before his appointment to Cabinet, would the Premier tell the House how he could, in such a short period of months, demand the resignation of one person from the Cabinet, for the set of circumstances that I have just outlined, and yet proceed to appoint another person in similar circumstances to his own Cabinet knowing beforehand what those circumstances were?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
It is easy to explain, just state the facts correctly. The facts are simple. The position that I

took with respect to Dr. Collins and his situation at the time was that he either must resign or he must dispose of the assets. He must do one or the other. I am glad to see hon. members acknowledge that.

So when the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans told me what his situation, was my statement to him was you must dispose of those assets or the -

MR. SIMMS:
Or resign.

PREMIER WELLS:
Just one second.

You must dispose of those assets, or the government or any agency of the government cannot do any business with that company, cannot continue that rent, or you must resign. One of those three things must occur.

He took the position that he would take steps immediately to dispose of the asset. He has assured me that is precisely what he is doing. He knows that if the asset is not disposed of, and he has been told this, before the lease expires, that lease cannot be renewed. He has taken the position that he will either dispose of it within three months - the time that he has allotted for himself - or he will seek the termination of the lease, by agreement, with the Board of Liquor Control. Now he cannot cause it to be terminated because a lease is a two-way agreement, both parties agree. So he knows that he must either resign or that lease cannot be renewed. He also has indicated to me that he intends to seek the termination of lease if he cannot dispose of the asset in the meantime.

MR. RIDEOUT:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier knows full well that his minister has stated publicly that he intends to allow that lease to run its course and allow it to expire sixteen months hence.

MR. SIMMS:
That is what it says in here.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Now that is what has been said publicly.

Will the Premier, in view of the fact that the Premier said that the minister must either terminate the lease or suffer the consequences, tell the House today whether or not he has instructed his minister to terminate the lease or face the consequences and what those consequences are?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
Even right here the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has misstated what I said. I just got through saying he has no right to unilaterally terminate the lease. There are two parties to any lease. What he has stated to me, clearly, Mr. Speaker, is that he will seek the termination of the lease if he is unable to dispose of the asset within three months. Now, I do not know what they expect him to do: Burn the building down or something? I mean, that does not make any kind of sense. It is no problem.

MR. SIMMS:
It is not?

PREMIER WELLS:
No, it is not. My criticism -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

PREMIER WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to explain to the House without that noise over there. The House will never get the truth as long as they keep roaring this noise.

Mr. Speaker, if they want me to explain the Dr. Collins' thing and the difference, I will lay it out in detail for the hon. members opposite. Dr. Collins sat as a member of the Cabinet when the company in which he owned an interest negotiated the lease with the government, and that is totally wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:
Or negotiated the renewal of the lease. I have made it known -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Or!

MR. SIMMS:
Which is the facts.

PREMIER WELLS:
Either one. It does not make any difference. I have told the member for Windsor - Buchans, the minister, that he cannot negotiate a lease or a renewal of the lease as long as he is a minister. He must either resign, if he wants to retain that, or he must dispose of the asset; or there can be no new deal negotiated with the government, either by way of

renewal or a new deal, or with any government agency. Now, that is the standard, and it is very simple and it is very straightforward.

MR. SIMMS:

That is the standard, chaulk and cheese.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Is it not interesting now to watch the hon. the White Knight squirm and set his own standards here?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. the Premier this: Why could the hon. the Premier not have said to that hon. gentleman, 'You get your own private house in order and then I will talk to you about going into Cabinet.'? If it was wrong five or six months ago, why is it not wrong today? That is the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

I said to the hon. member exactly what I suggested to the former Premier he should say to Dr. Collins, 'Either you must dispose of the asset or you must resign, one of the two.'

MR. RIDEOUT:

He says he is not going to do that.

PREMIER WELLS:

He did not.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is what the paper says.

PREMIER WELLS:

I do not know what the paper says. I take no responsibility for that. I can only report to the House, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member has said to me, that he intends to have it disposed of within three months or otherwise he will seek the termination of the lease. Now, there is not much else he can do. I do not know if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition wants him to bare himself before the House or whatever, burn the place down or what. What does he want done?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Practice what you preach. That is what I want.

MR. FLIGHT:

I have done it.

PREMIER WELLS:

I have done, with respect to the hon. member, precisely what I asked the former Premier to do with Dr. Collins, ask him to resign or dispose of the asset, one or the other. That was the request.

MR. SIMMS:

He has sixteen months.

PREMIER WELLS:

No, he does not. He has to do it within three months.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, one day last week I questioned the minister on items concerning amalgamation, regional government and regional servicing councils, I believe they were referred to at the time. Mr. Speaker, I wonder will the minister confirm that the government is planning to force amalgamation on town councils before they receive desperately needed monies to improve their towns?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, the government has no intention of forcing amalgamation on any community. Prior to receiving services - I am not sure what the member means by his question - we have no intention of forcing amalgamation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, it seems, as the member said, to be one story for the media as in this week's edition of The Sunday Telegram, and one story for the House last week, Mr. Speaker.

Does the hon. minister realize that the present Municipalities Act has all the mechanisms

available or necessary for any towns who wish today to amalgamate?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Yes. I am aware the minister has the authority, if that is what he is implying, to force amalgamation if it is deemed in the public interest to do so. Your question was whether or not we would force amalgamation prior to servicing being put in place, if I read your question correctly. We will not force amalgamation and use servicing as a criterion prior to that forced amalgamation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, in the June 18 issue of The Evening Telegram, the minister is quoted as saying he is, 'pleasantly surprised' with the response he has received from councils who seem to believe that this is the obvious move to have one large city in the North East Avalon.

Mr. Speaker, will the hon. minister provide to this House a list of councils or councillors who support his idea of one large city for this area?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, the statement that I

made in regard to the issue of a large city, is that the response I received from councils, mayors, councillors, citizens was positive, very positive. It was, however, clearly stated that one large city for the North East Avalon is an option and it is probably what the future will see; whether it be this year or five years or ten years from now, it is probably in the future. The point that I was making is that it is the ultimate solution and could very well come sooner or later. Whether or not we would take that step sooner is a question that I want open for discussion. The reason that I gave the comments I did and had the interview that I had was to put it all on the table for the people to look at and respond to me. The response so far has been very positive.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to note that the hon. minister has not said that he would provide a list of people who are supportive of that concept. I doubt very much if there are any who are supportive of it, Mr. Speaker.

One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it true that the minister has a list already prepared of communities throughout this Province that he considers prime areas for amalgamation? Will the minister provide this list to the House of Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is very true. I have asked my officials to provide me with a list of communities that have common boundaries, and would possibly be candidates for amalgamation, so that I would open up discussion along those lines with them. What we are trying to accomplish, Mr. Speaker, is that, wherever possible, where we have communities in close proximity, rather than have them grow apart, which they are doing in many cases now, growing in through their developmental control area, for example, we want to encourage them to grow together. That is why I have asked for such a list.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I want to continue the line of questioning to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, specifically as it applies to the question of amalgamation. I am sure it is not a big surprised to him that I have been waiting for my opportunity.

Now I know that the hon. the Premier, as well as the minister, I believe, have talked a great deal about establishing a regional authority of some sort for the Central Newfoundland area. I understand this regional authority, as a matter of fact my latest informants tell me this regional authority will also have the responsibility for announcing things like the funding for the water treatment plant, which I understand from the Premier's Parliamentary Assistant (Mr.

Grimes) will becoming forth in due course.

But the other thing that they have talked about, I understand, and I recall from the Premier's conversations and comments publicly, is that this particular authority will also be an authority that, for example, in the case of Grand Falls and Windsor, would be established to take tax revenues from the Town of Grand Falls, which they now legitimately receive from businesses, and give it to another community, the community of Windsor in this case. Can the minister advise me, and advise the members of the House, if in fact this will be the case? If it is, can the minister tell us how this madcap scheme will make up for the loss of revenue that will be experienced by the Town of Grand Falls, which obviously has responsibilities and commitments to fulfill to their own taxpayers?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I have had several discussions now with the town councils in the Grand Falls area - Grand Falls, Windsor and Bishop's Falls - two of which, as you have already mentioned, are obvious candidates for amalgamation, and I have had discussions along those lines. The regional servicing authority he speaks about is a separate issue in that the three councils involved would be tied into this regional servicing authority on a per capita basis and, indeed, we are talking about waste disposal, water supply and other items of a regional nature that could be tied into that regional servicing authority.

As to the question about whether or not we would impose a taxation, whereby we would draw upon the industrial business tax of Grand Falls and use it for Windsor purposes and so on, that is obviously an option, but an option I do not foresee ever being used. Because I think, with the co-operation I have seen so far between the two towns, we can bring about amalgamation and that sort of an authority will not be necessary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I notice with some degree of interest the Premier turning a bit red when the minister made that response, because that is not exactly what the Premier was saying out in Central Newfoundland two years ago when he was campaigning for the by-election in Windsor - Buchans. But I am pleased to hear now that the minister has, in fact, confirmed that that is not an option that they are now considering any longer.

MR. GULLAGE:

I did not say that.

MR. SIMMS:

But you do not foresee it ever coming about, I think that was basically what he said, and that is good enough for me and good enough, I hope, for the people of Grand Falls.

I know it is a separate question from amalgamation, that is why I asked the question separately, but now, I will ask - I will give the minister an opportunity to get some instruction from the Premier, if he wishes. I do not want to

interrupt him.

Let me move to amalgamation since he raised it; I did not raise amalgamation, I raised the other issue specifically. Before we get to a decision on amalgamation, with respect to Grand Falls and Windsor, in particular, will the government, and will the minister now, on behalf of the government, indicate publicly - and I believe that is what he said in his answer to my colleague earlier - that before any decision is taken with respect to amalgamation, the government will commit and advise and notify the people, upfront, in advance, the amount of infrastructure funding that will be provided by the government and over what period of time that funding will be provided? Is that what I understand the minister to be saying?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very fair question. I have already started those discussions with the two town councils involved. I have attempted to be as open as I can. I think the need for amalgamation of those two towns is urgent, and I believe they agree with that. I will be very open about what we will do as a government to bring about the amalgamation. It is on an urgent basis.

We hope we will not have to come to the situation the member spoke about, where a taxation authority would have to be put in place. I think the councils involved do not want to see that. They would rather see amalgamation with a fair phase-in procedure and a fair phase-in treatment as far as

taxation is concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:
If need be, it will be.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. SIMMS:
I hope Hansard recorded the Premier's little comment across the House to me, when he said, 'If need be, it will be.' That is what I want recorded in Hansard.

PREMIER WELLS:
Precisely.

MR. SIMMS:
Now, Mr. Speaker, my final question to the minister is this: Before any amalgamation decision is finalized, and since this matter really, in Grand Falls -- Windsor has not been studied, I suppose, or looked at probably for fifteen years, at least, probably twenty years since it occurred, will the minister commit now to providing an opportunity to the people of the area through a vote or some other kind of mechanism, to let the people have a say as to whether they wish to amalgamate? I suggest to him, the only time you will get a reasonable response to it is once the government has made a commitment as to what kind of funding and infrastructure they will put in place. I would like to see him do it in that way, rather than force it down the throats of the people of Central Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the minister.

MR. GULLAGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that the process I am following of being very open and candid about the problems in that region and others will lead the people to respond to me and ask me questions, give me their concerns up-front. I think that is the right process to follow. For example, I am going to Grand Falls - Windsor to meet with the councils once again in the next few days. I have already had two meetings with each of the councils. I will also be meeting with the regional servicing authority, which involves the three councils. So I am being as open as I can and I hope I will get feedback, not just from the councils and the mayors involved, but also from the people in the area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries.

Before posing my question, I would like to congratulate the minister on his initiatives of last Thursday and today, and hopefully it will alleviate some of the problems pertaining to the glut.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

I concur with my colleague, the member for St. Mary's - The Capes

(Mr. Hearn), in saying that there really is not a glut, but because of the monetary situation, the lucrative situation in the caplin fishery, most of the plants are not taking any cod, and that is where the thing backs up. Now the initiatives taken by the union and some processors in having the **Northern Princess** down here, that was fine, that initiative was good. But the point remains that they cannot get people to work on the boat. People with experience, the cutters and the packers, are just not there to go in and handle the boat. Now that is why the boat cannot be utilized up to 100 per cent; certainly it is not doing 50 per cent as of now.

It is a situation that needs immediate remedies, because, as we know, as the caplin fishery winds down so does the cod fishery. By the time the caplin fishery is over, so could the cod fishery be over, and this is where the problem really lies. My question to the minister is, would he use his good office to contact those plant owners and ask them if they could, if at all possible, take some of the burden away from the fishermen and utilize parts of their plant for the present glut situation?

Again, because of the monetary situation, as it pertains to the government's involvement in many of those plants, I ask the minister, in approving any loan guarantees or grants to any processor, would he place a restriction on the owners, if the agreement was ratified, to be stipulated in that agreement that part of his premises or plants has to be utilized for the processing of cod during the caplin season?

