



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 44

---

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

*Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush*

Thursday

[Preliminary Transcript]  
[Preliminary Transcript]

30 November 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):  
Order, please!

MR. HEWLETT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

L40, Hansard, remarks made by myself are attributed to Mr. Dumaresque. I think that should be corrected. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:  
It is corrected.

The hon. the Member for Eagle River.

MR. DUMARESQUE:  
Mr. Speaker, Page L40, of yesterday's Hansard, I would like to ask for a point of clarification from the hon. the Leader of the Opposition who points out, 'this is the same hon. gentleman who, four and a half or five years ago, was going from one end of Labrador to the other promoting Labrador separatism.' At the time it was said yesterday, I thought he was talking about another hon. Member of the House and I did not rise to get any kind of clarification. I would like to take this opportunity to see if the hon. member was indicating my activity. If so, I certainly would have a response to that.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, if he so chooses to speak. I am not sure we are on a point of order.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I do not know if it was a point of order, a point of privilege, or what, but the answer to the question, Mr. Speaker, is I was referring to the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Eagle River.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
What is your point? Is it a point of order, a point of privilege, or what?

MR. DUMARESQUE:  
A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Obviously, this is a very serious issue. I have at no point in my political career, nor at any point, has there ever been a public statement attributed to me. Certainly, I was never a part of any activity or any party that advocated Labrador separatism. I certainly am a Labrador nationalist, Mr. Speaker, and I will continue to speak on behalf of the people of Labrador, particularly the people of Eagle River, as strongly, and as forcefully and as aggressively as I can, but I will always do it constructively, from within the Liberal Party. I find it very offensive that another hon. gentleman of this House, especially the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, would insinuate that I have been actively advocating separatism for Labrador. Certainly if the hon. gentleman has evidence of same, I would appreciate it if he would table it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Obviously the point raised by the hon. gentleman is not a point of privilege, he is taking an opportunity not within the rules of the House, but under the guise of the rules of the House to explain that he has a different viewpoint from one I raised in the House yesterday.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I accept obviously, as I must, what the hon. gentleman says, but my information is that the hon. gentleman has in the past been a proponent of Labrador separatism. Now, Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for saying that in this House. If it is not correct, then it is not correct, and I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. But the fact in the matter is, that is the information I have.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To that point of privilege, it is up to Your Honour to rule whether a prima facie case has been established or not. However, a couple of interesting points were raised. First of all, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition talks about his information. I suppose if he has information he is perfectly within his right to table the information and to indicate that what he is saying in fact does come from information. Because the interesting point that

is raised in this whole discussion, Mr. Speaker, is the tendency of hon. Members to get up and, because of the immunity of the House, say things and make statements that may not be backed up by facts. This has happened quite often, and I think it is a serious matter that somehow we have to deal with, whether through points of privilege or some other way.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is clear it is not a point of privilege. Beauchesne clearly says in paragraph 31, "A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege." Even the Government House Leader nods and acknowledges that. The Member has taken an opportunity to defend his position. That is all he has done, and it has happened before in the House on many occasions. Whether the facts are correct, that will be for others to judge. But, I mean, certainly the Leader of the Opposition would have difficulty tabling information provided to him verbally. That is not even possible. So if the Government House Leader makes that suggestion, that is a bit ludicrous. 'He has heard', is what he said, 'that the Member is a Labrador nationalist, and that the Member advocated separatism.' So what?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

He says no. And to somehow suggest that Members would use immunity in the House to make that kind of statement - I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would have no hesitation in making the same statement outside the House. That is not the kind of question you are talking about, covered by immunity. There is no point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair will consider it and rule on it before the day is out. However, I do want to say that at the moment I am inclined to think that it is not a point of privilege but it is a point of clarification. But the Chair will study it further and will make a decision before the day is out.

#### Statements by Ministers

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I am pleased to inform this hon. House of my Department's plans to reduce commercial ferry rates on the Province's intraprovincial ferry system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, my friends.

Commercial ferry rates will be reduced as of Friday, December 1.

For example, the present cost of transporting a 10 metre vehicle one way from Burgeo to Ramea is \$63.10. As of December 1 this will be reduced to \$50.

I am optimistic this reduction will result in some cost benefit to consumers who depend on the intraprovincial ferry system. With this in mind, my Department will conduct a review following the implementation of the rate reduction to see if consumers are indeed benefitting. The results of this review will determine whether further rate decreases are justified.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the House that this is the second reduction in ferry rates announced in recent weeks. On October 1 we began the reduction of non-commercial rates for passengers and vehicles on the intraprovincial ferry service, to bring those rates in line with equivalent road travel.

Again, Mr. Speaker, an example of this Government's commitment to rural Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I want to thank the hon. Minister for providing me with a copy of his statement in advance.

Mr. Speaker, this is again some good news for rural Newfoundland, certainly for people who depend on the ferry service in this Province. But it is also another

broken promise from the Liberal Government, who said they would eliminate, or at least make ferry rate the same as it would be for road travel in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, they are there seven or eight months now, and this is a Cabinet decision which could have been done in the first five minutes they sat in Cabinet. They could have changed that immediately.

The distance between Burgeo and Ramea certainly does not dictate that it would cost you fifty dollars to travel that distance by road, Mr. Speaker.

Also, Mr. Speaker, while we are speaking about ferry services in this Province, the people in Petit Forté will be very disappointed that they have to continue with the ferry service because the hon. Minister scuttled the road they were supposed to get.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. WINDSOR:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Development. In 1980, Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of introducing in this House legislation putting into effect the provincial preference policy which has had a tremendous measure

of success in this Province, and has been very beneficial to the manufacturers in this Province, particularly.

The question to the Minister is, would he give us an update on that particular policy and the success of that program over the past year, and would he confirm Government's policy that will reaffirm the provincial preference policy as it stands.

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

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, this is a Party that supported Free Trade and all of the ramifications that go along with Free Trade. With respect to the local preference policy, this Government, Mr. Speaker, since we assumed power, is reviewing every single thing that has been done in the past by the previous Government. That which has worked right in our opinion and in our judgement, will be kept. That which has not worked will be thrown out, as it ought to be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:  
Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I thank the Minister for that information. He has confirmed that provincial preference policy is indeed in jeopardy, and manufacturers and businesspeople in this Province, indeed, certainly will not be pleased to hear that.

Can I ask the Minister his policy,

or the Government's policy, as it relates to foreign investment; particularly, funds that are coming into Canada from the east, from Hong Kong, these types of funds? What is the Government's policy in attracting new investment into the Province, and will the Minister protect existing local industry from this? Will he ensure, in other words, that local industry is not displaced by foreign investment, or by funding under ACOA programs, or offshore development fund programs or other funds of that nature, that local industry will be protected and that incentives will not be put in place which are to the detriment of existing industry and existing jobs?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member is twisting my words with his first statement. I did not say that the local preference policy is in jeopardy. I said this Government is reviewing the local preference policy and the 15 per cent buffer that is currently in place under that provision to see if it is working out properly.

With respect to foreign investment, when we came to power we discovered an economic climate, Mr. Speaker, that was in absolute shambles.

In order to generate jobs and in order to bring this economy up on its feet and get it working, it will require a very focused effort, Mr. Speaker, to bring in foreign capital, new wealth to help us in industries that require that help.

I think the second part of the Member's question was, Will we be introducing new capital into the marketplace to hurt existing industries? That is not the intention of this Government at all. We want to welcome foreign capital. We want to tell the rest of the country and the world at large that Newfoundland and Labrador is a good place to invest and we welcome all foreign capital into this Province to get existing industries functioning even better, and to generate new industries and jobs for our people.

With respect to the Asian markets, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the House that I had a very successful visit with twenty-five businesses from this Province, in Hong Kong in particular; for reasons which we all know, I could not carry on to Taiwan, where there is a great pool of capital that wants to be invested in North America, as well. But I could not go to that country.

With respect to Hong Kong, we did go over there. I spoke to the Chamber of Commerce. I asked them to promote Newfoundland and Labrador as a good destination for foreign wealth.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Business Immigration Program, it is a very good program. Newfoundland and Labrador is on tier one, which requires that anybody who has a net worth value of \$500,000 and wants to contribute \$150,000 in new capital into this Province can do so. We currently have \$80 million on the books, some of it invested. St. Christopher's Resort is a good example of Asian capital coming into the Newfoundland marketplace, married to local capital, creating wealth, promoting the tourism

industry and creating jobs for our Province. Will I continue to do that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BAKER:  
Yes!

MR. FUREY:  
Indeed, I will!

MR. WINDSOR:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would indeed encourage the Minister to continue to do that. I remind him that I led the first trade mission to Hong Kong and Japan in 1984. We do, indeed, need investment capital, but I am concerned about examples we have now where capital from Asia has already closed up local industry in this Province. I am concerned about the Government's lack of provincial preference. The Minister may not have said that the provincial preference program is in jeopardy, but he certainly did not confirm that it is not.

In view of the Premier's statement at the Atlantic Premiers' Conference saying that they are going to review and perhaps change the provincial preference policy, and the Premier's haste to jump in bed with the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council and to remove interprovincial trade barriers, will the Minister now confirm that there is going to be, indeed, a preference policy in this Province to protect local industry, and will he ensure that foreign investment is invested in the right way and that no further industries are lost in this

Province as a result of their investment policies?

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the hon. member is getting so excited. I simply said, given the global context, the national context and all the ramifications of local preference in the environment of trade that we find ourselves in, we are reviewing that. Now, if you want to inflame that and put words in my mouth, that is entirely up to the hon. member. But I will say this, Mr. Speaker, this new Government is not sending the signal to the private sector in this Province that you ought to be afraid to compete. We can compete with the best of them and we are very proud of local business in this Province.

Will I continue to work diligently, as I have and as this new Government has, to attract foreign investment to this Province? Absolutely. Will I promote joint venture with local industry? Absolutely. Are we afraid of foreign capital? No, we are not. We welcome it to this Province, and we do not think the business community of Newfoundland and Labrador has anything to be ashamed of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WINSOR:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WINSOR:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. On June 5 I asked

the Minister a question with respect to the ferry Beaumont Hamel as it relates to its suitability for winter crossings. I indicated the ferry was probably unsuitable and the Minister responded by saying, 'As to the question from the hon. the member for Fogo, he might think the Beaumont Hamel has now been proven not to be satisfactory in winter, but my officials have not really confirmed that. They are still doing an investigation and I will let him know in due course.' My question to the Minister then is, What was the result of his official's investigation?

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

MR. GILBERT:  
The member poses an interesting question. I will point out that it was the Government he represents on the Tory side of the House that had that ferry built. With all the engineering technology that was at their command, they built that ferry and put it down there. As I understand from my officials tell me, it is not ideal to work in the heavy ice conditions that are encountered on the Fogo run and for that reason we are investigating other alternatives. I will be acquainting the people of the Province with our plans as to the continuation of the ferry service and the extension of the ferry service, within the not too distant future, sooner rather than later.

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

MR. WINSOR:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think that is the same answer I got last June. My supplementary then to the Minister is, the Minister's officials have been conducting a study on transportation as it relates to Fogo Island. As the Minister has had the report for some weeks now, will the Minister tell this House what the findings were and will he table the report in the House?

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

MR. GILBERT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for Fogo is privy to some information that I am not. There is no final decision made on the ferry system in Newfoundland nor in Fogo. I think he is now unduly trying to cast some blame on officials for releasing information which he does not have, because the information does not exist. We are studying the overall ferry transportation system in the Province, and unlike the previous Government, we are going to make sure that when we institute a policy and make a decision it is going to be for the benefit of the people who are using that service, not some slaphappy arrangement that is done for the short-term, the type of band-aid service you got from the Tory side of the House when (inaudible).

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

MR. WINSOR:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I find the Minister's response amusing, to say the least, since I was in his office when the Deputy Minister asked him if he read the



study he had already completed (inaudible), to which the Minister replied he had been busy and had not had a chance to look at it yet, but he would.

Will the Minister now tell this House what his plans are for winter transportation on Fogo Island? Will it be one boat serving Change Islands and Fogo Island, or will each Island have its own ferry?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I find the Member's question a little amusing because there is no decision made on any ferry for Fogo Island, and the report is not completed to my knowledge. I can assure you that any report that I have, when I get it I am able to read it and I am able to make a decision on it, and it will be for the benefit of the people of Fogo, unlike the Member over there who is getting up asking frivolous questions that have no meaning.

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to the Minister of Health.

Now, I know the Minister is aware of the very serious concerns of the professional health people in the Province and of the Canadian Public Health Association, about a dramatic increase in the incidents of sexually transmitted diseases

amongst our adolescent population. I know the Minister is also aware of the results of the National Youth and AIDS Study, which shows us very alarming incidents of sexual promiscuity in our adolescent population.