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, that is not going to be a simple regulation to impose. Let us face it, most of these companies are privately owned companies, although granted, they have loan guarantees and other financial help from the government. Ideally, yes, we should be able to one way or the other encourage them to process cod. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition earlier made reference to some comments that I might have made when I was sitting over there. Let me tell him, the comments that I made, Mr. Speaker, had to do with the government imposing upon fish plants operators, as a condition of their licence, that they provide a splitting capability for salt fish in their plants. Then, during the glut season, when fish could not be processed fresh, it would be incumbent upon them to provide within that facility provision for the splitting and salting of fish. But certainly the suggestion made by my colleague is worth looking at and I will certainly have my people take a look at it and we will see what can be done.

But the problem, as you say, is not because there is too much cod, really. It is because the existing plants are more interested right now, and for obvious reasons, in switching their operation to caplin, and, of course, thereby precluding any chance for the cod fishermen to sell their harvest to the plant. But we will have a look at it.

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

I want to thank the minister for his answer.

I would now like to ask a question to the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Kelland). We hear so much about not getting enough money from the federal government put into Newfoundland, that we need more money. There was a contract almost awarded for the Southside of St. John's here, an area known as Prosser's Rock. I went with a group of fishermen and met with the then minister, and as far as I am aware all authority pertaining to the federal government said give the project a green light. But it was our Department of Environment that put on the red light and said that there had to be an EIS done, and that EIS was suppose to be completed within one month. I ask the minister, what happened to that Environmental Impact Study? And when can the people of St. John's know whether or not that project is to start?

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

I thank the hon. member for his question. There have been so few related to the environment, Mr. Speaker, since I have been a minister in the House, that I was beginning to wonder what the level of concern was with the Opposition with respect to questions on the

environment, lands and other jurisdictions in my department. I have been briefed on the Prosser's Rock situation, as I have with all projects that are current in the department. At the moment there are some concerns which have been raised by a number of people. I have asked my Environment people to have another look at the situation and bring me up-to-date on what these particular problems are. And there are some alternate suggestions. I was just recently up on the Southside Hills and talked about that particular project that is being considered for parks, servicing, fishing and so on. There was an alternate suggestion made, within recent times, that perhaps a Prosser's Rock type of an operation might be considered for the Freshwater Bay area. Now, that information was new to me last week, but what we are doing right now is having the Environment officials advise me what the major concerns are with respect to flushing action, and so on, in the Prosser's Rock area. As soon as I have that information in hand I will be able to provide more detailed information to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask another minister another question. I ask this to the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. I have been approached by a group of driving instructors who are saying to me that there are driver training offices, just for to go in and get your license or to be examined, in all parts of the Avalon. Now, with the office changing to Mount Pearl, there is no office to go in

and have your driving-examinations done in any part of St. John's East or environs. I ask would the minister take a look at the problem and perhaps establish such an office?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Works, Service and Transportation.

MR. GILBERT:

I thank the member for the question. I will certainly have my officials check into it and see what is the feasible and right thing to do for having those offices open.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social Services. If reports are true, a number of people at the Remand Centre were held at knife-point by a youth for a period of time over the weekend. Could the minister let the House know exactly what happened?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

No, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. I am not aware of an incident taking place at the Remand Centre where anybody was held at knife-point on the weekend.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps there is a little change in terminology here. Is it not true that a student at the Remand Centre, who was into leather working, used a dagger-type instrument to hold a number of people at dagger-point, knife-point, and threatened them physically?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just make one little statement to the hon. member: Before he asked the question, Mr. Speaker, he should do research and get his answers, because he is obviously asking questions from someone else's advice. Let me tell you very clearly what the hon. member is asking. That took place at the Youth Correction Centre, not at the Remand Centre. I am aware of the situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:

I answered the question truthfully. It was not at the Remand Centre but at the Youth Correction Centre.

MR. SIMMS:

You tried to cover it up.

MR. EFFORD:

There was no cover-up. It happened just over the weekend, Mr. Speaker. To be very clear, it was not at dagger point, it was not at knife-point, but it was a small instrument that they use in the leather craft shop - that is quite correct - but it was not life threatening and it was taken

care of by the Youth Correction Officers. These things do happen from time to time. The situation is in hand at the Youth Correction Centre, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell the House exactly what instructions he gave the people at the Youth Correction Centre as regards to the boy who had created the disturbance?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, first of all the minister was not in the area on the weekend. This took place when I was out in Corner Brook doing some other duties on the weekend. We have an administrator at the Boy's Home, a very capable individual, very capable supervisory staff, and very capable Youth Corrections Officers. When an incident takes place they are properly trained, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the situation at hand and to make the necessary decisions.

They briefed me on this this morning. We are meeting again this afternoon. The situation is taken care of. The boy is in the Youth Corrections Center. The instrument was taken from him, as naturally it should be, and he will undergo disciplinary action, counselling and whatever other measures we can administer to take care of the young boy, which we

do. Mr. Speaker, this department under the new Minister of Social Services will make sure that all boys in all correction centers in and around the Province will get proper care. We are not going to do anything to hurt the young boy, but we are going to do a lot of things to help him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a supplementary I would like to direct to the hon. gentleman. I applaud the hon. gentleman for articulating, as he does, that the prime goal here is to care for and counsel and train those young people. But let me ask the hon. minister this: Is it a fact that the minister has given directions to those staff people that makes it difficult, and, in fact, impossible for them to deal with circumstances such as were outlined here today, because the minister has given direct ministerial orders that those people are not to be dealt with in any closed-custody fashion? Is that a fact?

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

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely untrue. Since I have become Minister of Social Services I have given no orders to anybody to keep people in closed custody. They

are in closed custody in the Youth Corrections Center. They are in closed custody in the Remand Center. What we are attempting to do is to treat them like human beings, with respect, and give them the proper counselling that they deserve to help rehabilitate them, not to make them worse. We realize the environment from which they came was very difficult. We have there young boys who have major problems and we intend, Mr. Speaker, to help them. I gave no orders not to work with those boys at any time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Let me ask the minister a question. Is the Remand Center, now moved to the old School for the Deaf, the same as a closed-custody facility? Has that been done yet? Are there people in remand in that building right now?

MR. SPEAKER:
The Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, that the former Minister of Social Services is no more versed on the things that are taking place within this government than he was in his own government. He knew nothing about it then and he knows very little about it now.

Mr. Speaker, the Remand Center, as

I stated very clearly publicly, as I have stated in this House of Assembly, will be closed up. We will still use the facilities at Torbay. The process has already been approved by my government.

MR. TOBIN:

How can it be your government?

MR. EFFORD:

By our government. It takes some time, Mr. Speaker, to put that process in place. On or before July 31, which is just a little more than a month away, all our young boys at the Remand Center will be transferred to the remand facilities at Torbay. There are still some boys at the Remand Center in Pleasantville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I wish to inform hon. members that Question Period has elapsed, as opposed to collapsing.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

In accordance with the provisions of the Internal Economy Commission Act, I wish to inform hon. members today of the appointment of the Commission to enquire into and report on the indemnities, allowances and salaries to be paid to members of the House of Assembly.

The Commission will be headed by Dr. M.O. Morgan. Dr. Morgan served as President and Vice-Chairman of Memorial University of Newfoundland from 1973 to 1981. He has served as Chairman of a number of boards of

arbitration and conciliation, and as an industrial enquiry commissioner.

Dr. Morgan will be joined on the Commission by two other very able and experienced people: Mr. Garfield Pynn, and Mr. Gonzo Gillingham.

Mr. Pynn is Director and Associate Professor of the School of Business Administration and Commerce of Memorial University of Newfoundland. Professor Pynn was Chairman of the Commission appointed to look into the remuneration of the members of the House of Assembly in 1979. He is presently a member of the Executive of the Council of Deans and Directors of Canadian Schools of Business, a member of the Provincial Council of Newfoundland Institute for Management Advancement and Training, a member of the Business Advisory Council of the Extension of MUN, and a member of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board of the Province of Newfoundland.

Mr. Gillingham is an international representative for the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. He has been affiliated with the labour union in this Province for twenty-five years and he, too, was a member of the Commission appointed to look into the remuneration of members of the House of Assembly in 1979.

The Commission will complete their enquiry and deliver their report containing recommendations within ninety days of their appointment as required under the provisions of the Internal Economy Commission Act.

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to provide the answers to questions asked by the hon. the member for Grand Falls. Question number 4, on Order Paper 11 of '89.

The question was: To ask the hon. Premier to provide an itemized list of expenditures for any office equipment, personal equipment, furnishings and photographs purchased for the Premier's Office since May 5, 1989.

For the Office of the Premier, none. For the Executive Support Office, none. For the administration section of the Office there was a total of \$7,000 worth, made up of a shredder that had been ordered by the previous administration for \$2,700. I do not know what they intended to shred.

MR. GULLAGE:

We were lucky they did not get it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

There were two typewriters, for a total of \$2,000; a computer table; sixty 3 x 5 photographs of me, Your Honour, and 100 - 8 X 10 photographs of me. We cannot keep up with the demand for photographs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

I have no idea why. I have to frankly admit to the House, Mr.

Speaker, that I do not understand it. I really cannot understand it. I do not know if the physiognomy is that much more attractive than prior Premiers, but there are extensive demands. And, I may say, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why there is so much demand from outside the Province. There is a fair bit from outside the Province, too, but I guess they are collectors, or whatever they are, and we have to try to be responsive to the requests.

A binding system for \$565; a typewriter table for \$119; and a coat tree for \$75.

I am happy to table that information.

The second question was also asked by the hon. the member for Grand Falls, and he wanted an itemized list of travel expenditures incurred by the Premier, Executive Assistants or any other member of the Premier's personal staff, as well as expenditures for any other staff of the Premier's Office who may have accompanied the Premier, since May 5, 1989.

The answers are as follows: For the Premier Office, himself, a total of \$1,853.94, made up of air travel, costing a total of \$1,200-plus for myself and my wife in travelling to the meeting of the New England Governors and Eastern Canadian Premiers; accommodation while there totalling \$537.50; meals totalling some \$16 - \$17; miscellaneous \$39; and long distance telephone calls \$55.21, for a total of \$1,800.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No limousines?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:
No limousines.

Mr. Speaker, I think that will keep us well within the \$63,000 that we have budgeted for the year for the Office, as opposed to the \$210,000 spent last year in the office.

The other expenses: For the Executive Support for the Office of the Premier, Mr. Robert Dornan, who is the Executive Assistant, travelled with me to Montebello and the total air travel, accommodation and telephone expenses for his travelling was \$1,057.76; Mr. Edward Joyce, the Executive Assistant in Corner Brook has, in the last six weeks, travelled to St. John's and back and had some accommodation here, and travelled to various points in Western Newfoundland on behalf of the office, for a total travelling cost of \$677.37, all of which is spelled out.

Mr. Speaker, I am very confident that this will keep us well within the budget that is considerably less than last year's budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I also have some responses to questions posed by the hon. the member for Grand Falls. Question No. 34 appeared on the Order Paper of the same day as those to which the Premier has responded, June 14, in which the hon. member asked

for an itemized list of expenditures incurred by the minister, executive assistant and any other member of the staff and so on. On the May 21st- May 22nd. period, a trip from St. John's to Goose Bay and return, to meet with a concerned citizen's group, the airfare was \$526, Mr. Speaker.

On June 11 I was required to travel from Labrador to Corner Brook to represent the Premier on a panel, Environment Symposium, as was mentioned earlier in the House. There were no commercial flights available to meet both commitments on both ends, it required a charter at a cost of \$1,760. I returned to St. John's from Deer Lake, commercial, \$192.10. There was a meal cost of \$15.00. On the other trip I was not accompanied by any staff member. My executive assistant position is still unfilled, Mr. Speaker, and I would be happy to accept a resume from the hon. the member for Grand Falls if he feels he has the basic requirements to fill the position.

AN HON. MEMBER:
You did not even get a laugh from your own hon. crowd.

MR. KELLAND:
They only laugh at jokes. That was not a joke, it was a sincere offer in the sense of fairness and balance.

With respect to the second question, No. 16, on June 14th, he asked about expenditures for office equipment, personal equipment, furnishings and photographs purchased by the minister since May 5. There were no expenditures for office equipment, personal equipment, furnishings or photographs purchased by the minister's office.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I might add that I thank the former administration for well stocking the office and well furnishing the office. I am very comfortable over there, as I hope they are in the spaces they now occupy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before going on to the next item, on behalf of hon. members I would like to welcome to the galleries today the hon. Colin Maxwell, the Minister of Parks, Recreation and Culture from the Province of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this further Answers to Questions?

MS COWAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The answer to Question No. 17, appearing on the Order Paper dated June 14, 1989: My expenditures, first of all, for office equipment totalling \$1,400 - itemized list attached. Personal office expenditures totalling \$664.00 - itemized list attached.

Under Travelling: Travelling to Prince Edward Island to meetings with one of the assistant deputy ministers, total, \$2,064.

Petitions

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber East.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:

I wish to present another petition calling for immediate action on the part of the government to improve mammography services throughout the Province. The petition is of some twenty-five residents of the St. John's area and is seeking the immediate introduction of a province-wide screening mammography program.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for these people's cries for immediate action have to do with a desire to do what medical experts now say can be done to prevent deaths and alleviate sufferings resulting from breast cancer.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the Minister of Health (Mr. Decker) was in Corner Brook on the weekend and while there was questioned by a reporter about the government's position on this. He was asked specifically about the government's intention to provide the wherewithal for Western Memorial Regional Hospital to acquire a modern mammogram. The present mammogram is fourteen years old and is obsolete. The minister's reply, which is quoted in today's **Western Star**, is that if people in the Western area of Newfoundland want a modern

mammogram then they should initiate a community fund raising drive. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is insulting to the women of the Province and the women of the Western region.

The minister, in trying to defend the indefensible, is putting down me and other former P.C. Government members for our not having acted. I would remind the minister that he is now the Minister of Health. So, really, what we did or did not do is not relevant. What matters is what he and his colleagues are going to do to respond to the health care needs of the people of the Province.

I would also remind him that it was not until six months ago that Health and Welfare Canada endorsed the findings of a major study about the benefits of screening mammography and recommended to the provinces that routine screening be made possible for all women over fifty and younger women with warning symptoms.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition I would call on members opposite to stop trying to defend the indefensible and act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the few moments that the rules

permit me to support the petition presented by my colleague for Humber East. I am surprised that when there is so much interest in this issue in the Province that there does not appear to be any substantive response at all from the government benches to the prayer of this petition.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a very sensitive and important issue facing the women of Newfoundland and Labrador. And for the Minister of Health and others on the government side of the House over the last several days to try to make some kind of an obscene political issue out of this very important question is insulting, to say the least. It is insulting to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. The minister knows, and practically everybody who has had any dealings with this issue knows that it is only within the last six or seven months that Health and Welfare Canada have released the studies and the documents that show that it is now safe to proceed with the acquisition and use of this equipment for women in Newfoundland and Labrador and across Canada. And for the Minister of Health to continue to try to hide behind some political smokescreen and be as damaging as he is to the women in this Province and try to play down the issue, as he does, it is just not good enough, Mr. Speaker. And to suggest that people in various regions of the Province ought to get on their own horse and on their own effort and raise funds is ludicrous. The Minister ought to know that in region after region in this Province there are hundreds of thousands of dollars raised a year for necessary hospital equipment, including this particular equipment we are talking about, in some regions of

the Province. There have been foundations set up in various areas of this Province and they have been asking the government to match what they themselves have raised in the various regions of the Province. So for the Minister to continue to sit there is to insult the women of the Province, and it is an insult to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to claim this is only a political question, that the Opposition is trying to make politics out of it. It is time for the Minister, after a month and a half, or almost two months, to come to the realization that he is now the Minister. Anything he can throw across at us, we can duck and it will go on over our heads, but the fact of the matter is that it is the Minister and the government who must act, and if \$200,000 or \$300,000 or \$400,000 a year can legitimately be used to help the women of this Province, as it can, with acquiring this equipment, then the Minister should be fighting right, left, and center to make sure that the equipment is provided. Do not get up with the silly political answers that you got up with on Thursday or Friday. They sufficed when you were over here, I say to the minister, but the minister is now over there and it is his responsibility to act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the prayer of this petition so ably presented by the members opposite. To hear them talking, you would never know they were in power for the last ten to

seventeen years.

I remember reading the book about the Depression, **The Ten Lost Years**. Mr. Speaker, I think that would be extremely appropriate to refer to the last ten years in Newfoundland, as the ten lost years we have had.

Now, I am supporting the petition. The hon. members are trying to cloud this issue by making it political, and they are confusing people between mammography services and mammography screening. Now, the mammography screening program, as I said before, we are looking at, and we fully intend to bring one in in due course, after we have given it every consideration and after we have examined what is right and proper. The mammography screening program is in the works, Mr. Speaker, and it will be delivered when it is reasonable to deliver the mammography screening program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. members are trying to confuse mammography services. There are in this Province, Mr. Speaker, a reasonable number of mammography machines. For example, at the Grace General, a new mammography machine has been installed as of today. How is that for action? We have been in office six weeks and a brand new machine is being installed today and should be operational within a couple of days. The Grace General has a waiting list due to the fact that their old machine has been down for a while. St. Clare's has a significant waiting list. They have tendered for a new machine and they are anticipating its installation in September, 1989.

Corner Brook: Their current

machine is obsolete, and I mean obsolete. It was obsolete five years ago when the hon. the member for Corner Brook was in Cabinet. It was obsolete then. Why she did not take action to replace it I will never know, but she did not. It has been dumped in our laps and we are certainly making every effort we can to have it replaced. Their current machine is obsolete -

MS VERGE:

Why do you have the machine working?

MR. DECKER:

If the hon. member will just listen.

- and they are tendering jointly with St. Clare's, and pending approval of a funding proposal by this department, their mammography machine should be installed in September. After ten years, ten lost years, we are going to install one in September, hopefully, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

St. Anthony has a mammography machine and, in the past, has had no significant backlog.

In Central Newfoundland, Gander has a new machine that is functioning satisfactorily. Grand Falls has a new machine that is functioning satisfactorily. Clarenville has a modern machine that has been operating for a one-month period, since we have come in office. This is housed adjacent to the hospital in a self-contained mobile caravan.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that we have done a lot to

increase mammography services in this Province, and I am proud to tell hon. members of the House, as well as the people who signed that petition, that that is the trend we will be following. That is what I am proud to tell the people of this Province.

Mammography screening services as opposed to mammography screening is a slightly different issue, wherein we have to take the equipment to the people instead of bringing the people to the equipment. That is in the works and it will be done at a reasonable time. I do not believe we are going to get it in this fiscal year, but I can guarantee the people of this Province that it will not take this minister ten years, like it took the previous administration, to end up with obsolete, worn-out equipment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

Order 2 - Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take the first few minutes of approximately the next half hour to try and speak to the budget, but I will then, during the last part, try to give some examples of the changes that have been made within my department in the few short weeks

since I was appointed minister, compared to what was happening over the last seventeen years. I think, Mr. Speaker, when I get to that you will realize the direction and the real change that this government is about to undertake in this Province.

One thing about it, Mr. Speaker, is the budgetary process is not something that happens overnight. It takes a while, Mr. Speaker, to that process into place. Given the amount of time that this administration had, the time that the government of the day called the election, the time it takes for a transition period and then the time that the ministers were appointed, I think the Minister of Finance (Dr. Kitchen), with his colleague the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Baker), and all people concerned, Mr. Speaker, did one fantastic job. In fact, I would think that we should even look at possibly placing a statue of the Minister of Finance out on the lawn so that all people in this Province can see what a fantastic job was done for the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

For any minister to come in and in such a short time provide a budget such as we have today, whereby we see some bright outlook for the future of this Province compared, Mr. Speaker, to the dismal view that we went through over the last almost two decades, shows there is a real change in place. This Province is going to move forward at a positive rate and the economy is going to change. I am very pleased to say that, Mr. Speaker, because as Minister of Social Services I want to reduce

caseloads so that people can have some alternative instead of asking and begging for food to put on their table. That is what they have been subjected to, Mr. Speaker, over the last decade and a half, and especially the last ten years.

Because we know, there is nobody in this Province who knows any more than we do, the cost of food, the high cost of living, and the cost of heating their homes. We know what they have been subjected to. Compared to the rising cost, the amount that they were given by the former administration did not even come close to keeping up the pace. But, Mr. Speaker, that will all change, there is no question about that.

I have to make a few comments about my colleague sitting adjacent to me on my right, the Minister of Fisheries. The fishery is very closely related to me, being from Port de Grave, which is one of the largest fishing communities in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and I am very proud to say that. Leading up to the past election, the fishery outlook for the Province, the inshore fishermen and the problems that they encountered, they were never getting any light as to anything being done about it. They could never get into see a minister or get their problems explained to them.

MR. RIDEOUT:

You are not talking about me, I hope?

MR. EFFORD:

No, I would not talk about any minister like that.

Mr. Speaker, the provincial level

was one problem, but the federal level was another major problem. Since we have changed, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries is now providing an opportunity that they do see some changes coming in place, that they do see a better future, that they do see there is going to be changes made to the regulations that drastically effect the inshore fishery, especially when we relate to the fifty-five to sixty-five foot boats fishing on the Grand Banks, absolutely chased by the federal people on a day-to-day basis. No quotas in any sufficient amounts that to provide not even a month's fishing. We have thirty-one Otter trawlers now around the coast of Newfoundland with two weeks fishing. Two weeks out of the fifty-two. But since this hon. member was appointed Minister of Fisheries they do see some bright outlook and some changes coming. I want to say how pleased I am to be able to sit between the Minister of Fisheries and the hon. Minister of Works, Services and Transportation (Mr. Gilbert), because not only are they providing a good job but they are also keeping me in line and not letting me jump up as often as I would like to. For that reason I am very proud to be able to sit down and be able to work so closely with them.

Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague, the Minister of Development (Mr. Furey), I am going to get around a little later to the Minister of Development, and Tourism, and Rural Development, and Northern Development, because he deserves some special attention, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to make sure that he gets that before this speech is over.

There are a number of things that

we changed and we had to change in the budget, but one of the remarks made the other day by my hon. friend, when he was in- what? I think six hours of speaking, that we were lucky that we did not get a sales tax increase. I say that the people of this Province were real lucky that there was a change in government, because if we had continued on with the past administration, if they were to have had another term in office, then Newfoundland would not need any sales tax. They would not have to increase sales tax, because there would be no Newfoundland whatsoever. The majority of people, by the end of that term, would be out of this Province, and those who would not have the opportunity of getting out of the Province would probably be half starved to death, so there would be no existence. There would be no fishery, there would be no jobs, there would be nothing, absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker, for them to do.

The Employment Opportunities Program in this Province: I had to sit for four years and listen to a government bragging about the type of long-term jobs they were creating. When the Employment Opportunities Program was brought in by the Department of Social Services, by the former administration, to create jobs in this Province, there was a little in excess of 400 the first year put to work for a ten-week period. Last year there was 12,500 people put to work through the Employment Opportunities Program in the Department of Social Services.

Now, what have we accomplished in those ten years since that program started? Here is what we have accomplished. We started out with

a ten week program to put people to work for \$200 a week. Prior to going to work on that particular program, the Department of Social Services was paying their rent, they were given a basic amount of money to live on, a family of four, for example, receives \$515 a month, and we were supplying them with a drug card. So they were getting those benefits before going to work, before earning their \$200 a week. When the former government put them to work on the ten-week programs, they received a total of \$200 gross income. Then they took away their rent, took away their drug card, took away their income subsidy - took all that away from them. Now they must live on that for ten weeks. Then at the end of ten weeks, when they received their layoffs, they have a period of waiting time, approximately no less than four weeks, from the time they are laid off, when they received their last cheque, until they receive their first unemployment insurance cheque. Then, when they were to the Department of Social Services at that particular time, they were told they should have saved enough money from the \$200 a week they received, when they had to pay their drugs, their rent, all essential needs, that they should have saved enough money to keep themselves from the period of time they were waiting on their unemployment insurance. Then, when they received their unemployment insurance, they received a total of \$124 a week for a family of four.

Now they had to spend a period time going back to the Department of Social Services to try to beg for some subsidy, and to give a full financial statement of where they spent the money over the ten

week period, or twenty week period that they were employed on the Unemployment Opportunities program. Absolutely no incentive whatsoever for a person to go to work. In fact, they were forced to say, "I do not want to go to work. I want to stay home, because if I go to work I am not going to be able to feed my family. So I have to stay home and try to survive on the few dollars I am getting from Social Services."

Now you would think after ten years with a program that started out to try to encourage to get into the work force, once those faults were recognized in the department - what is happening to the people? The incentive is being taken away from them - there would have been something done by the department and by government to change direction. Because, obviously, from the very beginning you did not have to be a genius to recognize that it was not working. We are not even so sure if they saved any money on the Newfoundland Treasury. I will know that soon. I have asked my department officials to provide me with the information, did we actually save any money? If that was the purpose of the past administration, I do not see how we could, but let us find out. But you would think that they would have had the incentive to say, look, we are not helping our people. The idea should have been to get the people away from being dependent on Social Services altogether. Now how do you do that? Most of those people are uneducated, most of those people have no training and they have no opportunity. They are at an age, it could be twenty-five, thirty, thirty-five year olds, when they are married with a family. If we

had taken a portion of that money and we had said to those people, We are going to give you some training - we are not talking about training in computer systems, and we are not talking about flying an airplane, about becoming a pilot, we are talking about some training - number one, in life skills, in actually how to have the initiative and the aggressiveness to deal with day to day dependency on yourself, and not asking for handouts:, How to manage your own affairs, how to approach looking for a job, how to get out there and present yourself to an employer, to train people to deal with themselves.

Secondly, we should be looking at how to train people in dealing with the resources that we have in this Province. For anybody to stand in this House of Assembly, or anywhere else in this Province and tell me that we have no resources, then they should not be calling themselves Newfoundlanders or Canadians, because they have no knowledge or no concept of what this Province is all about.

There are lots of things in this Province that people could earn some sort of an income from if we gave them the opportunity to actually look out through the door and see what is around them, and especially in rural Newfoundland. But the mere fact of going to a supermarket or a local industry or a local employment agency to ask for a job, most of those people do not have any skills now to do that.

Now if we had taken a portion of that money and we had trained those people, Mr, Speaker, we would have lessened the caseload and the dependency on Social Service. And by doing that, those people would have had the

opportunity of earning more money for themselves, and by lessening the caseload we would have taken the monies that we had allotted out for Social Assistance and instead of spreading it out and giving it to 20,000 people, if we did decreased the number by 20 per cent we would have been able to give that allotted money to 16,000, therefore we would have been able to increase their assistance that much more so they could get more money to live on.