Would the Minister agree that we are facing a very serious public health crisis, which requires aggressive action by his Department? What new initiatives have been taken by this Minister since he took office? Or, what new initiatives are being considered to deal with this problem before we are faced with a full-scale epidemic amongst our teenagers?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am always amazed at the sense of panic, sense of urgency the hon. Member brings to something. You would never know that her Party was in power seventeen years. In the last seven months, we have had a major outbreak of sexually transmitted diseases.

Mr. Speaker, the question is certainly appropriate, tomorrow being International World Aids Day, as the hon. Member knows. The answer to her question is very simple. It is a matter of education. We cannot stop people from engaging in what might be a sort of dangerous life-style, but the Department in this year did do some education, especially with emphasis on AIDS. The hon. Member will know that the high-risk group now is the bi-sexual teenager. That is where we foresee a lot of problems, and that is where we are trying to direct a lot of our educational programs. We are

developing an educational program which we are hoping in the New Year to go in with even heavier.

We are confident, Mr. Speaker, that the gay community in Newfoundland and Labrador are reasonably well knowledgeable about sexually transmitted diseases. It seems like they are educated enough to practice a safe life-style, whereby the sexually transmitted disease will not be passed on. But there is a problem, as the hon. Member points out. There seems to be a problem with the teenager. I have some statistics in front of me which I could make available to the hon. Member, if she wants to read them.

But the answer is education. The answer is not panic. There is no epidemic. I would ask the Member not to go on with that foolishness of panicking and epidemics and trying to get the people all outraged. We have only been in power seven months. There were seventeen years when her Government did nothing about it. We will get around to it very soon.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to express my very serious disappointment with this Minister who thought the question was a joke and gave me his answer with a very large laugh on his face.

I can assure you that as a former health professional, I do not raise questions to cause panic, nor do I ever raise them until I have checked with reputable health professionals. I have checked with the most knowledgeable people in this Province and nationally

about this concern, and it is a very grave concern. I think the Minister would know that the AIDS crisis in the United States need not have happened, need never have become an epidemic if the public health officials in that country had acted aggressively and responsibly early on; instead of that, we have tens of thousands of people dead and more to die.

In view of the fact that the Minister places his total reliance on education and that efforts to date are certainly not resulting in changed attitudes and behaviour among the teen-age population, has the Minister considered any other initiatives, for instance, a full-scale public information campaign, using the print and electronic media to alert the teen-age population and their parents about the very serious health hazards from promiscuous sexual behaviour and unsafe sexual practices?

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) question.

MS DUFF:

Specific.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member is a former health person as she says she is, I am surprised, then, that she would try to make cheap political points on what is, indeed, a very serious problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MS DUFF:

(Inaudible). You are not fit to be the Minister.

MR. DECKER:

I talked about education, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Member talks about an information campaign. What is an information campaign if it is not education? That is the whole point. That is exactly what we are doing. We are developing an information campaign, which is education. Now, if the hon. Member does not want to call that education, that is her problem, not mine. Information, television, that is education.

Now, the Department of Health and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

Maybe we should change the structure of Question Period. If hon. Members are not happy with the question asked, maybe we could have an arrangement where four or five ask the question at the same time.

Hon. Members know that one question has been asked. It has been the habit of people to repeat the question and to ask questions while the hon. Minister is answering. I would ask, please, that we refrain from that and that the hon. Minister do justice to the question that was asked.

The hon. the Minister.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I pointed out, we did start an education program. It was in the Budget this year. Work is being done on it. The media campaigns she is talking about, all these

things are under consideration. Some of them have been acted on. We are working in close co-operation with the Federal Government to take advantage of some of their educational information campaigns. These things are all being done, Mr. Speaker.

Now, neither the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador nor the Government of Canada, no Government on this earth, has the authority to stop people from engaging in sexual activity. I am not sure it would be a wise decision if we did have that authority. We have to educate people, if they are going to engage in sexual activity, to practice safe sex, Mr. Speaker, and that involves education, which the hon. Member wants to call an information campaign. Well, so be it. I will retract education and call it an information campaign, if that will satisfy her.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MS DUFF:

The education campaign is alright as far as it goes, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is well-known that one of the problems is that some of the material that has already been prepared is sitting in teachers' rooms because the teachers themselves do not feel competent to deal with this issue in the classroom, and that campaign is not reaching the parents. We have in this Province, children as early as the age of fourteen engaged with multiple sexual partners, with grave, grave consequences.

I would like to know if this Minister, who has admitted that it

is impossible for Governments to stop people from being sexually active, and that it would not be a good thing if, in fact, we did, whether the Minister has considered the recommendation of the Canadian Public Health Association for placing condom vending machines in publicly-owned buildings in order to provide access to prevention for those people who, despite the best educational efforts, refuse to stop engaging in promiscuous sexual practices? If the Minister has considered that recommendation, I would like to know if, in fact, he has had any discussion with his colleague, the Minister of Works and Services, on this, and what his response has been to the Canadian Public Health Association.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, in the first part of the hon. Member's question she refers again to education in the classroom. She still has it in her mind that the only education that takes place is in the classroom. She referred to teachers who will not make the information available. Now, I will tell the hon. Member that education is not confined to the classroom. Education is the media. Education is the various information campaigns, so let us not let her get bogged down. It is not because the Department of Health is not out in the classrooms teaching the facts about the transmission of sexual diseases that no education is taking place. Let us broaden her horizons. We have to look at this on a wider scale.

The second part of her question,

Mr. Speaker, refers to the condom vending machines in public buildings. The answer to that is, yes. I met with a group not too long ago who made that very request. It is being actively considered by the Department of Health, members who know the process, it is one of the considerations. That is not to say that tomorrow we are going to do it, but it is being considered. Now, when you consider it, Mr. Speaker, we have to ask about the availability of condoms. Condoms are available in drug stores and in convenience stores throughout the Province. They are very readily available in every single part of Newfoundland and Labrador. They are available everywhere.

MR. SIMMS:

They are not sold in convenience stores.

MR. DECKER:

In some convenience stores, yes, I tell the hon. Opposition House Leader.

AN HON. MEMBER:

In all of them?

MR. DECKER:

I cannot say all of them, but they are available. Now, is it necessary to put the condom vending machines in public buildings? It is being considered. That is all I can say. We might do it, and we might not do it.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, the hon. gentleman who last year did not know a MC existed and this year does not know a report exists.

Mr. Speaker, it was with disgust, disappointment, and indeed disbelief, that I read in a local paper the other day that the Minister said it was wrong to construct a road to the residents of Petit Forte. The people of Petit Forte and South East Bight are hard-working, independent and successful fishermen. The people who live in isolated communities in Placentia Bay.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who do not want to leave.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, despite the fact that the Premier was part of a Government in the 60s that tried to resettle them and they would not accept it.

MR. HOGAN:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I can say to the hon. the Member for Placentia (Mr. Hogan), who is now interrupting, that I will not turn my back on the people of Placentia Bay like he has done since April.

These people in isolated communities have the same right to be treated the same as any other people in this Province. Let me ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, if he will apologize to the people of Southeast Bight and Petit Forte for his suggestion that they should not receive the same type of treatment that hundreds of thousands of their fellow Newfoundlanders receive, and that is a road service.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Member for the question. There is no doubt about it, everybody in Newfoundland should be entitled to a road service of some type, but, again, it has to be tempered, Mr. Speaker, to the cost. Here is the situation that we find. What I find unconscionable about the decision the previous Government made concerning putting a road into Petit Forte is this: They agreed and signed an agreement with the Federal Government whereby the Federal Government was going to put twenty-seven kilometers of road into Petit Forte, a community that has 114 people, and in return the Provincial Government was going to maintain that road and then bring it up - it would have to be paved and that down the line - but also provide a ferry service between Petit Forte and South East Bight, which would again cost the Provincial Government another \$300,000 a year.

The thing the Member is forgetting is that in order to do this, the Federal Government presently are operating a ferry service between Argentia, South East Bight and Petit Forte, which is costing the Federal Government \$550,000 a year. Now, by doing this and putting this road in, it is going to mean that in seven years time the Federal Government will be off the hook and the Newfoundland Government will forever be paying \$350,000 to \$400,000 a year to provide this service to Petit Forte.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing I think we should bear in mind here

is that at this point in time we are in the negotiation stage and there has been no decision made, but we have to look at the situation this way, we can possibly provide a much better service for Petit Forte if a ferry service was put in from Baine Harbour to Petit Forte and South East Bight, and the money was spent somewhere else, or the Federal Government maintained the ferry service there. It could be cheaper on the Federal Government than what is going on right now. But I would also point out to the Member who asked the question that there are many communities in Newfoundland which are isolated fishing communities that are contributing to the Provincial economy as much as Petit Forte or South East Bight. And it does not make much more sense to me to see a road to Petit Forte than it would be to take the road from St. Alban's and put it down to MacCallum, MacCallum is a community that has about 350 people. But, in the meantime, it is one of the things I said, and I am quite happy with the statement I made. I think it was unconscionable of that crowd, when they were over here, to commit this Province to spending \$400,000 a year and letting the Federal Government off the hook.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I know the question asked was almost a philosophical one, and the Minister gives us this longer type answer than the Chair would like to see. But the question was rather philosophical, and I would like for the Minister to clue up his answer. On to the question.

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

I think the question was indeed very sociable and economical as it relates to the residents of Petit Forte.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we say to the Minister, the fact of the matter is, there is an amortization taking place here where the Federal Government has taken the money they would spend over many, many years, put it into the construction of a road for Petit Forte, and the Province has been asked to maintain that road. As a caring Government we accepted that proposal from the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, and provided a road to the people of Petit Forte.

MR. HOGAN:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, there is a question. I will ask the question. And I will tell you something, the residents who live in Placentia, in Petit Forte, will be told where you stand on this issue, too.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Works, Service and Transportation is he part and parcel of a plan in that Government to resettle Placentia Bay, under another title? That is what is happening.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) a traitor, too.

MR. GILBERT:

The Member, in his preamble to his

question, talked about the good Federal Government -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I thought I heard the hon. Member refer to a Member as being a traitor?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is not parliamentary, and I ask the hon. Member to withdraw it.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, you are exactly right, I did tell the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation that I believe he is a traitor. And if that is not parliamentary, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now to get back to the question. We have no intention of instituting a resettlement program for any community in Newfoundland. Our aim in this Government is to improve the lot of rural Newfoundland and make sure it is a better place for them all to live.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

In the Roads for Rail Agreement there is \$500,000 included for this proposal. This is a separate ERDA agreement -

PREMIER WELLS:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Oh, yes, Premier, there is. Do not shake your head and say no. There is. I signed it. I know what it is. It is a separate ERDA agreement, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the people.

Mr. Speaker, listen, we on this side of the House are used to telling the truth. Members on that side of the House do not know what the truth means.

Let me say to the Minister that a Government that can put hydro into Pinsent Arm, which we did, and agreed with for several millions of dollars, which was the appropriate thing for forty people; airports, Mr. Speaker, in Williams Harbour for 240 people -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman is up on a third supplementary, and I have not heard the beginning of the question. The beginning of the question begins with an interrogative word, and I have not heard one. So would the Member please start the question.

MR. TOBIN:

Does the Minister know what we put into Pinsent's arm, Mr. Speaker? Let me ask the Minister will he come clean with the people of Petit Forte, will he not forget where he was born in Placentia Bay, like some other people, will he not forget where he was born, Mr. Speaker, and put in Petit Forte and live by the agreement that had been accepted?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, far be it from me to forget that fine community of Haystack in Placentia Bay. I will never do that. And let me tell you, as for the road to Petit Forte, Mr. Speaker, I asked my officials about it when I came there and I looked at it, and I thought it was an unconscionable act that had been done. I asked my officials and they told me the only reason it was put in was because that Member over there insisted it was to be put in, it was purely political, and nothing else.

MR. TOBIN:

I would like to thank the Minister, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is much time left, but I will ask one question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Oh, Question Period has expired.

#### Notices of Motion

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

DR. GIBBONS:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled, "An Act To Amend The Electrical Power Control Act." (Bill No. 54).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled, "An Act Respecting a Pension Plan For Certain Employees In The Province." (Bill No. 52).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Land.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled, "An Act To Revise And Consolidate The Law Respecting The Crown Lands, Public Lands, And Other Lands In The Province." (Bill No. 53).

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Member for Kilbride asked a question about the list for the provincial capital roads project. I now have that list for him, if it is detailed, I could not tell him.

He also asked a question concerning the paving of a short section of the Bareneed Road. So I will give him the explanation for that. Project No. 3989, PHP, included improvements, recapping and paving of approximately 21 kilometers of road in the Harbour Grace and Port de Grave areas. One project included, was the upgrading and paving of 7 kilometers of the Otterbury Road from Route 70 to Ship Cove Road.

During the preconstruction meeting between the contractor



superintendent and the Department's engineers, while performing the initial site inspection, it was determined that a 360 metre section of the Bareneed Road was in poor condition, and it was decided at the time to include this section as an extension to the contract. The extension costing \$23,200 was performed within the guidelines of The Public Tendering Act, which permits a contract of this value, and it was \$2,198,943 to be extended up to 5 per cent, which would be \$109,942. Including this extension the final cost of the contract did not exceed the tendered amount.

In response to specific questions, the work was not on the list, there was no separate tender. It was performed as an extension to the existing contract.

### Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for LaPoile.

MR. RAMSAY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a petition to present, Mr. Speaker, I received it quite some time ago actually. The letter that was written to me was dated the 11th of October, and it had to be returned to the petitioner for the proper wording and proper signatures to be reattached to it. I will read the prayer of the petition first and then the additional parts that make up the body of the petition as well and it states as follows: To the hon. The House of Assembly of Newfoundland in the legislative session convened May 24, 1989, the petition of the undersigned, of

the District of LaPoile, that the parking lot be expanded in Harbour Le Cou to accommodate the automobiles of the people of Petites. Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable House may be pleased to give your full support to this necessary project. And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray and a signature to the effect affixed under the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker. As well, there is a letter which was the original part which I did receive, Mr. Speaker, and I think this should be read into the record as well, and the letter states: Dear Mr. Ramsay, I am writing this letter on behalf of the residents of Petites, in order to express their concerns on a very real and crucial problem facing them. This year residents are confronted with a problem of not having enough access to adequate parking spaces for their vehicles in Harbour Le Cou. At present, some of the residents have been forced to park on the narrow sides of the roads in Harbour Le Cou, because the small community parking lot is constantly full. As a community we depend upon this vital link with Harbour Le Cou. With no ferry service or air transportation, the ground route from Harbour Le Cou to the rest of the Province is an absolute necessity. Residents depend upon this link for purposes of employment, for emergencies and as an access route to supplies and services that are not found in the community itself, such as doctors, banks, gasoline, etcetra. Another concern that goes along with this problem is that if no solution is found, almost immediately the upcoming winter weather will certainly compound our troubles. With vehicles parked as they presently are on the sides of the

road, snow clearing will present some obvious difficulties, including safety hazards. As a concerned community in your District, we are asking you to take positive steps toward rectifying our problems and we would appreciate your time and consideration in this matter. Enclosed you will find a petition containing names supporting these concerns. Please be informed that a copy of this letter and petition have been sent to the following: Hon. Roger Simmons, hon. David Gilbert and hon. Tom Rideout. Sincerely yours, David J. Hodder. And the petitioners then, and I have attached a photo copy, the part of the original part which was sent to me, Mr. Speaker, and under that it says the following have considered seriously the inadequacy of parking in Harbour Le Cou and support the concerns expressed in the preceding letter and therefore wish to voice their discontent. Mr. Speaker, I presented this petition, prior to being presented to the House, to the hon. Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, and he assured me at that time that something would be done and as I understand it, I think, Mr. Speaker, that action is being undertaken at this time. With that, I would like to present the petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It certainly gives me pleasure to rise in the House today in support of this petition, Mr. Speaker. We understand on this side of the House that there are problems created from parking in the area. We do not think it would cost a great deal of money to solve this

problem. There are safety problems, and certainly as stated in the letter from the people, there are going to be very great safety problems again, this winter. So on this side of the House we have no problem in supporting the petition, and we implore the Government, and especially the Minister of Transportation, to undertake to make improvements to the parking lot as necessary, as I believe he has done in his own District some time ago, which I agree with, it is necessary, he should do it and he should do it here also.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very happy to be able to respond to this because as the Member for Kilbride stated, it is a problem in many places in Newfoundland, particularly in one area of my district, Grey River, which unfortunately I have not been able to respond to yet, but if asked the question—. However, as these problems have been ongoing for some time in Newfoundland now, as a matter of fact, it shows that the previous Government had a chance to correct a lot of this over seventeen years, but they did not do much of it. Just to show you how caring this Government is and how we are concerned about the people of rural Newfoundland, as a result of the Member for LaPoile coming to me, and his diligent efforts to work on behalf of his constituents, I was able to ensure that there is going to be a parking lot constructed in Harbour Le Cou and the good people of Petites will have a place to park their cars this winter. It is another example of this

Government's commitment to rural Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

### Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:

Order 10, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Works, Services And Transportation," (Bill No. 33).

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, this is really a Bill to put the Department together. It is an amalgamation. I am sure Members opposite are familiar with this Department, because it is the one they put together, as I understand it. It is the one the civil servants were not involved in, and they had some serious concerns about it. The civil service said it was the previous Government who put this together and it was sort of like a helicopter, a lot of people looked at it and said it would never fly. But I would like to tell you now, Mr. Speaker, that this is flying.

Basically, this Bill is made up of a few small housekeeping items to unite the Department of Public Works and the Department of Transportation. As you know, it is a big Department, one that has two distinct outlooks. You have the Transportation side, which is, I suppose, the extroverts of Government. They are the ones who are dealing with the public all the time. And then you have the Public Works side, who are looking inward. They are the landlords of

Government who perform the government services end of it. I will have more to say about it later, as time dictates, but in the meantime, as I said, it is basically a housekeeping Bill to give the correct title and do the small housekeeping items that are required.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to have a few words on this Bill, and, unlike the Bill which established the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that this Department is too big to manage. I believe this Department is manageable mostly because the Department of Public Works is pretty well self-regulated because of the good policies brought in by the previous Administration, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Over the last ten years, in particular, Mr. Speaker, The Public Tendering Act, has been a great improvement in this Province. The Minister is already jiggling with it, I understand, and I advise him that he should not be tampering with The Public Tendering Act, because it will cause him endless headaches. I understand his first foray with The Public Tendering Act was to let a contract in his District, an electrical contract, I believe, to a constituent of his. In this

Province, by fooling with that Tendering Act, Mr. Speaker, he has created, maybe, an expectation, I am not sure if that could be considered, but certainly confusion among contractors, of whom I have two instances now of a similar problem, of people who did apply for, and were low tenders on contracts, but they did not have their CIU number or CPU number, local preference number is what I always called it, and they were not awarded the contract.

Mr. Speaker, it appears from these two contractors, the contractors who called me, that if you happen to be from the Minister's District and make this mistake, you can get the contract, but if you happen to be from my district, as Rideout Transportation is, they cannot get the \$24,000 contract they were low on, because they did not have their local preference number.

There is another instance of a contractor in this area, Mr. Speaker, who was low tender on snow clearing. He tried to get some meetings with the Minister, to explain the problem he had interpreting the contract. He assumed that the price he was submitting on the contract was a one-year bid with an option for a second year.

Had it been for a one year bid his tender price would have been low enough that he did not require a bid bond, Mr. Speaker. But when the tenders were opened, he was not disqualified for not having a bid bond, Mr. Speaker, but some days later he understood through interference by someone, I do not know who yet, so I will not accuse anyone, but his bid was thrown out because they considered the two year estimate to be over \$25,000 and he did not have his bid bond.

To that contractor, who was quite used to getting bid bonds, it was quite acceptable, he had a bid bond within an hour of when he needed it, Mr. Speaker. But the Minister or the Deputy Minister would not have a look at it. The tender was awarded before he could get to the Minister and plead his case, Mr. Speaker. That to me is an indication that maybe the Minister cannot handle the problem. Maybe it is too big for this Minister, Mr. Speaker, to be able to look after the details that constituents, ordinary Newfoundlanders, small contractors, want to see the Minister, they want to plead their case. If the Minister agrees with the interpretation that the staff has put on it, most of these people would agree with it also. But they want at least to have the time to get to a Minister to plead their case on these types of instances.

Now they will never get to the Minister of Municipal Affairs because he is too busy, but I thought they probably could do with the Minister of Transportation, Mr. Speaker, because the Department is not that big. But obviously from the contact that I have had with these two contractors lately, the Minister either will not give them the time of day, or he just has no interest in dealing with these contractors unless they are from his District. I think the Minister is familiar with one of these cases, maybe he might like to comment on it when he is finishing up the debate on this Department.

Mr. Speaker, I also note in this Department, and I am finding it happening more than it should happen, the Premier and the

Provincial Government now have suggested that there is a fairness and equity in their programs. It appeared, when the list of roads came out first, that they were public service lists and they were not interfered with much.

What I feel, and what I find out vaguely right now, is that yes, the lists were public service lists - there is no doubt about that. They differed from the lists that the public servants gave us, so I wonder why they differ? Was it because they were sent back and the public servants told what to put on the list. Technically yes, it is a public service list, but the public servants were told what should go on the list. I have several instances now, but I have to get some more information on it, that although roads were not on the list, contracts were extended to cover roads, including a road that passes by the former Minister of Social Services house. There is another road in the Bellevue District which has a connection to a Member of the Provincial Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, that was not on the provincial roads list, yet it is paved now. There are other roads in the Province which are being done, not through the tender calls, Mr. Speaker, but by extending contracts which are in the areas that the tenders have been allotted on, Mr. Speaker.

I will be continuing to check this, Mr. Speaker, but as for the reorganization of the Department of Works, Services and Transportation, it should be a manageable Department if they had a competent Minister looking after it. It should be quite manageable.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had not intended to speak on this particular Bill because I did not see the necessity. But there have been several allegations by the press, and by the Opposition recently, on the piece of road that was paved in the Port de Grave District, and I am amazed. I want to say very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that I am not at all ashamed of any pavement done in Port de Grave District, but what I am ashamed of and what disgusts me mostly is that hon. Members will stand in the House of Assembly and they will either make accusations or make statements that have absolutely no foundation to them whatsoever.

Now when I was on the Opposition, I do not think there was a day, I do not think that there was one day that I did not rise to my feet either to have permission to ask a question or ask a question - every single day while the House of Assembly was sitting. But there is one thing I did do before asking a question, I researched any information that was given to me. I researched the information and I asked the question, knowing the answers before I asked the question or made a statement. And there is nobody in this House of Assembly who can dispute that, since 1985, when I was elected to the District of Port de Grave. Now, I want to clear up, and I do not mind, I can take it anytime, I will stand by anything I deal with, I am not always going to do the right thing, but I will stand by any statement or anything I say at any time. But please, when you are making statements in the House

of Assembly, do it with respect - whether it be against me or against anybody else - with truth and honor.

Now, I will say very clearly, and I will go on record, Mr. Speaker, and I will say it very clearly, the Department of Public Works, Service and Transportation, allotted money to the District of Port de Grave last year. The first time there was any paving done in the community of Port de Grave since 1966. 1966 was the first and last time there was any pavement laid in the Port de Grave community - now that is a fact, that is a fact. And in the last four years the road to Otterbury, where there are three fish plants, in the community of Port de Grave. There were three fish plants in that community, and that road to Otterbury leading into the community of Port de Grave was closed by the local Department of Transportation for a period of time because of the road condition, the faulting in the road. When the list was submitted to the Department of Public Works last year, the superintendent of the Department of Transportation called me, because he is a very close friend, and he asked me if there were any roads that I would like to, as MHA, put any preference on. I very straightforwardly answered the gentleman, and I said, you are the superintendent of the Department of Works, Service and Transportation in the District, you know what roads need to be done. You are the man who knows best. Whether they are done in Port de Grave, whether they are done in Brigus or whether they are done in Mackinson's does not make any difference to me. My votes come from all parts of the District, very clearly shown by

almost a 3 thousand vote majority in the last election, and that has no bearing on politics. The need was there, it had to be done. It was done by the superintendent in that particular Department on an absolutely, Mr. Speaker, and I want to go on the record clearly, and I can look any man straight in the face and say that I had absolutely no input into where the money was going to be spent in the District. My only interest was that a bulk of money would go to the District of Port de Grave. The first time in ten years that any money went in that District for any work on roads, except the local road - the main highway going through. But it is the first time in ten years that any community work, was done.

The point is that there was an inaccurate statement made by Members. If you are going to get to your feet and make statements, at least do it with some integrity and some honesty, and then probably the people of the Province will listen to you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to listen to the hon. gentlemen getting up and ranting and raving and trying to defend the indefensible, trying to attack people on this side of the House, let me say to the hon. gentleman -

MR. EFFORD:

I did not attack anybody.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman before I got 'Mr. Speaker' out of my mouth.