You are never going to provide enough money for everybody to receive everything they need, but the essential things, the basic things like some decent food, now that does not take any great initiative on anybody's part. But what I can tell this hon. House is that for the seventeen years that that administration was in power, it did not happen. But in the eight weeks that we have been in power, Mr. Speaker, that has already started to happen. We are looking for a new direction to give our people, the common initiative and the aggressiveness they need to be able to manage themselves, and to realize that you can exist without always asking, and can provide a portion for yourself. That, Mr. Speaker, is a real change, and that is one of the things that this government is all about, a real change for a better economic future and the betterment of every individual Newfoundlander and Labradorian in this Province. And we will deliver that, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it.

Priorities: That is what this government is all about, putting your priorities in the right place. You know, in a Province like Newfoundland and Labrador there is only a certain amount of

money, there is a ceiling and there is always going to be a ceiling. We are not going to be able to create an industrial site like Ontario or Montreal. We are not going to be able to get access to all the foreign companies coming in, and all the industries and manufacturers and the wholesale companies that are set up in Montreal. Our tax base is dependent on the two main natural resources we have, the fishery and forestry. And as long as this federal government in Ottawa now keeps making the rules and regulations that they have, then not our fishery is going to go further and further down, and we are going to get less income from it. So our income is not going to grow in the short term by any great leaps and bounds. So what we have to do as a government is we have to manage with the amount of dollars we have. We have to put our priorities in the right place and, if we are going to do that, Mr. Speaker, we have to get the message out to people, 'Use what we have so that everybody can get the best service out of that dollar.' That is where the former administration failed, Mr. Speaker, they did not get the message across, did not get people to understand that this is what we have to do. Once you tell people and once they understand and realize that this is what we have to do, that we all have to tighten the belt a little bit, they will work towards that goal. When they respect the government of the day, the administration, for having their priorities in the right place, they will tighten up and they will realize that their priorities have to be directed towards the same end, and they will not be as wasteful. But you have to set a standard and that is what this government will be

doing. We will be setting a standard of priorities to give the best possible service with the amount of dollars that is available today.

I know with the number of requests I have gotten from my department over the last six to eight weeks, there is not enough money coming out of Fort Knox to say yes to every group that came to you, to say, 'Yes, we have the \$1 million, we have the \$3 million, we have the \$25 million or we have the \$10 million that you are asking for.' But once you sit down and explain to them that what we do have you will be getting your fair share of and you will be fairly dealt with, and we will not be throwing \$20 million or \$25 million away on cucumbers, and we will not be throwing it away on foolish projects, it will be prioritized and your needs will come first, they will understand.

Mr. Speaker, I touched briefly on education in this Province when I said that one of the main reasons that a lot of clients of the Department of Social Services are there is lack of education. That is a problem. If you look at rural Newfoundland you will see what is happening. Most of the people are undereducated. The dropout rate in rural Newfoundland is unbelievable, and we have to address that situation.

I can honestly say that my colleague, the Minister of Education, in his few short weeks in office, has been working constantly night and day. I have talked to him about this on a number of occasions, and I can definitely pass on to this House of Assembly and this Province that those concerns have already begun to be addressed. We are going to

see a better opportunity for equal education right across this Province. We are not just going to see the urban centers around the Province get the best advantage for education. Rural Newfoundland, everywhere, all the people, are going to be given accessibility to equal education. An equal opportunity is going to be made available by this government and by the Minister of Education who is leading his department to ensure equal opportunity and fairness to all people. It will be addressed and we will ensure that it will happen. That is one message that has already gotten out to the people of this Province, and the people are already starting to feel confident.

Once you start that process people will realize -- they start hearing it in the new media and they start looking at it and reading it -- that some of the people who are less educated than others have a problem with understanding the education system, but the more it is talked about the more they will understand. That in itself will encourage people to talk to their children and say, 'Look, you should stay in school and you should get a better education.' We do not expect everybody to be doctors and lawyers and politicians. God forbid! If everybody runs for politics I might not get re-elected next time. I might lose some of that majority I had in the last election.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, irregardless of what position you take -- I tell my own son this -- you should have an education. A fisherman needs an education. A labourer needs an education. No matter what you do today you need

an education. How many people in this Province today, in rural Newfoundland, have even got education enough to be self-sufficient on getting their own food? Now, you say, 'How could you possibly need an education for that?' When I was growing up, and I would say just about every hon. member in this House of Assembly, we survived on the land. We did not have the money, the \$200 or \$300 a week, to go to the supermarket. The land is still there. The land has not disappeared. But what has disappeared is the knowledge and the ability and the initiative to go out and do that.

Now, if we had some sort of program in place and we spent some of the dollars more wisely and we educated those people they could be self-sufficient. We could tell them: Look, you have a piece of land in your back garden -- there is millions of land in this Province for farming -- and show the people how to grow a few vegetables: You can get fifty, sixty sacks of potatoes, and carrot and cabbage and all other kinds of vegetables to put in your cellar for the winter. Those few dollars invested would alone provide a better income, and that is where the little bit of education comes in. When we say education the first thing we think about is getting Grade XII, going on to university and becoming an economist, becoming a doctor, becoming a teacher. Education is much more related to every day living than that. In the province of Ontario, they have in their school vocational, because there are a lot of people not capable of going on to university, but they are capable of learning a vocation, whether it be in carpentry, electrical, or farming

or some sort, it is taught right in the elementary schools. They get a knowledge, they get a fair concept that there is something else available, so they have a reason not to drop out. There is a reason to stay in school, there is an interest that keeps them there.

In our education system the most thing there is academic and a lot of kids lose their interest, they are not encouraged by their parents, and therefore the dropout rate grows and grows, and that is the reason why we are into the problems that we are in today. That is why this Province needs an administration which realizes the source of the problem: Before you get the answer you have to know that the problem exists, and you have to be willing to admit that there is a problem out there, and not only is there a problem, it is an expanding problem. Now when you start to put that all together, when you recognize that, then you start to look for the solutions. But you must admit there is a problem there first. When I stood on that side of the House, every time I would stand to my feet and ask a question, much like the member for Humber East asked today on a health question, I realized, with the problem that I was having to get across here, that these people did not recognize there was a problem there. But the Minister of Health today, when the question was put, recognized there is a problem there, a need for that equipment, and he is willing to ensure that it will happen, that the piece of equipment and the screening program will be provided in the very near future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

It might take some time, and the member for Humber East realizes that, but it does not take ten years. But you accomplished one thing; the Minister of Health admitted very clearly to you and to everybody the need is there. He did not have to do it, although he knew it before he came to the House of Assembly. When you were on this side, question after question was asked and you denied there was a problem, 'Everything is okay. What do you expect? What do you want, everything coming all at you one time? We provided all kinds of jobs, we provided all kinds of opportunities for people.'

To say that you provided all kinds of jobs, and then I got over to my department and realized that those 12,000 jobs they bragged about, Mr. Speaker, all last year and the year before and the year before! 'We are creating all of these jobs, long-term jobs, 12,500 jobs provided through the former administration, through the Department of Social Services, and during that time they half starved to death or half froze to death, and the same for the 42 weeks they were on unemployment insurance. And they bragged about that, Mr. Speaker.

We will give people something to brag about, we will give people something to be proud about. We will provide opportunities. We will provide access to long-term jobs, we will be encouraging people to take those people on for longer terms, not just for ten weeks. We will provide an incentive for the people to get some warm clothes for their children and some food for their bodies so that they will not have to go to school hungry and they

will not have to go to bed at night cold. And it will not take ten years, it will not take seventeen years, Mr. Speaker, it is happening now. And it is going to happen very, very fast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:
What is happening?

MR. EFFORD:
You should have been in a few minutes ago, and you would have heard what is happening. Because I have outlined what I am going to do with the Employment Opportunities Program already. One of the biggest problems, Mr. Speaker, that I have in my department is child abuse, and it is a frightening situation. There are approximately today 781 cases of reported child abuse that my department is looking at. Out of that number of cases, I think something like 356 are sexual abuse of children.

The social workers, the child abuse workers of this Province have, on an average, a case load of ninety-five per worker. The national average for a child abuse worker is twenty-five. Now, that is the result of the former administration. I did not cause that to happen. I have only been here eight weeks. The former Minister of Social Services and the other ministers knew this was happening in the Province. They knew that that problem existed. It did not happen overnight. It took some time to get to that situation.

We have to put measures in place. We are going to put measures in place and we have already started to do so, where, number one, we

are going to find out where, in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, the case loads are extreme and where they are not so extreme. We are trying to find out exactly if there is need for an extra social worker here, an extra child abuse worker there, and any place in the Province that is overstaffed will be analyzed to see exactly what it is all about.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we are going to put preventive measures in place, because an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. And if our social workers or somebody in the field says, 'Look, there is a potential problem in this particular family. This man or this woman have neglected their children physically or mentally, or the parents are alcoholic, or whatever' Well, when you are dealing with communities, you can recognize the potential problem, and we are going to put in place preventive measures and work with the families to prevent these sorts of things. It is our intention to keep children with their families. It is better to counsel the children. You have to deal with it one way or another, so you may as well start at the beginning with prevention.

MR. WARREN:
That is why your department took kids away from Nain last week!

MR. EFFORD:
Not only that, Mr. Speaker, when the case occurs, we have to recognize there is a problem there. And, if for the safety and the protection of the children, we have to remove children from a family, then we have no alternative but to do it. And, surely goodness, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) would not expect this department,

or any department or any minister anywhere in this country to leave children in a home and have something serious happen to them. We have to provide protection for children. I did not tell the member for Torngat Mountains that all preventive measures were in place. We have started to put preventive measures in place. We are working with families and we are doing something about the case loads of child abuse workers and social workers. Also, Mr. Speaker, we are doing something about follow-up after problems are identified. We are not going to forget about the family. After the problem is identified, you have to work with the family. You have to provide a proper home for the child, and the proper and best home for the child is with the family. In a lot of cases, you can provide the counselling needed in that home to provide the type of home and the love and care that is needed for the child. One cannot simply go in, grab the child, take it out of the home and forget about it. It is a very complex and serious situation, and we are going to have a change, a real change that will provide better opportunities for those victims of child abuse, supportive of the families. Because there are cases where you have two parents, one of them calling for help with child abuse. Therefore, the other parent needs proper counselling, and follow-up to provide a better opportunity for the child to stay with its family. That help will be provided by this department.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this government is all about, providing the care and opportunity for the people of this Province to be able to deal with the day-to-day situations they encounter. We all

do not have equal opportunity, we are not all the same. There are many, many problems with living in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and we have to ensure that whether they are in the field of education, counselling, job opportunity, or in providing the decent essentials of everyday life, we have, as a government, to provide accessibility to all people to avail of our help. When you put your priorities in the right place, Mr. Speaker, and the people of this Province realize that, then everything will come together and will work, because they know there is a government here now that cares about people.

I have just a couple of minutes left, Mr. Speaker. I want to touch very briefly on my department in the area of youth correction. I was questioned today in the House of Assembly about youth correction. I admit, there are problems with youth correction, there are problems with the training program and there are problems with providing facilities. But I tell you very clearly, as you already know, this government did not cause the problems. That government caused the problems. This government is going to do something about the problems. This government is going to provide a better opportunity for those young boys and girls who are victims of circumstance. We are going to provide better opportunity for children in institutions so that when they get back in society, they will be properly educated and be able to get jobs. Because, in the past, when they have left youth correction centres, they have gone back into the community, Mr. Speaker, to the same environment they came out of, with no family life, no job

opportunities, and no education opportunities. And what happens? The circle starts all over again - back into the system.

Out in my district in Conception Bay we have already put in place an alternative measures program. That alternative measures program means working with the young people, working with the boys in the community to keep them out of secure custody, to let them work in the community instead of serving sentences in an institution and, probably, in most cases, working with the victim whom they committed the offense against, so that they will realize and have a better understanding of what they did and the trouble that they caused, a better understanding of how to cope with it, and a better understanding that there is an alternative to what they have done.

The most important thing is they will realize that this volunteer group, who are providing this alternative measures program, cares about them. That is one of the problems with those young offenders, they do not have the people within their own families who really show them any care and any love and any attention. In a lot of cases it has been proved by psychiatrist and statistics that these people did a lot of those things, committed a lot of those offenses because they were lacking the attention. Once we provide the opportunity for them to get the attention and get the care they need, then we will change their lives around. You are not going to do it, Mr. Speaker, in every case. But if you only do it in some of the cases, if you only decrease it by a number, every dollar that you could possibly spend, Mr. Speaker, would be well

spent, because you would improve the lives of some of those boys and girls.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WOODFORD:
In opening the few minutes I have to speak on the Budget debate, Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell how a few years ago, when farmers out West were having a hard time of it, I walked into an office one day and I saw up over a farmer's desk a sort of plaque or memento which showed a cow with a farmer holding on to its tail, a banker holding on to its head, and a lawyer under the cow milking it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:
In relation to the budget, I would say that the taxpayer is on the tail end this time, the Minister of Finance is acting as the banker, on the head, and the Premier is doing the milking. In any case, it is just a reference to what has been happening in conjunction with the budget and the \$95 million tax grab that was released only a couple of weeks ago. Mr. Speaker, it is evident everywhere you go in this Province. Everywhere you go! You have the increase in personal income tax, you have the 10 per cent increase in tuition fees, the tax exemption on children's clothing, and you can go on.