Now, let me tell the hon. gentleman that this matter was raised in public and not by anybody on this side of the House. It was not anybody on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, who raised the issue of pavement, taking a detour, and going right in front of the Member's house. That was not raised by any Member on this side of the House. It was raised in a public forum, in a public newspaper in the Province. That is how it was raised. It was not raised in the same way that that hon. gentleman and others raised, for example, the Round Pound Road question two or three years ago, or whenever it was. We did not go and have a press conference and invite the television cameras to come out and take pictures of the piece of new pavement detouring and going across in front of the Member's house. The hon. gentleman need not go ranting and raving and go off his head about something that was not raised by people on this side of the House. We did not raise it. The question was raised by a newspaper in the Province, and not even followed-up on in Question Period here, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It was raised in the House.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I cannot recall. It was not raised initially by anybody on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, for the hon. gentleman to get up and to go ranting and raving against people over here on that particular question just begs the question of what he is up to. Is he guilty or is he not? What is he talking about it for, Mr. Speaker? We did not make an issue out of it, but it is kind of strange. An investigative journalist, I can only conclude,

found it kind of strange that there was a tender let for a piece of work in that District that did not include that piece of work, as the Minister verified here today in an answer.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He blamed it on the superintendent.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Then, as they continue to do in this Government, they do not take responsibility for the Government's actions. They hide behind the skirts of the bureaucracy and have them take the responsibility. Well, Ministerial responsibility means that the Ministers answer in this House, Mr. Speaker. The fact was unearthed by a journalist, not by the Opposition, brought to light by a journalist, that this piece of road was not on the Government list, that it was not tendered, that there was an extension to an existing contract to cover the cost of paving the piece of road in front of the Member's house, that it did not go anywhere else. There was a detour from the Otterbury Road, or the Bareneed Road that was under contract, it was a detour from that, and a journalist found it suspicious, a journalist investigated, and a journalist reported. And, who would not, Mr. Speaker? We all find it suspicious but we are all doing a bit of investigation, or research, as he calls it, and we never made an issue out of it on this side of the House other than raised it on one occasion because we did not have information. We asked the Minister for information and he gave some today. We will have a look at that and we may make more of an issue out of it. For the hon. gentleman to get up and rant and roar, rave and fly off the handle and go off his

head, because a journalist in this Province was doing what he considered to be his work, does not at all add to the debate or to the question.

MR. SIMMS:

Go ahead, close debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the Minister speaks now he closes the debate.

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this as well, as it relates to the Minister's Department.

Mr. Speaker, we have several issues in this Province relating to the way the Minister and his Department have been dealing with the allocations of funding for roads agreements, the allocation of funding throughout the Province, and the way they decided to politically interfere with the operations of roads in this Province. The Minister of Works, Services and Transportation is responsible for the Department of Transportation and therefore the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation must bear the brunt of the decisions that are made. There are a lot of things that are going on in the Department of Transportation these days that are not very encouraging or anything that makes us all very happy in this Province. I want to say to the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation that when there are agreements put in place in this Province - I am not talking about the Roads for Rails Agreement - but when they are separate ERDA agreements negotiated to do specific things

in this Province, to give rural Newfoundlanders the right to freedom from isolation, Mr. Speaker, then I think - and I would ask if the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation and his colleagues in Government, would give serious consideration to the rights of people in Placentia Bay or anywhere else, to free them from isolation.

It was, Mr. Speaker, the former Leader of the Liberal Party in Newfoundland, when he was a Member of the Conservative Government back in the 1970s who fought for the right to give the people of Monkstown freedom from isolation. He was the MHA for Burin - Placentia West, Mr. Speaker. He did an excellent job in convincing his colleagues in Government of the need to provide the Monkstown people with a road. That road is by far a lot longer, in terms of mileage or kilometers, than the road to Petit Forte. But Mr. Barry - Mr. Justice Barry he is now - much to his credit; Mr. Speaker, even when I was on that side and he was on this side, I always gave him credit, and I always admired him for being a person who went out and fought for the rights of people in isolated Newfoundland. Leo Barry, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, deserves full credit for that road to Monkstown.

I believe that the decency and the concern and the desire to see rural Newfoundland becoming free from isolation, that existed in the Cabinet when the decision was made to provide that road, should indeed be prevalent in the Cabinet today.

I ask the colleagues of the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, the people over



there who I believe would be caring individuals, if they would seriously consider or reconsider and encourage the Minister to ask the Federal Government not to scuttle that ERDA Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here in the Department of Works, Services and Transportation, which is responsible for building roads in this Province, is the Federal Government have an agreement, under the Terms of Union, I guess, to provide ferry services in Newfoundland.

There were some changes made to that agreement back some years ago, when the Newfoundland Government accepted responsibility for ferries in Newfoundland. I do not want to get political on this issue, so just let me say, back in the 1970s, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Liberal Government of the day decided they were going to take the coastal boat service - and I say this to the Members of Cabinet - in the dying days of the Federal Government back in the 1970s, decided they were going to take the coastal boat services that did the South Coast off the Petit Forte/South East Bight/Monkstown run, because Monkstown now had their road. They decided to do it and they decided to replace it, Mr. Speaker, with a boat called the 'Regina B'. And the residents of Petit Forte and South East Bight were not about to accept the 'Regina B.' going to Baine Harbour. I am sure my colleague from Placentia (Mr. Hogan) would know what I am talking about, because there are several former residents of Petit Forte and South East Bight and other places, living in his District, who like to be able to drive home.

There was, Mr. Speaker, what people never thought could take place in Petit Forte. There was basically an uprising, where every man woman and child in that community, with the support and assistance of the people of the Placentia West Development Association, stood up and they burnt the Canadian flag on the wharf. They did whatever had to be done, Mr. Speaker, and brought it to light. And, as a result of that, the 'Newfoundland Voyager' replaced the 'Regina B.'

What has happened since then is that we, as a Government, approached the Federal Government and asked them if they would be interested in taking off the ferry service they now have from Argentia, and putting that money into a road.

They looked at it, Mr. Speaker, and they came back, their economists and our economists got into it and they came back with some figures for the total cost of what the project was amortized over a period of time, I am not sure of the years, but I think it was ten years. Mr. Speaker, who owns the ferry service between Burgeo and Ramea, it is the Province, and why cannot the Province have them between Petit Forte and South East Bight, they are Newfoundlander's boy, they are Newfoundlander's, what is wrong with you. The people of Petit Forte and South East Bight were delighted with this work, and the economist looked at it from both sides and they came up with a figure amortized over a period of, I believe, ten years, that they would spend x number of dollars on this service in Placentia Bay. There was an agreement, Mr. Speaker, basically an agreement, except there was some hang up by

the Federal Government on five hundred thousand dollars out of the total agreement that had to go in place. The Province said, no, it is the Federal Government, you are taking your boat off, your ferry service off, we want the road and you pay the shot. And what happened? It was agreed the five hundred thousand dollars would come out of the Roads for Rails Agreement, while at the same time there were several million dollars the Federal Government had put in place because they were going to take off the ferry service, they were going to put a road to Petit Forte and then the Province would have to administer the road. Not a paved road, Mr. Speaker, but a good dirt road, and the Province would have to maintain it. What would the Province have to do? They would grade the road a couple of times a year, they would do the snow clearing on it and some things like that. Here we are today in a situation debating a Bill looking at the Department of Works, Services and Transportation. Looking at a Bill, Mr. Speaker. At the same time we have communities in Placentia Bay, and I want to say one thing, I spent ten years as a social worker going back and forth Placentia Bay and in that ten years, Mr. Speaker, in that ten years going in to Petit Forte, I would venture my life, I think, that in ten years, there was not ten requests for social assistance in that community, not ten. Now, Mr. Speaker, what Government services have the residents of Petit Forte got, I see my friend up there for Bellevue who is certainly familiar with Placentia Bay. The gentleman himself moved, I believe from Port Elizabeth, an isolated community in Placentia Bay. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, they are probably in your

District in Bonavista North, isolated communities, and in other Districts throughout the Province. We talk about the Outer Ring Road and we talk about the Prince Phillip Drive, Mr. Speaker, we talk about the roads. You talk about the road to Burin Peninsular Highway, Mr. Speaker, you talk about the Argentia Access Road, you talk about any road in this Province, any road in this Province, no matter where it is, cost a fortune, cost a fortune to build them and maintain them. Mr. Speaker, population is one thing, people is another thing, is Government's commitment to population and numbers, or is Government's commitment to the people. I submit, from the Government that I was a part of and the party that I am a part of, is that priority No.1 was the people. The people of Petit Forte and South East Bight in this case, should be the priority of the Provincial Government and not the numbers, not the numbers, Mr. Speaker, because it is not the tax payers of Newfoundland that are building the road to Petit Forte, it is the tax payers of Canada that are building the road to Petit Forte. Mr. Speaker, the Premier nods his head and says no. Let me say to the Premier, Sir, that you should have your Minister check it, because it is a separate ERDA Agreement, that was negotiated.

PREMIER WELLS:

I know what it is.

MR. TOBIN:

A separate ERDA Agreement.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, okay, but it is not the Roads for Rails Agreement, except five hundred thousand dollars. The rest of it is a separate agreement

that permits the Federal Government to take off their ferry service to Petit Forte and the Federal Government is now -

PREMIER WELLS:

And place a burden on the Province.

MR. TOBIN:

Come on now, what we are talking about here is twenty-six kilometers of road that the Provincial Government would have to grade once a year, because it is not paved. But Mr. Speaker, he should want the Burgeo road paved, he should want the Burgeo road paved and the people of Petit Forte, Mr. Premier, need a road and they deserve a road.

PREMIER WELLS:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

How is that taking the Federal Government of the hook, Mr. Premier, I do not know how you can see that?

PREMIER WELLS:

The Province is stuck with paying the ferry cost.

MR. TOBIN:

No, no. You are wrong again. It is not a ferry cost. The ferry is coming off.

PREMIER WELLS:

The ferry from South East Bight will still be there. Who is going to pay for it?

MR. TOBIN:

There will be a new ferry put on South East Bight and the Province is going to pay for it. It is part of the agreement.

PREMIER WELLS:

Who is paying for it now?

MR. TOBIN:

The Federal Government are paying for it.

PREMIER WELLS:

Finally, it sticks in.

MR. TOBIN:

No, Mr. Speaker, not finally it sticks in. And I can tell you that the people of South East Bight and Petit Forte will not let you stick in either.

PREMIER WELLS:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

They are Newfoundlanders, boy, they are Newfoundlanders. Have you not been elected to represent Newfoundlanders and Labradorians? Why turn your back on the people of Petit Forte? Is it because they did not vote for your Government? Mr. Premier, I tell you something Sir, it is not worthy of the office that you hold, to make such statements about the people. This to me is a very emotional issue, when I see Government turning their backs on isolated people in Newfoundland and Labrador. I can debate anything in this House, but when it comes to debating you trying to (inaudible) Newfoundland together with your Minister of Transportation, then I take strong exceptions. It is wrong for the Government not to honor that agreement.

I will be asking, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, I will be asking Mr. Crosbie to live up to his end of the Agreement. And I can tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, that if the Federal Government turn their backs on the people of Petit Forte, I will be just as vocal as I am today because the Party is not important

to me, Mr. Speaker, whether it be Liberal, Tory, or NDP, that is not important. The important thing to me is the men, women, and children of Petit Forte and South East Bight. That is where I stand. And this Government over here have turned their back on them. It is shameful. It is shameful.

Now the Premier is talking about the coastal boat service. Sir, the coastal boat service is now from Argentia to Petit Forte and the Bight and you have a little ferry service. The people of South East Bight are not looking for the coastal boat 'The Bar Haven' or something to be resurrected and brought back. They want a ferry that goes between Petit Forte and South East Bight and across Paradise Sound.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
How far is that?

MR. TOBIN:  
Two miles, probably.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to stop here when that is done. My intention after I get that done is to get a road constructed between South East Bight and Monkstown. That is where we are going.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
How far is that?

MR. TOBIN:  
It is about five or six miles, I suppose, down Paradise Sound.

Why should they not have it. They are Newfoundlanders living in Newfoundland connected to the highway to the main portion of the Island, why should they not have a road? Sure they should have a road. And you have the Federal Government who want to build a

road and the Premier and his Government do not want to take the money, because I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that it is because the people of Petit Forte did not vote for the Liberals in the last election.

I can tell you one thing that this issue, Mr. Speaker, in Placentia Bay will not die, and this issue in Placentia Bay will be an issue. Oh, the Member for Windsor can laugh all he like. The Member for Windsor can laugh all he likes. The people from Petit Forte are not laughing over this issue if you talk to them today. Nor is the Development Association of Placentia West laughing over this issue, nor is the Rural Development Association laughing over this issue. Expect to hear from them Mr. Premier, because they are not at all very excited to know that their fellow Newfoundlanders are not going to be freed from isolation.

There are no harder workers, Mr. Speaker, than the people from Petit Forte, hardy workers, fine people, you will never in your life, Mr. Speaker, meet finer people in this Province.