Those taxes are something you can see and something you can relate to. Granted you are going to need tax increases somewhere along the road regardless of what administration is in power, but you usually take where it is more palatable and less hurtful to the people involved, especially the poor people of the Province.

In this case there is indirect taxation in this budget that is not talked about at all.

The first one to come to mind is the one on, for instance, municipalities. There are three forms of government, federal, provincial and municipal in this Province, and one passes the buck to the other, no doubt. We have the cost-sharing on incinerators reduced from 75/25 to 60/40 in the budget, and, naturally, somewhere along the way this has to be passed along to the taxpayer in the communities. This will be more evident come this Fall, after the budgets are done up for the end of the year, December 31. And it goes on and on. We say, yes, that 20 per cent of the local revenue is paid on capital debt, but those municipalities have to get revenue from somewhere. It was only the other day, I think, the minister stated there was \$150 million worth of requests for municipal affairs and we got \$50 million. Let us fact it, somewhere along the way someone has to pick up the tab, so the ordinary Joe picks it up in a municipality as well as picking it up on his personal income tax or some other form of taxation.

I am no senior around here, as I have only four years in as an MHA, but I have a word of caution, especially for some of the new members who have spoken in the

budget debate or to resolutions. The one thing I have noticed is that there is a real sense of cockiness, so to speak. Self-confidence is one thing, but cockiness is another. There is a little bit of it and I would just to caution them. All this blame that is going back and forth, that is all we hear. Granted it is on both sides, but, as I think the Premier mentioned a few weeks ago, we are not going to get anywhere blaming each other. Get up and be constructive, on both sides. We are big enough, we have been in the business long enough to be able to take the heat and not have to get out of the kitchen. The bloom will be off the rose before too long. It is there now, it is a honeymoon, so to speak, but it is like getting in a shower, one wrong turn and you could be in hot water. So you had better be careful. This is just a little word of caution to new members. I went through it.

The Economic Recovery Commission that was set up by the Premier and his administration, I, for one, would be the first one to congratulate them and go along to any member of that commission, or any member opposite, and say it was one of the best ideas since sliced bread. It is in place now and I hope more than anybody in this Legislature, or in this Province, that it works.

I am not going to look back and blame everything on the past seventeen years. Over the past seventeen years the past administration put some good things in place. There is no doubt about it. It was not all bad. There were some good things.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Name them.

MR. WOODFORD:

I can name them.

There must have been something awfully good, for instance, and I do not intend to back away from it, if everybody, over the past two years at least, is talking about the \$21 million spent on Sprung. Well, I would say we should get a medal for being excellent managers if that is the only monies that were spent wrong out of the total budget of this Province. That is the only negative thing I heard. What happened to all the other dollars, the fourteen hundred-and-some-odd million dollars that were spent? There must have been some spent right. I will not touch on that now, I will come back to it later. I do not intend backing away from it, in any case.

I have great respect for every educator and every academic in this Province, but if we go back to the commission that was set up in 1967 and 1968, if we go back to the Whelan Commission that was set up, I believe, in the early seventies, which came in with the report on municipal government, the House Commission of 1986 on Employment and Unemployment, and now the Economic Recovery Commission that is going to be the saviour of the Province, on every one of these commissions, if you go back and look, they were all academics and educators. We just heard the Minister responsible for Social Services say, and I agree with him, that there is all kinds of education. There are two kinds at least. All successful people have an education. Some get it without going to school and some get it after going to school. In the Commission on Employment and Unemployment it stressed the rural importance of the Province, some

500 communities represented by rural development associations around the Province. I think it is 80 per cent in rural areas, rural municipalities, or what have you.

For example, in this Province we have the President of the Federation of Agriculture, we have a president or chairman of the Newfoundland Sawmillers Association in the Province, we have the president or chairman of the Newfoundland Federation of Municipalities, we have the same with the Credit Unions, we have the president or the chairman of the Rural Development Associations in the Province. Why do we not see any of those people on the Commission? On the advisory part of it we see some. I see one name there, Gerald Smith, a good man. He was good in the Rural Development Associations in this Province and I respect him. He is on the advisory part of the board. There is no doubt that he will add something to it. And Jerome Walsh, from the Federation of Municipalities, he is on the advisory part.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WOODFORD:

I am talking about the five member body, the top.

Now, some of the names I have mentioned this evening are people who are quite capable of writing up reports and who are quite capable of filling in applications. But how many of the five members at the top, the five members of the first part of the board - the Economic Recovery Team, I should say, I am getting it mixed up now. Then there is an advisory team - how many of those

five people have run a business of their own? How many? Someone tell me.

In the rural areas of this Province, and I will name just the dairy business alone, Mr. Speaker, FCC, Farm Credit Corporation, estimates that it costs \$8,000 per cow unit to run a dairy operation. You might as well whistle in the dark and forget it if you are going to start with under a fifty cow herd. That is a \$400,000 investment, minimum. Most units in the Province today which have been in business for any time are running anywhere from that to \$1 million or \$1.4 million in business assets.

Now that is running your business in a rural area of the Province, as big a business as you have anywhere in this Province. They know what they are doing. It is not like it was years ago when the farmer would come in and mark his X to sign his name. Those days are gone. They were well-intentioned, they knew what they were doing, but they just did not get the chance to get an education. As I said before, if anybody is going to be successful, whether it be in that or any other part of the rural development movement today in this Province, they have an education, as I said, whether they got it without going to school or whether they got it after. They know what business is all about. And not only that, they are coming from areas of the Province where we are going to have to identify, whether it be the Commission or whether it be us as politicians, or someone else, they are coming from areas where things matter most, and those are the rural areas of the Province where we are going to have to make some changes.

All things over the years have been identified. We have problems in agriculture - room to grow and renewable; we have problems in the forestry - room to grow and renewable. We have problems in mining, not so much because it is, I suppose, controlled by outside interests, you need big bucks and they can choose where to put them. In the fishery, God knows, there are all kinds of problems. Tourism is another area that is all renewable. So I am talking about the fishery, agriculture, forestry, and tourism. The Minister of Social Services just mentioned the resources we have in this Province. We are blessed with resources in this Province, but we cannot seem to get them going to the point where every man, woman and child should be working. We are more or less sending out all raw product and having nothing to do with secondary processing.

We have 580,000 souls in this Province, and every man, woman and child here should be working. So what is wrong? We have to identify the problems before we can find the solution. We can set up all the commissions we like, we can pay them what we like, we can spend as many hours in boardrooms as we like, but unless we get someone with practical experience, who is not afraid to get down in the mud and get their hands dirty, who can do something practical, who can know when an individual comes in with his application where he is coming from, we will not solve the problems.

I have often said that bureaucrats are people who figure God gave them ten restrictions instead of the Ten Commandments.

As sure as I am standing behind

this mike today, when this Commission's report comes in will it not be said that, for instance, the paper companies in the Province have control over our timber resources? They have. I have said it before, and I mentioned it when talking about rural development here earlier. Where do you get the resource to bring to the sawmillers in this Province or anything else to do with timber resources in this Province? Where do you get it?

It is like the fishery now. Whatever is closest to us we will pursue, and when that is gone and caught up, what happens? We are too late then. We have nothing ready to move offshore. It is the same thing with everything. We have a tendency to just grab what is close to us. The same thing around the roads. The timber companies use the same analogy. They cut what is closest. What is in the back is left there. The person who can survive on a 150,000 or 200,000 board feet of lumber a year in the little sawmill, hiring four or five people - I am not talking about eight or ten months - they could be working year-round if they had access to the timber. It is there, but it is not accessible.

Solution: We either get the closer stands back from the timber companies or else we - I say 'we' - as a government, put in the roads so that they can access that timber. There is no other way to do it.

In the Hampden area of White Bay, in my district, we started on an area last year when the other minister was involved. We thought to get the timber company to pass it over to the Crown so that the sawmillers could access it and

have it for their own use. That is not finalized yet, but hopefully the new minister will pursue that and bring it to fruition. Because all those things in agriculture are renewable, again. We do not have to wait. We do not have to do anything. We can renew it every year, plant, seed, and harvest. Granted we are at the whims of nature, but then again 75 per cent to 80 per cent of the people involved in the agricultural industry in this Province today are doing well. No matter what industry you are in, you are going to have a certain portion that is not going to do well, mainly due to management. And nature controls a lot of it, I guess.

Permanent jobs: All those things are true. By the very nature of our Province, namely climatic conditions, what do we do and how do we hold on to permanent jobs? How can we say you are going to work twelve months of the year in this Province? Can somebody tell me that? How are you going to work twelve months of the year in the fishery? How are you going to do it in forestry?

Forestry, for instance, the one that comes to mind, only a couple of years ago we had a real crisis on our hands in the Humber Valley area. Kruger wanted people in the woods. One way or the other they had to be in there cutting eight-foot wood, not four like they did years ago, but eight-foot wood with five and six feet of snow around them. Most Newfoundlanders are no Will Chamberlains. They are much like myself, average height, and you know what that is like going around in five or six feet of snow, with a power saw, trying to cut eight-foot wood and pile it.

So we went with them and the union and sat down and talked to Kruger and said, 'Look, why not put a few extra people on in the Summertime and the Fall, cut what wood is needed and, for God's sake, let the people go home in the depths of the Winter when the going is rough, for three or four months, and let them do what everybody else is doing, taking it easy?' No problem! Done!

The other thing in relation to working all year is, how can you do it? You have forestry. There are parts of it, the sawmilling industry, where you can. It is a little rough because of the ice on everything and stuff like that, but it can be done if you have access to it. The fishery: You cannot do it. Agriculture: There are certain commodity groups in the agricultural sector where you can do. You cannot do it with root crop. You have a job to grow that in the normal months of the year let alone in the Wintertime. You can grow it all year in greenhouses, the twelve months.

This is one of the things that has to be addressed. We can only have so many paper mills. We can only have so many, say, fish plants that can work year-round and access the Northern cod and so on. We can have all kinds of things that are relative to the service sector in the Province, but we have to have the fish plants, we have to have the Krugers of the world in order to have something value-added so that the Minister of Finance has extra revenue to work with. We can hire all the nurses we like, we can build all the hospitals we like, all the schools and all the universities, value added to the economy of this Province, but it is not going to generate any

revenue, except for the taxes that come from wages, in order to do the other things that need to be done in this Province. We almost have a tendency to look at the big, and overlook the obvious, and that is so true when you look at mega projects like the Hibernias of the world, the Churchill Falls of the world, and some other projects. Yes, they are there. We have to have them. And I hope that over the next few months at least a couple of them will come through, namely, the Hibernia thing and Churchill Falls.

But we have to have the small stuff, the things that are going to work in the rural areas and are going to generate jobs for even eight or nine months of the year so that municipalities in which those people live can stand on their own two feet, they do not have to rely as much on government funding. If you have a good tax base, you start at the bottom, you have a good foundation, you build. If you have a good tax base in your local municipality, you are going to have it Provincially, and you are going to have it Federally.

I mentioned about the bureacracy a little while ago. How often have I sat down at my desk, as I am sure other members in this Legislature have, and saw someone sitting across from me with a million dollars worth of education and not a nickel's worth of common sense? And it is so true all throughout our system; they get in and they get flustered. You will look at So-and-So in his shirt and tie and his double breasted suit, and all of a sudden he clams up; the idea he came into the office with is gone down the tubes because he cannot express himself. I have seen it! I have

had people come to see me since I got in politics and because I had switched from coveralls to a suit, they figured I changed completely. Not so! If we have persons who are lawyers, or persons who are teachers, they cannot be blamed for that. We all have our chosen careers in life, but we should have something, some kind of system whereby if I, say, do not know anything about the law profession, or the education system, I will consult.

It is like the young fellow one time who said if swap a car you still have a car, but if you swap ideas you have your old thought and your new one, you have something to work with. Which is so true for everyone, no matter who you talk about or whom you talk to in the Province.

I mentioned the Rural Development Associations in a speech about a week ago. The Rural Development Authority: Something I do not agree with is taking the Rural Development Authority out of a small department where it is pretty well on its own and putting it in with Development. I was always a critic of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. I do not mind saying it. I said it in caucus. I said it publicly and I do not mind saying it today. It was too big. If I wanted to come in off the street as a small operator and get a loan through NLDC, it was just as well for me to go meet with the bankers in New York. The one thing the Rural Development Authority has going for it now is that the Minister looking after that department is from a rural area of the Province and he can associate with the people in his district and the area which he serves. That may be

a plus, and it may not be as bad as I think it is going to be. Then, again, the jury is out on that. But it is a good program. I think last year we had to put extra money into it to the tune of \$7.5 million. The jobs identified in it were something like 25 to 37 weeks for each one. And not only that, it helped the private sector. It was expanded in 1986 or 1987 into the service sector, which really helped, because the tourism industry tied in with the restaurant business and so on. In my area, Humber Valley, it really helped, where tourism is a big plus and is only coming on as of late.