Years ago, Mr. Speaker, they manned banking schooner, they were foreign going skippers who produced the best seamen this Province could ever produce.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
There was never one of them in Petit Forte.

MR. TOBIN:  
Yes, the Premier was in Petit Forte one time. He most certainly was.

PREMIER WELLS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, I know you were Sir, and I am delighted that you were there, but the only thing is I wish you had a greater understanding of what I am talking about. As a result of your visits you probably should.

PREMIER WELLS:

I do.

MR. TOBIN:

You do.

Well, can I expect, Sir, that you will intercede and ask the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation not to proceed with the cancellation of this. Can I expect that?

AN HON. MEMBER:

I will speak when I am ready.

MR. TOBIN:

He will speak when he is ready. Mr. Speaker, he should speak, too. I can tell you something, I am going to speak on this Bill, too. What we have seen is a Government that is not committed to rural Newfoundland and it is quite explicit in this action. As I was explaining when I got interrupted there, but I had no problem with that either, the coastal boat that was going from Argentia to Petit Forte, South East Bight will be taken of and the money will build a road. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a ferry service that has been agreed to, in the agreement that was signed, to go between Petit Forte and South East Bight and would bring the people back and forth, I do not know how often, however often the ferry runs, I suppose. Back and forth between Petit Forte and South East Bight and that will cost the Province a few dollars. Sure, it will cost them a few dollars. Why should it not cost

them a few dollars? They are taxpayers. They pay the taxes in this Province the same as everyone else. It should cost money. It is going to cost money. Mr. Speaker, the Government is not going to run away from money. They did not run away from money last year when they changed the priority list of the civil servants in terms of the Minister of Transportation applying patronage to his District. They did change their minds, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the Road for Rails Agreement, the final (inaudible) back in 1991 when they removed from the list in their Cabinet meeting just recently, the road to Monkstown to be paved. Why is it that Monkstown has been removed from their list? Why is it that they have now decided to do what they can to try to cancel the road between Petit Forte and South East Bight? Why are rural Newfoundlanders being brought to their knees by the people who want to scuttle it? The Premier gets on national stage and talks about Meech Lake and how he wants a strong central Government for Canada. To dilute the powers of the provinces, Mr. Speaker. Now, he wants a strong central Government in Newfoundland and dilute the powers of the municipalities. That is what the Premier (inaudible). Let there be no mistake that the attitude that the Premier has for trade on the national stage by diluting the powers of the provinces, by building a strong central Government, is exactly the same that he wants to portray in Newfoundland and Labrador. The Premier of this Province is committed to resettlement, to ensuring that there is no community in rural Newfoundland that is presently isolated, that remains as an identity on its

own. That is the commitment of this Premier, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that no community in rural Newfoundland remains with the powers invested into it by the Department of Municipal Affairs.

We will be getting into a Bill from the Department of Municipal Affairs very soon where the Premier and his Government want to amalgamate. Again take the powers of the smaller places, build a large place and to again dilute the powers of the smaller communities. Let me say with a lot of sincerity to the Premier, and to his Government, that I ask you to reconsider your actions on the road to Petit Forté, to let the Federal Government construct that road, to permit the Federal Government to build a road to Petit Forté. It is important to the people who live there. It is important to the children who attend primary, elementary and high school there. It is important to the people who depend their entire life on the fishery. That is the problem but it is important, above all, that all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians be given equal treatment by this Government. Why would the Premier want to say no to \$7 million Federal Government funds to build that road?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I wonder if the hon. gentleman would permit a brief interruption?

MR. TOBIN:  
Sure.

MR. SPEAKER:  
It will not take away from his time at all.

The First Minister from Ontario

just came into the Speaker's galleries. I am sure everybody would like to welcome the Premier of Ontario, Premier Peterson.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
We would like to remind Premier Peterson that all of the Provinces in Canada made a donation to the House of Assembly when it was opened in 1949, and the Speaker is very grateful that the Province of Ontario donated the Speaker's Chair.

Thank you very much.

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

MR. TOBIN:  
I probably should have left my seat earlier and introduced Premier Peterson. I had the opportunity of meeting him several times when I was Parliamentary Assistant to Premier Peckford, at First Ministers' Conferences and Premiers' conferences. He is an outstanding Canadian and we are all extremely proud to welcome him to our legislature.

Mr. Speaker, when I was Minister of Transportation -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
For a very short time.

MR. TOBIN:  
Well, I was there. I was there for forty-three days. That is longer than some people have been in positions.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Roger Simmons (inaudible) was he not?

MR. TOBIN:

That is right.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly believe the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation, to this day, has not been there forty-three days. If he has, there has been no evidence of it in this Legislature.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do not be nasty, now.

MR. TOBIN:

I am not being nasty. Do not be nasty against the man who wants to scuttle rural Newfoundland?

But I want to get on to that, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

The President of Treasury Board - I am going to say something now - is probably one of the most decent men who ever graced the House of Assembly. I say that because -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

No, I mean that. He was a good man when he was in Opposition, decent and honourable and, as President of Treasury Board, he is decent and honourable.

Mr. Speaker, as I say that, I want to say to him with all sincerity - I ask him, Mr. Speaker, as I have asked my colleague from Placentia, I make no mistake about it. I have asked my colleague from Placentia, who understands and knows Placentia Bay, if he would talk to the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. Mr. Speaker, there is no politics in

this for me. Politics in this is not important. I am serious. I have played politics in this House with the best and as much as anybody.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Speaking of politics, how many votes did the Liberal Party gain last time?

MR. TOBIN:

The count in Petit Forte last time was 74 to 1.

AN HON. MEMBER:

One?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, 74 to 1.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

I will not answer. No, I will not answer him, Mr. Speaker.

But I have asked my colleague from Placentia. I am serious, there is no politics, this is above politics for me. For me to have the satisfaction of seeing the people of Petit Forte with the same freedoms, to be able to get in their cars and drive out, the same as people can drive out of Baine Harbour or Boat Harbour or Marystown or Sunnyside, or Come By Chance, whatever the case may be, for the sake of \$7 million in Federal Government funds, with only \$500,000 coming from the Roads for Rails Agreement, then I think they should have it.

I ask the President of Treasury Board - and I am serious; if you want me to beg, Mr. Speaker, to have the road to Petit Forte, consider me on my knees. Consider me on my knees, Mr. Speaker, that is how important that road is to

me. I will beg to build a road for the residents of Petit Forte and South East Bight. I would beg the Government to do it.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
What is that?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
No, no! Now, Mr. Speaker, that is wrong. This road was signed for long before the election. Long before the election, Mr. Speaker, this road was dealt with.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
You were in for forty-three days. That was long enough to have (inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
No, no! Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. Because the Member for St. John's South, and the Member for Carbonear are wrong. The agreement to build a road was signed sometime last year between both Governments. Two years ago, was it? I presented a petition in this House signed by all the residents in these communities to have a road constructed because I believed in it, and the Government of the day supported it. Now, Mr. Speaker, do you know who else supported it at that time—the Liberal party supported it. They stood in this House and said it, and now they turn their back on them.

I want to ask the president of the Treasury Board with all of the sincerity that I can muster, if he would seriously talk to his colleague the Minister of Works, Service and Transportation. It

may be difficult because the Premier is obviously opposed to it too. But if he would honestly talk to these people, to your colleagues in Cabinet, and leave that road intact, Mr. Speaker. The people of Petit Forte deserve it, the people of South East Bight deserve a decent ferry service between Petit forte and South East Bight, until we get back in Government in four years time and build them a road between South East Bight and Monkstown. But it is absolutely important to these people.

Some of the Members over their do not understand rural Newfoundland. The Member for St. John's South probably does not understand rural Newfoundland. The Member for Placentia understands the problem that I am talking about. I would suspect that his Honor, the Speaker understands what I am talking about. I know, Mr. Speaker, the person sitting in the Chair now understands what I am talking, about because he too came from an isolated community resettled in the sixties in Placentia Bay. I am sure the Member for Bonavista South, even though he is from St. John's, represents a rural riding with some isolated communities, understands what I am talking about. Yes, he would understand it as would the Member from St. Georges understand it, and as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the former Member from St. Georges, who was one of the Chief Architects of building this road to Petit Forte. That man worked tirelessly, he really worked hard to try and fulfill that commitment when he was — that is when it was done now. To get back to the Member for St. John's South, that was done while Mr. Doyle was Minister of Transportation, and



Mr. Doyle was there -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
The people of Petit Forte -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:  
From the comments that are coming from over there, Mr. Speaker, if the President of Treasury Board accepts my offer, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from the comments that are coming from over there that we might be in deep trouble in getting that road. And the Member from Placentia together with myself are going to have our hands full to try to convince the Minister of Transportation.

Now one other thing, I know my time is up, one other thing, six months ago, the contract to build the road to Petit Forte was closed. The lowest bidder was McNamara, six months later they were given the contract for the first kilometers, now the Minister tells us again that he has spent no money on it and is not. And do you know what happened, Mr. Speaker, six months ago? The Minister of Works, Services and Transportation got on a helicopter, went to Petit Forte and announced the road that now he wants to take away. Is that what your Government is proud of?

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I will have a few minutes on this particular piece of legislation. I can go back to last week at the combined councils of Labrador, naturally, when the hon. Member from Eagle River was there representing all Ministers of Government, and in particular the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. That was the main Minister that he used to represent him at the combined council of Labrador. There is nothing wrong with that, I have no problem with that, I believe he did do a good job, okay? But he failed to tell the combined councils of Labrador that he is a part of a Government that cancelled the construction of roads in St. Lewis, Port Hope Simpson, and Black Tickle, and he failed to tell them that his Government cancelled the construction of the roads. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman went around and said that there was no such thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a piece of paper here that the list is all compiled on and everything else and it says upgrading, local road in Black Tickle and St. Lewis and of \$800,000. Your Government, the Government that this Minister is the Minister of now, you went to Labrador last week and you went on his behalf and you did not tell them that your Government cancelled the construction of those two roads.

Now, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the hon. gentleman that it is wrong. It is wrong. My colleague from Burin, Placentia - West said the same thing, regardless of where you live in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador you should get the services that you deserve. I say to the hon. gentleman you go to the Minister of Transportation, your Minister,

and ask him for it. In fact it is T-1589, so you can go and you can see for yourself. You can get the list from your own Minister. The list is there, but the Minister has changed it, that is what happened. Also, at the same time, there was supposed to be a road constructed in Nain and in Rigolet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say to the hon. Minister that the year before last we started construction of two roads, one in Makkovik and one in Postville, both of them were done and carried out and it was a good job done by the contractors.

This year, this summer there is supposed to be five other places completed, Nain, Rigolet, Port Hope Simpson, St. Lewis, and Black Tickle. So a commitment was made by the Government, and I would say that the Department of Transportation are now pork barrelling, because you are taking the money now -

MR. R. AYLWARD:

They took it from Labrador and put it in Bay d'Espoir District.

MR. WARREN:

Not only that, but look at what did out in Port de Grave. I am sure the hon. Member for Eagle River would really have appreciated a little piece of that money that went out in the Port de Grave District to help him in St. Lewis and Black Tickle. I say to the hon. gentleman for St. John's South (Mr. Murphy) that he knows his fish plant is going to be closing next week. He knows his fish plant is going to close down. And, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about that, and he will have a rough time when the next election comes around, I am sure of that.

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

I wonder if the hon. gentleman would be prepared to table that document so that we could have a look at it.