I hope they do not cut the service sector or other parts of that rural development movement, because everybody benefitted from it, and you can come right on up through, as I said, from a restaurant owner to a forestry worker, an agricultural fellow, the fisheries, pretty well anything - all things that are very, very valuable to the lifeblood of this Province. The other suggestion I should make to the Minister responsible for Forestry and Agriculture is not to do away with the sawmill assistance program that was there last year. And he should raise the limits. The Premier is here and he probably should take note of this; I am sure he will agree with me that it is of importance. Raise the limits to the loan boards. We raised it from \$30,000 to \$75,000 a couple of years ago. Because if the \$30,000 could be used for operating, the \$75,000 could go to a loan.

The agricultural sector is now getting to the stage where it is what I call big business in the Province, and what is a \$30,000 or

\$75,000 limit. If you go to FCC and you are not talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars, they will not look at you, and it is usually 13 per cent or 14 per cent. But the provincial one, I believe, was 3 percentage points below prime. I stand to be corrected on that. I had some thoughts of probably trying to get that raised to \$150,000. For instance, in the broiler industry in the Province, if you are looking at operating from one flock to the next, it takes about \$50,000 worth of feed, and this is why the \$30,000 in operating that was there in that department was too small. Now they can say that should have been done over the past seventeen years and so on, but then, again, a lot of things are never identified. Some things are never identified, you go along and you go along and you have a tendency to not see the woods for the trees.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be too big to be able to accept some responsibility and some change, some ideas, and walk up to them. I mentioned Sprung at the beginning and I do not intend to back away from it. Primarily what was wrong with it, and I said it publicly and I say it again, was the way it was handled. It was not the project, it was the way it was handled. Management in that place - I would not want to repeat it here. But right down through there was a veil of secrecy. What was so secret? when I could write a letter and send it off to Holland for \$1.37 and get directions to grow a cucumber back in the mail, what was so secret? If I built a place out on the parking lot tomorrow, put a fence around it and had a dog at every gate, I would have the press there for the next twenty years

wondering what Woodford had in it. I would not have to put anything in it.

It is sad. The bottom line is that it is sad to see a project like that being maligned and mistreated when it could have been a godsend for this Province. I hope government in its good judgement, when judgement day comes on Sprung, will do the right thing. I will not go any further into details, but I hope it will do the right thing. And that will have to take its course, because the banks are involved.

But it is sad. The people who were running that business, every time a problem came up, they threw a body at it instead of asking someone for a bit of help. Never, never put the inventor in charge of the invention or you will have nothing but trouble. Look at what the Dutch did. In fifty-one days, they grew 460,000 cucumbers. In the previous eighteen months, the Sprung's pumped out 860. Something is radically wrong. The election is over, people. Gentlemen on the other side, government members and ministers, the election is over. It was fought, it is done. It is like a good game of hockey; when you get on the ice you fight, you go out and hit. My colleague from St. John's South knows that, he was a few years behind me in the NAHA. But I will tell you that when you got on the ice you hit, you checked, you went in the corners. And the gentleman for Exploits knows all about it. You did everything. If you got a penalty, you served only two minutes in the box. If you get a penalty in this game, you serve more than that, you serve four years with no chance of appeal, and that is the problem.

But the opportunity is there. As I said, the election is over, let us be men and women about it. If it works, so what? You said what you had to say, we said what we had to say, and the lucky thing about it is that the problems were identified. As to the \$21 million subsidy, I do not think there is a member in this House, if we were to get out of this Chamber and into a room together, who would not admit, each member, on the other side as well as on this side, to having fish plants in their districts and every other thing, including mines that went as high if not higher in subsidies than Sprung ever did or ever will, and we survived.

The other day the member for St. George's talked about silviculture programs and the nursery - government money. The member for LaPoile talked and he slapped up about Sprung. Well, I guess it was the easiest one to grab at. You do not mention Rose Ting. You do not mention CN. You do not mention any of the fish plants in the district. All members have something in their districts that was subsidize, and heavily subsidize, by government. So we just cannot stop there. We cannot throw out the babe with the bath water, we have to stop, think, be reasonable, and forget the pettiness.

Mr. Speaker, we only have a half hour to speak and you cannot cover every commodity group, you cannot cover every part of the resource sector in the Province, you can only cover so many, and just touch on them. The bane thing with this Economic Recovery Commission, and I say it to the Premier to pass it along to him, and we have people who are all too willing and able to pass along information to this

Commission, as we did for the Economic Council that was on the go a couple of years ago, is that we can have all the Commissions we like, we can put people as good as we like on them, but once the Commission's report comes in, we have to have the money to do the job. It is needing tools to do a job. No matter what they identify, we are going to need money. A lot of the people on this Commission also served in Chambers of Commerce, were involved in businesses in some way, shape or form, whether it be the president of a company, or another company of which they had been chairman or president or what, they had the chance over the years to identify some of the problems that should have been put in place, as well as any politician in this Province. Now they have a better chance.

There is something I did not mention earlier. The Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation has been disbanded, or at least the Board of Directors has been disbanded. So, really, they have a better chance. They even have a bank behind them, and they have the government behind them. So whatever solutions and ideas they come up with or take from the people in the Province, you have a better chance to implement them, if given the chance. And if this government set up the Commission it must, deep down, no matter what those people come in with, make a special effort, a real, solid effort to make sure that some of the ideas are implemented. You cannot put them on a shelf. And I am sure not a member on this side, when they come up with the ideas, is going to say anything bad or derogatory about them, that is for sure, if they are implemented. If

they come up with the ideas and they are not implemented, well, that is a different situation.

I do not know if my time is up or not. Will you let me go on?

MR. TOBIN:

You have lots of time. They will give you leave.

MR. WOODFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in the **Budget Highlights** the one thing I would like to touch on is: "The Economic Recovery Team with additional capital equity and loan funds to be allocated utilizing Development Savings Bond proceeds through the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation." That is an idea I had in mind. It is nice to see it there, and it is nice to see it associated with the Economic Commission. But I had something similar on my desk, ready to go to Cabinet. I do not know if the minister has seen it or not, but I have a copy of it here: Community Economic Ventures Program - it was a pet peeve of mine for some years. I do not know if members realize it or not, but 55 per cent of all bonds sold last year in the Province were sold in rural areas of the Province, in rural Newfoundland. A couple of ideas I had were with regards to - I mean, the Credit Union is associated with Rural Development, there is the Credit Union Commerical Lending Plan and the Employment Co-operative Equity Plan, which I had almost ready to go when something happened. I was only there for a short while.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

In any case, the Commerical Credit Union in the Province is something I would like to touch on.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MR. WOODFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to have a minute to touch on the Credit Union part of it because of the Commerical Lending and Credit Unions. They can now only make personal loans, so they do not have that jurisdiction yet. I think it is something that should be given to them, because you are giving them a chance to loan commercially.

Small business in the rural areas of this Province: The banker who sits in the office, nine chances out of ten he is from Nova Scotia or P.E.I. or New Brunswick and he does not have a feeling for the area in which he lives. If a businessman goes in and he is starting off in a new business, he might as well whistle Dixie, forget it, if he is going in to sit down to talk to him.

MR. FUREY:

The Trade Unions have \$500,000 (inaudible).

MR. WOODFORD:

Yes, but that is the equity program. That is the second one I was talking about. That is a good one, as well. That is the other one I was going to put in place.

For commercial lending, I think the maximum they could go was \$60,000, if I am not mistaken. So that should be put in place and then the fellow who has his personal account in a credit union, for instance in Humber Valley, who two weeks later goes in, no matter what his account is,

if he is in good standing and he asks for a loan of \$20,000 or \$30,000 or \$40,000, he has a good chance. Because it is something personal, the fellow behind the desk knows the individual, he has another account there, he knows exactly what he is doing, and the fellow sitting behind the desk is not afraid to go out and get his shoes dirty. In rural areas of this Province that is something we cannot forget. It has got to be looked at.

The equity one the minister touched on earlier is another important one, because the Newfoundland Federation of Co-operatives has a \$500,000 equity plan there. Something happened some time ago, one of the Co-ops closed, and they were willing to match that and start an equity program for the credit unions of the Province under the commercial lending program.

Anyway, that is one of the things I am sure he will pick up on. I do not intend to go on anymore, Mr. Speaker. I could go on, but there will always be another time. I want to thank members for their co-operation, and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Before I recognize the hon. the member for Pleasantville, I would like to welcome to the House of Assembly fifty Grade VI students from Anthony Paddon Elementary School, Musgravetown. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Brown, Mr. Perry and Mrs. Brown.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. NOEL:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member speaking previously is obviously a very practical man, who has good economic sense about some of the problems in this Province. Perhaps he should consider withdrawing from his seat, and maybe we could make room for him with the new Economic Recovery Team. We can put his good sense to a more practical use rather than the less obvious practical use we put it to in this Chamber.

Sir, since this is my first opportunity to address this Chamber, I would like to say that I consider it quite a privilege to be given an opportunity by the electorate of Pleasantville to serve in this Forty-First Assembly. I trust that it will not take me as long justifying the confidence they have placed in me as it took me in persuading them to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. NOEL:
The hon. the member for Menihek pointed out the other day that I was nominated for the NDP back in 1974. I did not know at the time, but he informed me afterwards that at that time he was also a member of the NDP. So we all have circuitious methods of getting to this particular station.

MR. TOBIN:
Not only that, but you ran against the Minister of Fisheries in St. John's West.

MR. NOEL:

Yes, that is right!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What a shame!

MR. NOEL:

Is the present situation not a good example of how we both matured over the years?

I hope I shall prove to be as successful in retaining the support of my electors as many of you people whom I have met here, and who have been elected to this House for some time. I believe it is a real accomplishment to be re-elected by your voters. A lot of people who have not been involved in politics take great pleasure in demeaning the motives and capacities of some of us who are, and I think it is largely because they fail to appreciate the complexities of the political process. I have been impressed by the hon. members I have met here on both sides of the House, and I look forward to learning from you and working with you in the short time, I guess, we all get to spend here. When you look over the course of activities in this Province, it does not turn out to be a long time.

I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Speaker and Deputy Chairman of Committees on the responsibilities you have been given in this House. I have known the Speaker for a number of years. He was one of the first people who encouraged my participation in our party, and I have enjoyed his friendship ever since I became involved. We never knew each other beforehand. You, Sir, and the Deputy Chairman, I think, have impressed hon. members of this House in the short time you have been here. Being new

people to your responsibilities, I think you have performed very well and you can look forward to the co-operation, I think, of most members, and certainly me.

I would like to congratulate the new Premier and his ministers on their elevation in the affairs of our Province and assure them of my confidence and any assistance I may be able to provide over the years. I know they will honour their responsibilities in the manner expected by our electors, and I am sure they will be assisted in doing so through the diligent, though sometimes diverse, no doubt, efforts of members on both sides of this House. We all have different roles to play in contributing to the proper government of our people, and while our responsibilities will not always enable us to make life easier for each other, we must honour our various responsibilities if we are to justify our presence in this House.

While there are differences in the rural and urban parts of our Province, we remain a small society, Mr. Speaker, and we are all subjected to very serious economic constraints in the existing political context in which we find ourselves. The average income in Pleasantville might be among the highest in the Province, but few of my constituents are living in luxury. Many are unemployed, or are senior citizens, or students living on subsistence incomes. Others are making do with government assistance, or earning barely enough to make ends meet. Some are earning comparatively good incomes, but for many of them the standard of living they are experiencing is no more satisfying

than that of people earning less in different circumstances.

The average Canadian family earned \$39,500 in 1988 and paid about 52 per cent of that in taxes to various levels of government. Apparently, they also spent about 44 per cent of their income on the necessities of life. According to government figures, if you spend more than 58.8 per cent of your income on necessities, you are classified as poor. So, a lot of our people are living very close to the borderline of poverty. Some Pleasantville families may have more cash income than people living elsewhere, but after taxes, the high cost of living in this city, and the absence of opportunities to augment their income, their standard of living might be no more satisfactory. They may not have the water and sewer and road problems some of our fellow citizens suffer from, but they have others more common to the city. And we all share the deprivations our depressed economy is unable to alleviate. The people of Pleasantville are frustrated by our lack of economic progress. They expect their representative in this House to be committed to pursuing all avenues of opportunity for them and their families - and I am. They are not content with the extent to which the promise of Confederation has not been fulfilled - and I am not. They are prepared to consider all legitimate options in the pursuit of improved economic opportunities and security, and so am I. And I am prepared to demonstrate the degree of leadership and support expected of me.

We, in Pleasantville, realize, Mr. Speaker, we will not improve our standard of living unless we

improve it throughout the Province. We have many civil servants, educators, and office workers in our district, but we are interested in the development of our fishing and mining and forest industries because we realize changes affecting people directly employed in those activities, inevitably affect our interests.

I have many constituents directly employed in the fishing industry, for instance, Mr. Speaker. St. John's is one of the most important fishing ports in this Province, and a number of my constituents work on trawlers and in fish plants, as well as in the offices of the fish companies.

The government is considering the establishment of a provincial water and sewer utilities corporation. I welcome any efforts to achieve economies of scale and the provision of government services, and support the objective of minimizing and equalizing costs in order to maximize and equalize reasonable provision of services to our people.