It seems to me to be a commonly accepted practice that when you quote from a document and wave it around and say this document is backing up what you are saying and quoting figures from it, or some names from it, that that document should be tabled in the House. So I wonder if the hon. gentleman would do that.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, I am surprised that the Government House Leader would make such a spurious point of order, Mr. Speaker. He knows, when he makes reference to Beauchesne, that it says in Beauchesne 'that the only people who have to table letters, if they refer to them or read them, are Ministers'. He should know that anyway.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do this for a reason that is not at all frivolous. The simple reason is that it is easy to wave official documents around, especially by individuals who were Ministers. The Opposition House Leader did it a couple of weeks ago, wave around a document that he claimed purported to say one thing, when in actual fact the document said the exact opposite. I think it is not a very satisfactory practice for Members, especially who were very recently Ministers and who have what they claim to be official documents in their possession, which are in fact documents which resulted from their Ministerial activities. I think that should be considered as Ministerial documents and should be tabled in the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

The Government House Leader, clearly, is on a roll, but is on a roll downward today with respect to raising points of order. The point of order was, that he must table it, and that of course, as my friend from Kilbride, a former Deputy Speaker of this House who knows the rules, pointed out how inadequate the argument was that the Government House Leader put forward. So we would ask the Government House Leader, perhaps go out in the Common room, have a coffee, refresh his memory, he has not been feeling well the last few days, I know that, and obviously he is making grave, grave errors today in raising these spurious points of order. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Torngat Mountains has simply referred to information that he is aware of, has in his

possession, had in his possession in the past. Mr. Speaker, the Member waved, as far as the hon. Member knows he waved Hansard or a piece of paper, who knows, do not be silly. Anyway Mr. Speaker, it is not a point of order, he is not required to table it, so it is no big difficulty.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

According to Beauchesne's 495, Section(6) " A private Member has neither the right nor the obligation to table an official, or any other document." There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This document does say money for the roads in Black Tickle and in St. Lewis in the hon. Member's District. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister has the same documents, so I say to the hon. gentleman for Eagle River go to the Department and ask the Department for the information. Now, Mr. Speaker, it was in the year 1989, the same as my hon. colleague from Burin Placentia West was talking about so, Mr. Speaker, let me say, I want to know from the Minister why his Government cancelled the upgrading of four different road projects on the Coast of Labrador, that was recommended by officials within his Department. Now, Mr. Speaker, why would he do that. Mr. Speaker, Nain and Rigolet, Black Tickle, St. Lewis are four that were recommended by his officials and he took it off the list, and there was an extra place added to it which was Port Hope

Simson. Actually there were five altogether. So, Mr. Speaker, now the Minister has to come clean with the people and tell the people, after the good job that his Department carried out in Makkovik and Postville, why did they cancel it in the other communities, and, Mr. Speaker, you know, I think there has to be an apology by the Member for Eagle River. He did not tell the combined councils the facts about this -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I was waiting for the hon. gentleman to mention the word Labrador Flag. I have a letter, Mr. Speaker, I will read the contents of the letter. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is from the hon. gentleman's district. "Mr. Warren: I have never met you before" this person is writing to me, "I have never met you before, although I saw you on TV and heard you on the radio, but you have caused a racket concerning the Labrador flag." She said "I am a person, that lived all my life in Labrador, much longer than you or our Member" so she is older than I am and much older than the Member. "I am shocked that such a talk in the House of Assembly would take place concerning the Labrador Flag should be on the floor, or on the wall, or on anything. I believe that everyone who loves Labrador should show the flag, and the Labrador people are proud that you are showing a flag. There is one lady down the coast who had the Labrador flag hooked in a rug, and there are a lot of people walking in and out of her house, and she has the Labrador flag on her rug." And I believe, Mr. Speaker, the hon.

gentleman knows who that lady is. I believe the hon. gentleman knows who that lady is. "What I am saying, Mr. Warren, is show the Labrador flag to the people out there in every way possible."

AN HON. MEMBER:

What District is she from?

MR. WARREN:

She is not from the northern part of Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, "Mr. Warren, you are a person who has always spoke up for Labrador." I believe I have on a lot of occasions, okay. Here is what the next sentence - the next sentence is very hard. "I voted for Danny Dumaresque." I voted for Danny Dumaresque-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

in the last election, and I know he will do a good job."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

"But, I think he should praise you for promoting the Labrador flag, and do something for the senior citizens, and help the young people."

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Minister of Education is pleased with you.

MR. WARREN:

I will be about one minute finishing the last part of the letter, and that is about it.

"Mr. Warren," she said, "I know you were here when the election was on." So, apparently during the election I must have travelled

through the District, and I believe I met the hon. gentleman in my travels. "The next time you are in here, you are welcome to come to our home." One thing about the Labrador people, by the way, you are welcome as the flowers of May, you are always welcome. And one thing too, I got a feeling that my hon. friend does the same, we just go and walk right into the house. We knock on the door and just walk in. We do not wait for the door to be open because the door is always open to us. And she closes off by saying, "that you are always welcome, Mr. Warren. You have done a lot for Labrador." And then she says this, "Say hello to Mr. Wells, and Mr. Rideout, and Mr. Peckford, and all the others. I have not seen Danny Dumaresque recently, he must be busy, and I hope to see you soon."

Now, Mr. Speaker. I have a little note right here. Someone on our side had a call from the Member's District today. I just got a note here that someone had a call from the Member's district here today, and they want him to keep working at the things that they want him to work at, and - oh yes, I agree with the hon. gentleman, but get out there and get after the Minister of Transportation - I know he is not returning his calls, that is understandable, but get after the Minister of Transportation. Just to give you a little hint so that you may be able to get something from the Minister of Transportation that could help this individual person to move around the community much easier. Now I named the four or five communities that there were supposed to be work carried out in. So, maybe the hon. gentleman can now go back to the Minister and say he definitely wants money

for the roads in Port Hope Simpson, St. Lewis and Black Tickle.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I will recognize the hon. Minister.

It now being 4 o'clock I will make the announcement for the three questions for the Late Show. The first one is, I am not satisfied with the answers given to my questions relating to the funding to open forty-one chronic care beds at the Agnes Pratt Home. I would like to have these matters placed on the Late Show for next Thursday. It is the hon. the Member for St. John's East (Ms Duff). Question number two, I am not satisfied with the answer given to me today by the Minister of Fisheries, re the fishing off Labrador, and that is from the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). The third question, I am not satisfied with the answers given by the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation regarding the road to Petit Forte. I would like to have it placed on the Late Show and that is the hon member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin).

I remind hon. Members that if the Minister speaks now he will close the debate on this Bill.

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

MR. GILBERT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This Bill did not turn out to be as straightforward as we thought. There seemed to be a little more debate than was intended. To change the name of a Department seems to have taken up most of the

afternoon, however there were a few concerns expressed by the hon. Members on the Tory side of the House, so I suppose I am going to have to answer some of them. First of all, when the Transportation critic got up, he talked about the possibility that the Public Tendering Act was being abused in the new Department. Well, I can assure the hon. Member that the Public Service Act is well administered and the civil service are carrying out the directions that are there, and it is monitored by me to ensure that it is carried out. That is the job of the Minister of the Department. We heard earlier today the Member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) ask questions of my colleague the Minister of Development concerning the POA numbers. There are some concerns about POA numbers, and as the Member said, the good things we are going to keep, and the bad things we are going to change, so we will possibly hear more about that as we go along. The Member adequately answered the question on that.

Now, we talk about roads. The Member had some doubt about the intent of this Government in the road paving program that we instituted this year. As you know, when we came here on May 5 we were left with a decision, we had to get a Budget ready, we had to get Interim Supply through the House, and what we really found, Mr. Speaker, was that the previous Government in the last year, when the House closed in July of 1988, the previous Government took a holiday for a month. They then came back in September and got involved in a Federal election. Then after Christmas they got involved in a Leadership Convention, and then they had a

Provincial Election, hence when we came to take over the Government nothing had been done, the Government had gone on a holiday for a year. It is interesting when we hear Members opposite talk about programs that were promised and cut by this Government.

The Member for Torngat Mountains just got up and waved a supposed list, where he heard some communities in Labrador were on this list. And as I have said to the press as a result of concerns that had been expressed by Tory Members opposite, they really cannot believe that the Government is trying and is doing things in the road paving program on a priority and needs basis, rather than the political patronage that the previous Government exhibited in all their paving.

I questioned the officials in my Department concerning the paving program of the previous Government, and I was told that indeed there was a list prepared and it was prepared before the election, but it had never been passed. It was there to be used as election promises, and there was \$50 million on that list, as I told one of the papers last week. When I took over as Minister on May 5, I told the officials in my Department to give me a list within the constraints of the budget, which was in the vicinity of \$30 million, based on a priority and needs basis.

Mr. Speaker, that was done. We did announce a program. It was a good one. It is now finished for this year. We made sure that it was done on a priority and needs basis, so there was pavement put in places this year that had never been paved before, and over the last seventeen years.

We heard the Member for Burin - Placentia West talk about the Petit Forte road. Well, I was going to talk about the Petit Forte road when I was about to close this, but he wants to talk about the Petit Forte road in the Late Show this afternoon. So I will now close the debate on this Bill.

This new legislation will give the staff and myself the important tools to carry out the job that is necessary to ensure that the Province gets fair treatment in the duties that are supposed to be put in place by the Department of Works, Services and Transportation.

The Opposition House Leader wants me to keep going. That is good. But, in the meantime, I can assure him that you have no worries, the Department of Works, Services and Transportation is in good hands now that it is combined, and we are going on to do a great job with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Department of Works, Services and Transportation," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, on tomorrow. (Bill No. 33).

MR. BAKER:  
Order 19, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local Road Boards Act." (Bill No. 34).

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

MR. GILBERT:

This is An Act To Amend The Local Road Boards, Bill No. 34.

Now, as you know, the Department of Works, Services and Transportation, in accordance with the provision of the Local Boards Act, provides funding in the form of grants to seventeen local boards.

Funding is based on a regular grant of \$20 per capita, however, in extenuating circumstances the Department will issue special grants for all or part of the additional work required. In 1988-1989, a budget allocation of \$90,000 was approved. However, many requests for special grants over and above this amount were either denied or funded in part due to lack of funds.

The following is an outline of suggested changes to this Act. Clause 1. This permits the establishment of local roads boards in summer fishing settlements, particularly coastal Labrador. Traditionally, the Department considered only permanent settlements as eligible, because grants were calculated on a per capita basis, again a further commitment to this Government's commitment to rural Newfoundland.

Clause 2. Set the date for re-election of Members to be an anniversary date at the first election. Example: If a board is elected on December 10, then the new board will be elected three years hence on December 10. Previous to this change elections were to be held only on the second Monday in December for all subsequent elections.

Clause 2, subsection (2) specifies that if any board does not hold

elections within one year of the expiry date of the previous board, the board would be considered dormant and not become eligible for future funding until one year following the actual date of the new election. This change permits better budgeting.

Clause 3. Limit grant calculation to per capita basis only. The previous miles of road was an alternative basis, but this factor was never considered.

That is it, Mr. Speaker. It is a pretty straightforward Bill, and I ask (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Just a couple of words on this. I am pleased - and I will congratulate the Minister when I think he deserves it - that this is being extended to summer settlements, local roads. There is not a big lot of money in this, but usually the money is being spent on very small roads or walkways, in most cases.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Does that include summer recreation areas?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

No, summer settlements is what it refers to here.

Maybe I will put the question to the Minister. Will this include summer recreation areas? I do not think it does. He might make some reference to it when he stands.

There is one concern I have that I want to raise. I did raise it in Committee the other day, and I was

assured by the staff that this would not happen. The old Bill suggests that a community could receive money based on the amount of roads they have, or they could receive money based on the population in the area. Now, it is conceivable that there could be an area where there is a very small population, five or six people, and a lot of roads; maybe it is hard to get in there, they have a lot of roads which are built back, away from the community. What this Bill is now doing is taking the road component, the distance component out of this and putting in the per capita basis. What the staff assured me, and I would hope the Minister will assure me also, is that of the seventeen local roads committees which are in existence now, there will not be any money lost to any community because of this change. If there is to be money lost to communities because of this change, I would certainly be opposed to it. Will the Minister give his assurance that because of this change - we are taking the distance criteria away from this - communities will not lose money?

One other thing: I know there is about \$50,000 in the Budget for this per year, and there is up to \$90,000 spent on it, and, as far as I know, the other \$30,000 or \$40,000 is spent more or less at the discretion of the Minister or of the staff, one or the other. The staff admitted the other night that there is not enough money in this budget to do the job that is required for these small communities. If the Minister would consider increasing this component of his budget next year, it certainly would be helpful, and it would really show a commitment to the smaller rural communities



in this Province. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. speaker, I just want to pursue the line of questioning my colleague was raising as it relates to two things that concern me. First of all, if a local board area has a small number of individuals but a relatively large amount of road to maintain, they, obviously, are going to be discriminated against here; you may have a large number of people grouped into a much smaller community with a lesser number of roads who would now be receiving a larger amount of money. It would appear not to be fair. Maybe the Minister could expand on how this is going to work.

I think the flexibility that was there before, as I understand it, to base it either on per capita or on miles of road, allowed the Minister the flexibility of meeting the needs of every community. So I really question the rationale for removing that flexibility from the Minister. I think the Minister should retain that power, to be able to deal with the particular situation.

The second question is one we spoke across the floor on as it relates to including areas used as summer settlements only. Is the Minister only referring to areas now where fishermen go, for example, in the summertime, or where people live for commercial purposes in the summertime? Is that all you are referring to? Another question, therefore, is why not some of the recreational areas which have very high populations? I happen to be

involved in one of them, and I do not ask for my own purposes, but there are many areas like Ocean Pond and many other areas around the Province, which are bigger than most communities.

My own area, the area I live in permanently now, in Deer Park, has over 500 homes there; some of them are occupied now full-time, but largely the majority of them are occupied almost full-time during four months of the year. Why cannot these people, who are taxpayers in this Province, and obviously if they are owning summer homes they are probably very high tax payers in the Province, why are these people, therefore, not eligible to band together and form a local roads committee and receive some funding to help them maintain those areas? I think it is a valid question, and I think they are entitled to it.

I know we have had questions for many, many years from areas such as that, and other resource roads areas that people want to use for hunting purposes. In central Newfoundland, quite often there are requests to maintain some of those roads.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:  
Which one?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:  
Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

It is.

The Department of Highways half maintains it and half does not maintain it; they maintain it when they have time. There is no commitment that you are going to get out tomorrow morning. When the highways are clear and they have nothing better to do, then they will run around. So if I am not here for two or three days, you will know they have still not finished ploughing the highways, and they have not gotten around to digging me out yet.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) leave you up there the winter (inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

That is right. At least I have a phone now, so I can call in tell you where I have been.

But I think it is a legitimate question. There are many people who are concerned in those areas, and it goes further. I say to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs he may wish to consider this as well, because there are many of those areas that want to provide very rudimentary services, such as maintaining their own roads, such as, perhaps, putting in place some garbage collection, perhaps some fire protection regulations and restrictions against camping and having open campfires in an area where there is literally millions of dollars worth of investment in these summer vacation homes, yet with no existing authority. And we were looking at that for some time, of making it possible to have some form of a local service area designated. A local road board would do it just for the roads, but we could expand that concept. But I think the grants

should be available to them, as well. What is the difference in people moving there for recreational purposes for four or five months of the year, for summer vacations, summer homes, and people moving there for business purposes?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. If the Minister speaks now, he closes the debate.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There were a couple of interesting questions raised. We talked about small communities, and when the critic spoke he was concerned that communities which are now receiving the grants would not be cut back now because of this. I have checked with my officials and they said no, this would not happen. As for expanding the amount of money put in that, yes, it is a great idea, but, of course, you realize the restraints we have on this in the Budget. During the four years I was critic, I asked the Government the same question about that and they did not do anything about it. At least now, in the first year we are here, we are trying to do something about improving the lot of the people who live in those small settlements which are not covered by any other sort of municipal government. It was brought in primarily to look after some of the communities along the Labrador coast, where people go in the summertime, and the community of Paradise, in Conception Bay, I would say, would come under this.

I sympathize with the Member who has to live in Deer Park in his summer home. I live in Sandy

Point, in mine, and this is my permanent residence, and the money is just not there to provide this type of funding you are asking about. I am sure the event, where people live in some of those summer communities, those recreation communities that grow up, has caused some of the problems we have in Municipal Government in Newfoundland, by people going into summer areas and then, all of a sudden, extending to become full-time areas. This is causing some of the problems my colleague in Municipal Affairs is having.

So it would be ideal, and I would certainly like to be able to tell the Member that yes, I have funding -

MR. WINDSOR:  
(Inaudible) that Mount Pearl was (inaudible).

MR. GILBERT:  
Yes, and I remind the Member that there was a lot of money spent on Mount Pearl. But we do not have it in this part of the budget. So I say, no, I do not see it at this time. And, again, part of our problems in Municipal Affairs comes from the things the Member is talking about, people extending and wanting to live in summer communities and then, all of a sudden, demanding municipal services.

As I am sure the Member is aware, there are a few budget restraints that we must put in in funding in this area. But we will, in effect, improve the lot of the people who live in the small areas and the fishing communities along the coast, who are part-time. I move second reading.

On motion, a Bill, "An act To

Amend The Local Road Boards Act", read a second time, ordered referred to Committee of the Whole, on tomorrow. (Bill No. 34).

MR. BAKER:  
Order 6, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
I understood from the Government House Leader earlier Order 17 was next, The Public Service (Pensions) Act. That is what he told me earlier, and I advised the appropriate critics.

MR. BAKER:  
The Opposition House Leader knows I said 10, 17, 19, I believe, and then some Committees.

MR. SIMMS:  
(Inaudible) 10, 19 (inaudible).

MR. BAKER:  
Yes. Right. I do not want to call 17 now, I was going to go to the Committee. I thought we could dispose of this particular one in Committee without too much trouble. We do not have time for a long debate on 17.

MR. SIMMS:  
We can accept that. We can live with that. But, then, why would he not follow the Order Paper as we normally do, and call Order 3 and 4, those two Justice Bills, which are even less important or lengthy. The other one could have some lengthy debate.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

I am just giving him some advice.

MR. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not need the advice, number one. Number two, if the Opposition House Leader recognizes what is going on - I suppose he does. He is maybe trying to kill some time for some reason. Obviously I will call the Justice Bills when the Justice Minister is here to be able to respond to questions. It is very, very simple. The Orders called are Orders that can be dealt with, and I believe should be dealt with at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I called Order 6. It is obvious there is not time for debate on 17, it is obvious the Minister of Justice is not around today, so I called Order 6. It is very simple. I do not know what the problem is. I thought Members opposite would be quite willing to get to the Education Act.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the problem is the hon. the Government House Leader in an act of co-operation told me what we were going to deal with today, and now the hon. the Government House Leader has broken that promise. That is what is concerning me. I thought his word was good. He told me distinctly he would be doing Order 10, Order 17, and Order 19, second readings, then Committee.

He has done Order 10, he has done Order 19, now, all of a sudden, he is not going to do Order 17. I have asked our critics on this side to prepare to respond to the legislation, so I did not expect

we would get into any Committees, obviously. If we did, we would begin with the orders on the Order Paper. It is not unusual for the Government House Leader to get up and answer questions on behalf of absent Ministers; he could certainly carry a couple of innocuous Bills, like those Justice Bills, through Committee. But the point is, the Minister of Justice is not here; he cannot go on, then, to Order 5, which is a Fisheries Bill, because the Minister of Fisheries is not here.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, he is. He is here.

MR. SIMMS:

Is he here? Well, in that case, listening to the Government House Leader's argument, why did he not do Order 5, if the Minister of Fisheries is here? That would have been the next one. I do not quite understand the logic. But, most importantly, he made an agreement with me. I, in good faith, passed it on to my colleagues on this side. Now they do not have any faith in me, and they have even less faith in the Government House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. The Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, this is mighty silly. I would like to remind the Opposition House Leader that this is not Wednesday, this is not the day when the Opposition calls the Orders, this is not an Opposition day in the House. The Orders of the Day have been called, and it is within what I told the hon. Member. I specifically said numbers 10, 17, 19 and some Committees. Now, this comes under the heading of some Committees.

Understand? Some committees. When I suggest to the Opposition House Leader that certain things may be dealt with during the day, that is not a guarantee that they will all be dealt with during the day. I do not guarantee that all of these things I mention to him are going to be dealt with during the day, before, as it happens, 4:30 today. Anybody understands that. I do not control the rate of passage of legislation through the House. I want to allow as much debate as possible. I do not know how much Members opposite have to say, so I cannot guarantee at three o'clock, or at 2:30 exactly what is going to happen. It is silly to be into this.

Mr. Speaker, we are at the point now, where by the time we change and get back into Committee, we would only have to get the Committee to stand again and come back into the House. So rather than prolong this silly, stupid argument, maybe we could declare it 4:30 and get on with the Late Show.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. The Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

No, Mr. Speaker, we will not declare it 4:30, we will get this matter resolved one way or the other. The point here that The hon. Government House Leader is missing and is misleading on is the point -

MR. BAKER:

(Inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Oh, listen to this! (inaudible)

call the order, you sit down.

MR. SIMMS:

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that I am now learning more and more every day that we cannot take the Government House Leader at his word, unlike what he is trying to lead us to believe; he is trying to be nice and kind. We had a Member on this side praise him today, and now he turns around and gives us this slap in the face. He made an agreement, Mr. Speaker, he made an agreement with me, and the agreement was we will do second readings, 10, 17 and 19 - that was the agreement - following which, we will do Committee. Now, that is what he said. Did he or did he not say that? Did he or did he not say that?

MS VERGE:

He admitted that. Oh, yes, he has admitted that.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Name him: Name him.

MR. SIMMS:

Now, now, the hon. House Leader is supposed to be an honourable man. Do not shake his head. He said -

MR. BAKER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, and some Committees afterwards, is what he said. So he has done 10, he has done 19, he has not done 17. Why? Is the hon. House Leader afraid? He is afraid to put the Minister of Finance up on his feet, that is what the problem is. That is precisely it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There was not time.

MR. SIMMS:

There was time. When this started ten minutes ago, there was plenty of time for the Minister of Finance, but methinks he is a bit afraid to put the Minister of Finance up with only a few minutes left. That is what is happening here, Mr. Speaker.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, there is no need to call it 4:30 as the House Leader suggested. Tomorrow, I suppose, we will see something else strange happen in this House without notice, they will maybe call a Bill or a piece of legislation where we have another agreement which will go to the Committees first before they will debate it in the House. I would not be at all surprised to see something like that happen tomorrow, or they will call a Bill that has not gone through Committee. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I see you are looking at the clock. Is it 4:30?

MR. SPEAKER:  
It is 4:30, yes.

The hon. The Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make the point that there really is no point of order.

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

To the point of order. There is a difference of opinion, I guess, between the two House Leaders as to what was agreed on or what was not agreed on, but there is no point of order. It is now 4:30.

Debate on the Adjournment  
[Late Show]

MS DUFF:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MS DUFF:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before getting into my remarks on the issue of chronic care beds, I would like to thank the hon. the Minister of Health for his recent gift of a nicely wrapped Purity kiss which he sent over to me. I am glad to see he is into local preference, but I would much prefer it if he just did not kiss off every question that I ask him.

On this whole question of chronic care beds, I have been, as I do usually with my questions, doing a lot of background reading on it, and from 1984 on it is very obvious that the Members Opposite, those who were on this side before, constantly beat up on Government for what it was not doing in terms of chronic care in this Province, including the Minister who made very lofty statements about the importance of chronic care.

Because this is an issue of the 1980's, this whole question of the aging and the health needs of the aging. It is one that has really gotten its full play in this decade. And the Government of the day, in fact, was, the record will show, very well aware of this problem, and taking very responsible action to deal with it. In the first instance, back as far as 1984, they commissioned probably the most major study on this issue the Province has ever seen, the Provincial Bed Study, and they also commissioned a study on Hospital and Nursing Home

costs. By 1986, the Government of the day was prepared to act, and they committed close to \$20 million in new chronic care facilities in this Province. And the time that it takes to do the planning, to negotiate the financing with CMHC to get these institutions in place, was all done and ready and passed to this Government on a platter. And it was done with a clear commitment at that time, because I have checked this out with various people, including CMHC, that CMHC will not give funding unless there is a clear indication that the Government will undertake the operational responsibility once those facilities are in place.

So what happens? This spring we have the wonderful opening of three new facilities, one in Botwood, one in the Agnes Pratt Home, and one in Carbonear. And now, nine months later, we have 77 empty beds, and that is the legacy of this Government to the chronically ill of this Province. All of these institutions have approved waiting lists that would fill these beds twice over, and where are these frail elderly? - Mr. Minister, I would appreciate your attention, since this concerns your Department. I have to say to our Opposition House Leader, if he would come over. The frail elderly are in three places. They are either - order, Mr. Opposition House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MS DUFF:  
The frail elderly are either in their own homes, and I do not have to tell the Minister what that means. If they are suffering from Senile Dementia or Alzheimer's Disease, they could be wandering

around at night, falling down stairs, burning themselves. Minimally they are not taking care of their personal needs, they are not eating properly, and that was a major concern of this Minister when he was in Opposition. If they are not in their own homes where they are at risk, they are living with relatives, and, in many cases, you have relatives who are themselves candidates for chronic care trying to take care of aging parents, or young families taking care of aging parents, where the stress of having a Mother with Senile Dementia in a home with small children is causing an unbelievably difficult burden. Or, alternately, they are taking up acute care beds, very expensive acute care beds, either in St. John's or Central Newfoundland or Corner Brook, or wherever these acute care beds are available.

Now, it was very interesting, also, in my little research, to read again the policies and the political statements made by this Government when they were running for office. They would make your heart break, something like the little old lady who was going to kiss the Premier's feet when she brought his son home. They were going to pour money into chronic care. That statement was made by the Premier in Corner Brook. They were not going to put the bottom line ahead of the needs of the elderly in this Province, no way! It was going to be one of their real priorities.

Well, I would have to say, based on the record of this Government, because they did not have to wait, all they had to do was provide funding in the last Budget to fill those beds, was that these election promises are fraudulent,

misleading, manipulative garbage that should be ripped up, because the Government obviously had no intention of ever fulfilling those promises once they got in a position to do so. The Minister made statements when he was in Opposition that it is the responsibility of the Department of Health to act, to make things happen. I would like to ask the Minister where he was when he was not acting at Budget time, when he knew he was not going to get the funding for those chronic care beds? He is still acting and people are going to be very tired and very disillusioned by the time they find a solution.