But we cannot expect to do everything for everybody, regardless of where they live. To endeavour to do so, would be to jeopardize our ability to deliver reasonable services to taxpayers throughout the Province. However, whatever changes may be made in the interest of extending and rationalizing municipal services, I appeal to the minister to ensure that St. John's residents are not burdened with increased municipal taxes. No more taxes, Mr. Minister! The people of St. John's cannot afford them. Many of my electors are already overburdened by property taxes and

school taxes, and they are less than satisfied with the level of services so provided.

I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, to see that the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs is interested in promoting co-operation and rationalization among municipalities. Why do we have more incorporated communities than all of the other Atlantic Provinces combined? Why have we failed to implement the recommendations of various commissions and other advisors, who have studied the situation and determined that changes are necessary? Perhaps we have failed to act because inaction was considered the more expedient political option. But, is it really, or are we underestimating the willingness of our people to support sensible restructuring? Are we paying too much attention to local politicians who are apprehensive about the role they may be able to play in expanded municipal services? I am glad the minister appears to be committed to substantial consolidation, particularly in the St. John's region.

We have to make some tough decisions in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and I am proud to be associated with a government intending to do so. We were elected to do so. Our people want more efficient administration of their affairs. They want us to run a tighter ship. And I commend the new government in its intentions. We are living in a very competitive economic environment and it is going to get worse. We cannot afford the luxury of indulgence and the financial vulnerability it fosters. We have to realize that surgery is essential if we are to

improve our economic health, if we are to expand our ability to provide for the weak, and if we are to encourage and facilitate the promising.

Before I finish with Municipal Affairs, I would like to point out that while the Speech from the Throne promised new legislation governing elections to this Assembly, the financing of such elections, and provisions to reform conflict of interest and ethics considerations, there was no mention of proposing similar reforms at the municipal level, where I believe improved regulations are long overdue.

As I understand it, there are essentially no controls over the collecting and spending of moneys in municipal elections. I hope this government will give due consideration to this inadequacy, endeavour to bring in new legislation, hopefully for the municipal elections intended to be held this Fall, so that we can correct this deficiency.

I would like also to propose that we consider reducing the terms of office for municipal politicians, who presently enjoy greater security of position and less requirement for performance than the members of this House, or the House of Commons, for that matter.

People may not be inclined to endure more electioneering or to finance more elections, but we should not forget that the objective is good government, and if we avoid paying the price for providing it, we may be stuck with the cost for failing to do so. Four year terms ensure too much security and foster apathy; shorter terms would make municipal politicians more responsive to the

needs of citizens, and I believe more productive.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. the Minister of Finance for producing our first budget on short notice, enabling him to maintain and improve the level of services that our people require without resorting to revenue sources generally unacceptable to our people. Hopefully, innovations of the new administration, improving economic conditions and efficiencies achieved through his increasing experience will enable the Minister to further improve the delivery of government services without having to resort to tax increases next year.

However, with the federal government budget taking an additional \$80 million out of our Province this year and a further \$160 million next year, the prospects are not impressive. But our people are reaching the limit of their ability to pay additional taxes, Mr. Speaker, and I think we have to realize that is going to be the situation in future years, for some time to come.

As a small part of the national economy, we continue being subjected to federal fiscal policies appropriate to central Canada but inimical to our interests. I encourage the Minister in his intentions to persuade the federal government to refine its targeting of fiscal action. Even if present monetary policies of the Bank of Canada, for example, may be justified as necessary to fight national inflationary pressures, and I am not convinced by that argument, it is the responsibility of the federal government to employ fiscal measures which may be more

specifically focused to counterbalance the inevitably universal consequences of monetary policy.

Invariably, national governments fail to do that because they are unwilling to pay the political price of ensuring that less populous regions derive a fair share of the benefits of Confederation. And that is the major constitutional flaw in our system of government, and one this government intends to deal with.

I am happy to see government's intention to fund a Task Force on agriculture, Mr. Speaker. I believe it is an area in which we should become more self-sufficient, and one with considerable potential for employment creation. I would suggest that we consider including forestry in the mandate, since it is an area with similar potential.

While there may be scope for further efficiencies in the delivery of public services, our electors do not want significant cuts, and in present circumstances there is a consensus for financing increasing costs through taxes rather than borrowing. Unfortunately, such a choice proves more costly to some taxpayers than to others, and the displeasure of those most negatively affected is understandable. The 10 per cent increase in tuition fees, for example, is unfortunate but probably justified in the circumstances. Perhaps the burden could be eased, however, by ensuring that increased costs could be accommodated through increased loan ceilings for students.

Trying to administer a sales tax

exemption for children's clothing is obviously difficult. Since the cost of such clothing comes out of the family budget, perhaps we should consider the feasibility of eliminating such exemptions altogether and reducing the sales tax levy across the board to a comparable extent. The previous system was certainly being abused, but we should do all we can to make the new system more equitable.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the new administration has earned a broad consensus of support for the initiatives it has taken to strengthen our financial position, improve the economy and maximize opportunities for our people. But we have to do more than that, and the new government intends to do more.

We have to do everything we can to bring about the kind of change in our political structure, essential if we are to develop our society significantly closer to our potential.

Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are becoming increasingly impatient with the frustrations of Confederation. Our party is committed to ensuring more equitable treatment for our Province. And we are committed to attaining a fair share of the benefits of Confederation, which we all know have been concentrated in Central Canada. Previous administrations have made the case for our Province and they have often been persuasive, but what has been accomplished?

Everyone knows we are the poorest Province. Everyone agrees we have a right to a standard of living enjoyed by other Canadians. But nothing changes, and nothing will ever change as long as Central

Canada is permitted to run this country through its control of the House of Commons. It is Parliament in Ottawa which has legislated regional inequality among Canadians, and it is Parliament which must be changed if we are to achieve our economic potential.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. NOEL:
The Speech from the Throne makes our case, Mr. Speaker. Representation by population is not an acceptable means of ensuring democratic government in a federal system. Special provision must be made to protect the interests of the less populous provinces, and it was made by the Fathers of Confederation who insisted on a Senate in which the regions were equally represented for that purpose. But the Senate has been effectively emasculated in this regard. Confederation would not have occurred if the less populous provinces had foreseen this turn of events. There would be no Canada today if Confederation had done for Ontario and Quebec what it has done for Atlantic Canada.

I enthusiastically endorse the intention of our government to rescind our support of the Meech Lake Accord if the most important constitutional changes we require are not satisfied. The triple E Senate proposal offers the possibility of reducing the control of Central Canada over our affairs to a more acceptable level. It would create a Senate more like that existing in the United States, where the smaller states have equal representation and equal say with the largest before legislation can be passed.

The American Senate has real power, which has impeded the ability of the more populous states to exploit the less populous, helping make industry more competitive and efficient than in Canada, and helping make government serve the needs of its citizens more equitably.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NOEL:

Perhaps that is why the employment rate in the United States today is about half of what it is in Canada, Mr. Speaker - not quite half, but almost.

Now we all know our chances of bringing about the kind of constitutional change we require are not impressive. But our chances of improving the Newfoundland economy without doing so are even less impressive. While we have to keep doing business on a daily basis and keep operating within the existing reality, we have to deal with longer terms objectives as well. There is always the impression that things are improving or are about to improve, that the offshore is on the verge of development, that the fishing industry has a new life, that prosperity is about to be inflicted on us. But the fact is, the opposite has been the case in recent years. We are falling further behind, and we will continue falling behind if we keep playing by a set of rules designed to keep us behind.

Any society which has abundant resources and capable people but finds it self-depressed economically, must realize that its problems are probably political rather than economic.

The eminent Cambridge economist, Joan Robinson, has said, 'All economic questions, except the most trivial, are basically political questions.'

The Economic Council of Canada, in a report issued in 1980 said, 'The low incomes, high unemployment and dependancy on transfers in Newfoundland are unnecessary' - unnecessary, Mr. Speaker. 'The problems are more likely to lie with the socio-economic system than with the natural resources or the numbers of people.' They might have included political with socio-economic, but they chose not to do that. That was an agency of the federal government.

What difference did that report make? What difference do any of the reports make? What difference do any of the programs or agencies or funds make if the will is not there? And the will is not there, in Central Canada. The words are there but not the actions, and, therefore, not the will. If the will were there, why would Ontario have gotten 95 per cent of the new jobs created in Canada in 1986? Why would Atlantic Canada's share of regional development funds have dropped from 56 per cent to 36 per cent, while Ontario's share rose more than 100 per cent in 1987, a year in which it had a \$1 billion budget surplus? Why do half of all job creation expenditures go to Quebec, a province with just one-third of the Canadian population?

Since the Economic Council Report was issued, Newfoundland's share of economic growth fell from 2 per cent to 1.4 per cent. Between 1979 and 1987, Gross Domestic Product increased 96 per cent in Canada, but only 68 per cent in Newfoundland. So what difference

do reports or good intentions or opportunities agencies make? We are constantly falling further behind.

Our people are sick of living on promises, Mr. Speaker. They want action! They do not want comparisons with how life was forty years ago, before Confederation. Most of the developed world is much better off today than it was forty years ago. Japan and Germany were devastated when we joined Confederation. Perhaps that indicates a solution to our problems, Mr. Speaker. I would not be surprised but a lot of Newfoundlanders will be tempted to declare war on the mainland if things do not change soon. We are tired of the role of Sisyphus, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:
What?

MR. NOEL:
Sisyphus, condemned forever to roll a stone up a slope only to see it fall back again after reaching the top and having the process begin all over. Our people are tired of rolling stones and filling holes and all of the other nonsense dreamed up by the occupational therapists in Ottawa.

Who knows what the true level of unemployment is in our Province, Mr. Speaker? According to Statistics Canada, last April about 42,000 people were out of work, some 15 per cent of the labour force. Those figures were only based on a survey. If you include those who have given up looking for work, those waiting for recall, able-bodied social services recipients and others, the unemployment rate goes up over 30 per cent. We have 2 per cent

of the population, over 4 per cent of the unemployed, and 24 per cent of Canada's discouraged workers. While Statistics Canada has said we had 42,000 people unemployed this past April, more than 99,000 received unemployment benefits in that month. That indicates 44 per cent of our estimated labour force of 223,000 were actually unemployed. But the size of the labour force is being very seriously underestimated, which is probably what makes the official unemployment rate look much better than the reality.

We have less than 200,000 people employed in our Province today, Mr. Speaker. According to a report produced last July by the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, we need 70,000 more permanent jobs to bring our employment and economic figures up to the national average, and they predicted that between then and 1995, only 18,000 more new jobs would be created, including 1,000 permanent and 1,400 construction jobs likely to be generated by the Hibernia development.

The jobs we need, Mr. Speaker, will never materialize in the absence of radical change in the manner in which Canada is governed. The confederation we have known has only enabled us to increase our earned income per capita from some 49 per cent of the Canadian average in 1949, to about 55 per cent today. In May of this year, the unemployment rate was 3.8 per cent in Toronto, 5.6 per cent in Ottawa-Hull, 9.1 per cent in St. John's, and 19 per cent in rural Newfoundland, even by federal government estimates. Our gross domestic product per capita in 1988 was 58.2 per cent of the national average, up only 1 per cent from 1980, while the

average for the Maritimes climbed from 63.5 per cent to 68.6 per cent. And Canada has not shown itself to be a country in which much is done to narrow the gap between the have-nots and the rest of society.

Whatever the solutions to the economic development problems of Newfoundland and Labrador may be, Mr. Speaker, the existing system is not working. Indeed, that seems to be our fate as Canadians, not working. Speaking recently, appealing for support for his Constitutional Accord, Prime Minister Mulroney said, "The time for generosity and fairness is at hand." But if it is not at hand for Newfoundland, it is not at hand for anyone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NOEL:

Canadians are tired of being fair and generous to Quebec and tired of paying the price for it. Newfoundlanders are not seeking generosity, we want only our legitimate share of the benefits of confederation, and adequate compensation for the cost. It is not a time of fairness to Quebec which is at hand, but a time for fairness in Quebec and in the rest of Central Canada.

I guess we are getting pretty close to the end, are we? A couple of minutes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. NOEL:

Premier Bourassa, the man who walked away from Victoria, warns about the humiliation for Quebecois if Meech Lake is rejected. What is that compared

to the humiliation of hunger and want and the indignity of our people? He will not be fair and generous in hydro negotiations, but he will never miss an opportunity to renegotiate the Confederation Agreement for Quebec any time he sees another chance to squeeze another advantage. Everyone knows he has no intention of yielding any more than he has to on Labrador power development, Meech Lake or no Meech Lake, but that will not stop Quebec from implying that the opposite is the case.

However, this government is not, and Newfoundlanders are not, going to be intimidated by Premier Bourassa.

MR. SIMMS:

Time is up.

MR. NOEL:

As the Prime Minister has said, Mr. Leader of the Opposition Number 2 - is it? - the time for fairness is at hand -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NOEL:

- fairness for the most disadvantaged people in this federation. We will not be honoring our responsibilities as members of this House if we fail to commit ourselves to making political changes essential to economic progress and social integrity for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker, in my very short time as a member of this House I think I already have one record to my credit, and it is not one I would willingly have chosen. The last time I rose to speak, I think it was in reply to the Throne Speech, there were exactly four minutes on the clock and, therefore, I have the record of having made the shortest maiden speech in the history of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:

Now, today, because of the order of speaking, I find myself again rising with, I think, six or seven minutes on the clock, so I think I will have another record and that will be a three part maiden speech, because I will have to continue tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, even though this is not strictly my maiden speech, I would beg the indulgence of the House, as the other new members have done, to speak a little about the district which I represent, St. John's East, and a little about some of my own concerns as a member of this House of Assembly, before dealing more directly with the issues of the budget which is currently under debate.

Over the past few weeks, I have heard many of the newer members - I pause for a change of Speakers, with difference to the Chair.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You do not have to.

MS DUFF:

I do not have to? Okay.

The newer members have been speaking with a great deal of pride and with a great deal of concern about their districts and about the concerns of the people they represent. I would like to congratulate them, not the least the most recent speaker, Mr. Noel, on their eloquence and the way in which they have brought their districts alive to the other members of this House. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that as the newly elected member for St. John's East, I am no less proud of my district. It is the oldest corner of the oldest community in this Province. It was visited in the 15th century by fishermen from the European nations, and settled first by the servants of the great West county plantations, who clustered around the East End of St. John's harbour.

It is one of the most varied districts in the entire Province. Most members are familiar, at least in a passing way, with the city of St. John's because the House of Assembly happens to be located here. That is an advantage, because not all of us have visited all fifty-two districts of this Province. But I think many people see St. John's as a community with a city face, when, in fact, it is a community of many faces, and there are none so varied within the city as the district of St. John's East.

I have in my district two fishing villages, two of the oldest fishing villages in the whole Province, the Battery and Quidi Vidi Village. There is a fish plant in Quidi Vidi Village which, unfortunately, has been closed for the past two years because of lack

of funding to make necessary repairs. What this has done is it has meant, first of all, the loss of forty part-time jobs in the fish plant, and also that the fishermen there, who land well over two million pounds of fish a year, have to truck that fish to Bay Bulls or to other plants around the Province. They would very much like to see that plant re-open.

I also encompass the district of Pleasantville. As the previous speaker is from Pleasantville, I have a difficult time, sometimes, convincing my constituents that they are voting for me and for the member for Pleasantville. In this whole entire area, which was a former American forces base, there is all apartments. It also contains the Janeway Hospital, the only children's hospital in the whole Province. In those apartments, there are many senior citizens. In fact, there is a senior citizens home, there are also government workers, and social service recipients, but all of them are people who, for one reason or another, are renting accommodation and certainly do not have a great deal of affluence.

Coming up from the harbour of St. John's is perhaps the area that is most characteristic of the city, the old part of St. John's, the 19th century harbour town with the tightly built wooden houses and the narrow streets, which formerly were the houses of the working class people of St. John's but now are, perhaps, the most mixed neighbourhood you would ever want to find. That is where the students and the artists live. It is also where university professors and others have renovated historic properties into some very fine homes, but amongst

all of that you also have some of the poorest people in the entire Province, and urban poverty has a very cruel and lonely face. In that part of St. John's and in some of the areas West of the Basilica, you have the boarding houses and the rooming houses where the winos and the ex-psychiatric patients, who have no family and friends to turn to, live. It is where you have your transition home for battered wives, your mother-led families, and your aging poor. And these are the most vulnerable and fragile people in our society, the people who are most likely to be hurt by cuts in social services and the failure to find adequate social support programs.

In other parts of my district there are suburb and subdivisions, some of them dating from the 1960s and very similar to the type of housing the previous speaker referred to, but, also, some of the newer subdivisions where some of the most affluent people live. So the district is totally varied in the concerns of its people. It also contains the highest proportion of historic buildings in the entire Province: the major churches of all denominations, the oldest business premises still standing in our Province and, because of that, it has tremendous potential as a tourism destination.

Mr. Speaker, I am also very proud not only to represent St. John's East - I am keeping my eye on the clock, and I think, perhaps, because it is one minute to, it might be wiser, before I get into a fuller flight here, to simply adjourn the debate, having introduced you to my district, and deal with some of the other concerns tomorrow.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A couple of announcements. First of all the Committees: The Committee meeting for tonight has been rescheduled. I announce that for hon. members. Tuesday, at 9:00 a.m., the Government Services Committee will meet in the House to examine the Estimates of the Department of Works, Services and Transportation. Tuesday, at 7:00 p.m., the Social Services Committee will meet in the House to examine the Estimates of the Department of Social Services. Wednesday the Resource Committee will meet at 9:00 a.m. in the House to examine the Estimates of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture.

This is just some advance notice.

In terms of Wednesday, there was an agreement between Government and Opposition that the particular resolution to be discussed on Private Member's Day would be announced on Wednesday - I am trying to find it here now. No. 13, by the member for Harbour Main, is the resolution that will be debated on Wednesday.

MR. SIMMS:

I just want to make a comment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House

Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to make a comment on the Estimates Committee. In all fairness, we have been very co-operative I think thus far. But I recall the days when I was on that side, in the member's position, and if we made the slightest correction or change in the Estimates Committee schedule, there would be strips torn off us from here to Corner Brook.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I can hear Roger Simmons now.

MR. SIMMS:

The only comment I want to make is this: I understand the meeting tonight has been postponed, and I gather there is a special Cabinet meeting called, or something of that nature. But, quite frankly, we were always told, in our day at least, that we had a responsibility to the House and if a minister's estimates were on and there was a Cabinet meeting on, then that minister should appear before the Estimates Committee. It is a bit late to say that now because you have already made the change, but I think if anything is planned like that in the next few days, you might want to consider that rather than lose a whole day or a whole night, or whatever, at meetings.

The other thing is, with respect to changes, that I understand there was a plan to have Education on tomorrow night. Obviously they spent some time on that so we have been able to change that so that Social Services is on tomorrow night as well.

I just want to suggest to the

Government House Leader that he should perhaps work a little harder at getting his House in order so that, for example, I do not have to try and explain all these changes to members on our side, and why they are occurring at the last minute. I just make that comment. I do not want to be too nasty.

adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 20, 1989, at 2:00 p.m.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:
I do not intend to be nasty. I say to the Opposition House Leader, the Committee schedule has been proceeding fairly smoothly. We have tried not to have too meetings on at the same time so that we can accommodate everybody that way.

There are, and there will be, occasions when there will have to be changes and I will try to notify the Opposition House Leader as soon as I am aware of these changes. There have been some incidences in terms of the scheduling where there have been requests on both sides, and we have managed to work things out pretty well so far.

I have tried to announce the committees well ahead of time, as far as possible, so that all members of the House are well informed, and I will continue to do so in the manner that I have been doing it.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 2:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising

Index

Answers to Questions

— tabled

June 19, 1989

Answer to question # 23 appearing in Order Paper dated June 14, 1989

DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND LABOUR RELATIONS
TRAVEL EXPENDITURE FOR MINISTER'S OFFICE
SINCE MAY 5, 1989

May 23/89	Standing Travel Advance		\$1,000.00
May 23/89	Travel to PEI for meetings with Minister responsible for the Status of Women (PEI) accompanied by Ms. Catherine Gogan, A.D.M. Employment and Career Support Services		
Air Fare	St. John's -P.E.I. P.E.I. - St. John's		564.00
Travel Claim	Hotel Accommodations	72.60	
	Airport Parking	6.00	
	Telephone	42.33	
	Meals 2 @ \$55	<u>110.00</u>	
	Total		230.93
June 5/89	Entertainment		79.14
Travel Claim	People in attendance:		
	Honourable P.A. Cowan		
	Roger Grimes (Premier's Office)		
	Keith Coombs (NTA)		
	Wayne Russell (NTA)		

Answer to question # 23 appearing in Order Paper dated June 14, 1989

DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND LABOUR RELATIONS
TRAVEL EXPENDITURE FOR CATHERINE GOGAN
A.D.M. OF EMPLOYMENT AND CAREER SUPPORT SERVICES
SINCE MAY 5, 1989

May 23, 1989

Accompanied the Minister of Employment
and Labour Relations to attend Status
of Women - First Ministers Conference
in P.E.I.

Air Fare

St. John's - P.E.I.
P.E.I. - St. John's

\$564.00

Travel Claim

Hotel Accommodations \$72.60
Taxi Service 27.00
Meals 69.00

Total

\$168.60

QUESTION # 16, ORDER PAPER # 11, JUNE 14, 1989

Mr. Simms (Grand Falls) to ask the Honourable the Minister of Environment & Lands -

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.

RESPONSE

There were no expenditures for office, personal equipment, furnishings or photographs purchased for the Minister's Office since May 5/89.

QUESTION # 34, order paper 3 11, JUNE 14, 1989

Mr. Simms (Grand Falls) to ask the Honourable the Minister of Environment & Lands - 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.

RESPONSE

Itemized list of travel expenditures incurred by the Minister since May 5, 1989:

May 21-22, 1989 - St. John's to Goose Bay - To meet
Concerned Citizens Group regarding
Park situation - \$526.00 (airfare)

June 11, 1989 - Corner Brook - Symposium of the
Environmental Conference Committee of
Western Newfoundland

- \$1,760.00 - Charter - Goose Bay to Deer Lake
192.10 - Commercial - Deer Lake to St. John's
15.00 - Meal

\$1,967.10

The Minister was not accompanied by any member of his staff.

Handled *Transmitted by the Premier's Office*

ANSWER TO QUESTION #4 (Order Paper 11/89)

As asked by Mr. Len Simms, M.H.A. (Grand Falls) for the Premier to provide:

An Itemized list of expenditures for any office equipment, personal equipment, furnishings and photographs for the Premier's Office since May 5, 1989.

	<u>Cost Including RST</u>
1. Office of the Premier	\$ nil
2. Executive Support	\$ nil
3. Administration:	
a) Shredder (ordered by previous Administration)	\$ 2,703.68
b) Two (2) IBM typewriters	2,004.80
c) Computer Table	757.12
d) Sixty 3x5" b/w photographs of Hon. Clyde K. Wells from Lane Photographic	168.00
e) 100 8x10" b/w photographs for Hon. Clyde K. Wells from Lane Photographic	880.32
f) Binding system	565.60
g) Typewriter table	119.00
h) Coat tree	<u>\$ 75.00</u>
TOTAL EXPENSES INCURRED	<u>\$ 7,273.12</u>

ANSWER TO QUESTION #20 (Order Paper 11/89)

As Asked By Mr. Len Simms, M.H.A. (Grand Falls) for the Premier to provide:

An itemized list of travel expenditure incurred by the Premier, Executive Assistants or any other member of the Premier's personal staff, as well as expenditures for any other staff of the Premier's Office who may have accompanied the Premier, since May 5, 1989.

OFFICE OF THE PREMIER

To attend meetings of Eastern Canadian Premiers and New England Governors, held at Montebello, Quebec, June 8-9, 1989:

Air Travel (St. John's-Montreal-Return)

Premier	\$	714.00
Mrs. Wells		490.85

Accommodation (Chateau Montebello)

Premier and Mrs. Wells	537.50
------------------------------	--------

Meals (other than those provided by Conference)

Mrs. Wells (breakfast, June 8)	7.98
Mrs. Wells (lunch, June 8)	8.80

Miscellaneous Items for Hotel Room

Snacks, refreshments	39.60
----------------------------	-------

<u>Telephone</u>	<u>55.21</u>
------------------------	--------------

TOTAL EXPENSES INCURRED BY OFFICE OF PREMIER ..	<u>\$ 1,853.94</u>
---	--------------------

EXECUTIVE SUPPORT, Office of the Premier

1. Robert Dornan, Executive Assistant (St. John's)

Expenses incurred to attend meetings of Eastern Canadian Premiers and New England Governors, held at Montebello, Quebec, June 8-9, 1989:

Air Travel (St. John's-Montreal-Return) ..	\$	714.00
Accommodation (Chateau Montebello)		299.26
Telephone		<u>44.50</u>

TOTAL EXPENSES INCURRED BY ROBERT DORNAN

	\$	<u>1,057.76</u>
--	----	-----------------

2. Edward Joyce, Executive Assistant (Corner Brook)

Expenses incurred to attend meetings of Executive/Special Assistants/Departmental Personnel in St. John's, May 31-June 2, 1989:

Air Travel (Deer Lake-St.John's-Return) ..	\$	360.00
Accommodations and Per Diem		219.00
Taxi		5.00
Meals		36.00

Constituency Travel:

Travel to Gilliams, May 16		14.62
Travel to Benoit's Cove, May 18		6.75
Travel to Meadows, May 29		3.50
Travel to Cox's Cove, June 10	\$	<u>12.50</u>

TOTAL EXPENSES INCURRED BY EDWARD JOYCE

	\$	<u>677.37</u>
--	----	---------------

Answer to question # 17 appearing in Order Paper dated June 14, 1989.

DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND LABOUR RELATIONS
EXPENDITURE FOR MINISTER'S OFFICE
SINCE MAY 5, 1989

OFFICE EQUIPMENT:

May 15/89	Photocopier	\$1,400.00
	Total	\$1,400.00

PERSONAL:

May 15/89	Lapel Pins	280.00
May 24/89	Variety of Floor Plants	174.00
June 2/89	"For Your Information" Cards (300)	70.00
June 2/89	Business Cards (300)	70.00
June 2/89	"With The Compliments Of" Cards (300)	70.00
	Total	\$664.00