Now, it is easy to say you do not have money, but I think it is very obvious, in terms of what this Government has done since the Budget, that if you put a priority on something and need money, you can find it, Mr. Minister. The Premier found the money to get a very high-priced lawyer down from Toronto for his Meech Lake deal, so if you meant what you said when you were over here, I think you are morally bound to open those beds in chronic care institutions.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Sit down.

MS DUFF:  
I will sit when the Speaker tells me to sit.

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

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member gives a vivid description of the health care system in this Province. I am glad to see she understands the mess it is in. The health care system has just come through a three-year freeze on hospital

construction, a three-year freeze that was placed on it by her Administration. Not a nail was driven, not a window frame was put in place, not a foundation was laid, Mr. Speaker, except in one or two of their own districts where they managed to circumvent the system. If the hon. Opposition House Leader were here, he would know what I am taking about. They put this freeze on, and it will take years for this Administration to overcome the effects of that freeze on hospital construction.

MS VERGE:  
You are compounding the problem.

MR. DECKER:  
I am just taking my time now.

MS DUFF:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member for St. John's East on a point of order.

MS DUFF:  
He is misleading the House. We are talking about chronic care beds, and he is making a statement that not a nail was driven in the past three years. These seventy-seven beds were built in the last three years, and I would like the Minister to withdraw his dishonest statements in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:  
Of course there is not. She is just trying to take my time



because she does not want to hear the truth.

It will take years to overcome the effects of that freeze. Now, let me tell the hon. Member what we found when we took over. There are sixteen chronic care beds in the hospital in Clarenville which have never been open, for three years they have been closed. In the Health Sciences Centre there are twenty-eight beds which have been there since 1978, eleven years, and have never been open, Mr. Speaker. At the Janeway Hospital there are twenty beds which have been closed for three years. Carbonear has a total psychiatry floor with twenty beds never opened, and that institution was built in the 1970s. Now, that is the kind of mess that Administration left. In Salt Pond, down in the Minister's district, there are thirty-five beds for chronically ill people. We have money in this year's Budget, Mr. Speaker - that is action - and we are going to open these beds. We are trying to turn around this monster which they left us.

In Agnes Pratt there are forty-one chronic care beds, twelve of which are specifically for Alzheimer's people. They were not included in this year's Budget. I have had meetings with members of the board at the Agnes Pratt Home and I am desperately trying to find the money within the Department of Health. Members on the other side who served in the Cabinet know what you have to do, you have to try to find a saving from some other program within your Department; we are trying to find that money.

If those Members had not wasted \$25 million on Sprung, had they

not wasted \$500,000 on Peter Lougheed, had they not spent our money like they were a bunch of drunken sailors, we would have been able to open our hospital beds by now. Now, for the people of Agnes Pratt we are trying to find the money to open these beds, and they will be open as soon as that money is found. The same is true with the Twomey Centre in Central Newfoundland where there are fifty beds not open.

But, let me tell the hon. Member, let me tell the people at Agnes Pratt, and let me tell the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that seventeen years from now the health care system will not be in the mess it was in when we took over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have no trouble tabling this. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the hon. the Minister of Health just said that in seventeen years the health care system will not be in the mess it is in now.

My question is to the Minister of Fisheries, and I would say that in the last seven months we have seen the fisheries into a mess in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say I believe this Minister of Fisheries to be a most hon. gentleman and to be a very honest straightforward individual, but I believe the

Minister of Fisheries did not give the House the real facts on Monday. When I asked the Minister on Monday why the fish caught off Nain and Hopedale was by-passed and unloaded in St. Anthony, the Minister came back shortly after and I would like to read what the Minister said: 'I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that the vessel itself was fishing for turbot on an experimental basis, and that the plants in Makkovik and the Labrador Shrimp Company were both offered the catch.' Now, this is what the Minister said when he brought it back, and I know for a fact that that is not true.

That is not true, Mr. Speaker. The Labrador Shrimp Company may have been offered the catch, I cannot argue with that, but Torngat Fisheries were not offered the catch from those boats at this particular time. Torngat Fisheries were offered the catch in the middle of summer when they were already blocked up. That is when Torngat Fisheries were offered the catch. But when the boat went off Nain in the early part of October, the Minister's Department and Mr. Hearn - I forget the guy's name - did not call or talk to Torngat Fisheries about whether they wanted the turbot unloaded at Makkovik, which they would have done if they were offered it at that time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as for the Labrador Shrimp Company, the Minister could be correct. I do not know. But as far as it pertains to the fish plant -

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to interrupt the hon. Member, but a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:

I am having some real difficulty in hearing what the hon. Member is saying, and I am quite interested in what he has to say. There is noise coming from both sides, Mr. Speaker. I cannot point a finger at any one side, but I really am having some difficulty at the moment. I wonder if you could call order to make sure we have silence while the hon. Member has his flow of thought going.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I say to the Minister of Fisheries, I hope that when he speaks in a few minutes he will admit that the information he was given was not correct. I think that is what is wrong, because I do not think the Minister came in and deliberately told us this unless he was given information from some officials of his.

Now, the middle distance fleet was fishing off Nain, Hopedale, and Makkovik, within 50 miles. The middle distance fleet did take one load of fish to St. Anthony. The middle distance fleet is still up there, or probably back to St. Anthony again now, but, meanwhile, I am not worried about the load now because the fish plants are closed. That is not the problem now. Nothing can be done, the fish plants are now closed. This is it, my hon. friend, the fish plant was still open when they had the first load of turbot. That is the problem. There were

twenty-three fish plant workers in the Town of Makkovik who needed two or three more stamps to qualify for UIC benefits, and this ship passed Makkovik, passed the fish plant that this Government has an interest in, and came down to St. Anthony and unloaded the fish, which I do not think was very fair, knowing that my hon. colleague from Eagle River said publicly to the Combined Councils of Labrador that we believe, and, in fact, everybody believes, that those nearest the resource should be the first to reap the benefits and, in order for the people nearest to the resource to reap the benefits, surely goodness, there should have been more dialogue with the Torngat Fisheries and, by doing that, we could have taken two or three, or five or six more people off social assistance, which they will be on most of this winter. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, in October this year, the 'Hamilton Banker', the mid-distance vessel owned by the Department of Fisheries, undertook an experimental fishery in the waters off Nain, Labrador. For the first time ever, the boat went up there under special arrangement to see just what is to be done in terms of developing the turbot fishery in that area.

When the boat went up there, there was no guarantee that it would catch a single pound of fish. Luckily, it caught, I believe,

160,000 or 140,000 pounds, and I expect there was nobody more surprised than the crew of that vessel and the fish plant owners in Labrador and probably, the officials of the Department of Fisheries.

When the vessel went up there to undertake the experimental fishery, I am told that talks took place with the Torngat Fishery, operators of the Government-owned plant in Makkovik, and that the price they were prepared to offer and that would make the trip economically viable was considerably less than what would have been realized under the auction system. And, of course, by virtue of a special arrangement, the Department is obligated to auction the fish caught by those vessels.

We also talked, Mr. Speaker, to the Labrador Shrimp Company and, in fact, we offered the Labrador Shrimp Company a package. We said, 'Look, we will give you the boats for \$500 a day, which is a reasonable price to pay for a boat of that for a boat that cost \$2 million or \$3 million. We will crew the boat and land the fish in your plant.' They came back and said, 'No, we are not willing to pay that kind of a price for the boat. We will undertake the experiment on a percentage basis. We will put our own crew on the vessel and hope for the best.' And, of course, there were a couple of downsides to that arrangement, a) the Department felt that it would not make sense to put a completely new crew on that vessel and have it prosecute the fishery in what can be rather hostile waters at this time of year; in fact, some concern was expressed by the Department for the safety of the vessel and, of

course, for the new crew. Word came back subsequently from the Labrador Shrimp Company that they were not interested in the deal.

As I said earlier, this experiment took place in October. Given the fact that the plant in Makkovik ceased to operate after October 15, then the question, of course should be asked, What would they have done with the fish had they been successful in getting it?

MR. WARREN:  
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:  
No. The reason why the plant in St. Anthony can afford to pay 40 cents and 42 cents a pound is because they are catering to the fresh fish market. It is not fresh frozen, it is fresh; hence, of course, a greater price can be obtained from the buyers.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, this is purely an experiment. It is proving to be reasonably successful, and I can tell you now that every effort was made this year to ensure that the fish caught would have been landed in Labrador. And I can tell you also, Mr. Speaker, that every effort will be made next year to ensure that the fish caught by the 'Hamilton Banker' and the other vessels and, in fact, by any other vessel over which we have control, that the plants in Labrador will be given first call on that fish. We believe in the - in fact, we use the adjacency principle to further our case against having Nova Scotians, for example, take the 2J+3KL fish to their plants in Lunenburg. And you cannot make chalk of one and cheese of the other. If the principle can be upheld when we deal with the Nova Scotians, then surely, it must

follow that we have to practice what we preach. I can give the hon. Member - and I have done the same thing for the gentleman from Eagle River, who has a total grasp, by the way, of this whole situation.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. W. CARTER:  
I have given him that same assurance, Mr. Speaker, that in future, every effort will be made to make sure the fish is landed in Labrador.

MR. TOBIN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Let me say that for eight years, I have been honoured to represent the District of Burin - Placentia West in this House. During that period of time, Mr. Speaker, I have given my all to represent the District to the best of my ability. I have tried, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:  
I have tried, and tried hard to treat all of the people in my District, regardless if they came from the larger towns or the smaller communities, regardless of their politics, I have tried to represent them hard, and give them the type of representation they deserved.

The Minister of Works, Services and Transportation stated in this House today that it was my fault that the taxpayers in Newfoundland and Labrador were going to spend money to construct a road to Petit Forte. That would not have happened if I had not interceded on their behalf.

I have been proud with many accomplishments in the District of Burin - Placentia West throughout the years. I have been proud of such issues as the Hospital, and one of the issues that I was extremely proud of was when together with my colleagues in Government for the people of Petit Forte and South East Bight, we were able to share a vision. A vision of someday being free from isolation. These hard working and dedicated Newfoundlanders had their dreams realized, Mr. Speaker, in their community, in their very own school when an agreement was signed between the Provincial and Federal Government that would see a road constructed to their community.

That day - that very moment, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to share the joy and the happiness with these people. The feeling that they would belong to Newfoundland and Labrador, the feeling that they would be freed from isolation, and become equal. That freedom, Mr. Speaker, I am serious today, and I take great exception to the smirk on the face of the Minister of - the gutless wonder, Mr. Speaker - the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. I am very serious about this, and the people of Petit Forte and South East Bight would not laugh if they saw you, I can assure you that.

Mr. Speaker, this happiness began

to wither away when the Minister took six months from the day the tender was called until the contract was awarded. This began to wither away, Mr. Speaker, it became shattered in these communities when they received the paper a few days ago indicating by the Minister, and I quote, "It is wrong, it is just not right to put a road to Petit Forte and a ferry service to South East Bight." The happiness that these people were experiencing, the fact that many of the residents, Mr. Speaker, bought cars, the fact that some of the older people in Petit Forte, people like Gerald Hann and many others who thought they would see in their day, a road being constructed to Petit Forte, has, as well, been shattered.

I spoke to the people from that community today, people who were very disappointed, people who were very emotional, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of this Province and the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation would try to destroy their way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am not playing politics on this issue. I am very sincere and very serious. I take exception to anyone who thinks that I am. I have worked with these people for seventeen years - ten years as a social worker and now, seven or eight years in politics. I have worked with these people, I know these people. I know them all very well. I have visited their homes, Mr. Speaker, I have stayed there. I have slept, probably, in every house down there. But I can tell you that it is very, very irritating, it is very disappointing - not for what he has done, Mr. Speaker, but to see the content the Minister is now displaying, the smile, the smirk

on his face when I talk about something as serious and as important to certain Newfoundlanders as this.

Let me ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, will he now take the floor of this House and inform us that he has changed his mind, that he will not deny the people of Petit Forte and South East Bight a road and ferry service to their community, that these people can expect the agreement that was signed to be fulfilled and the completion date of the road that was expected, be realized. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, when we took over the Government on May 5th, we looked at seventeen years of patronage and irresponsibility on behalf of the previous Government in their handling of paving and the priority for the paving system of the roads in Newfoundland, so what I had to do as Minister, and what this Government had to do, was try and be responsible for the next period of time and to ensure that the dollars we spend in transportation will be well spent. The first thing I looked at was the ferry service that we were presently operating in Newfoundland. The previous Government took over the operation of this service in 1979 and at the time they signed an agreement with the Federal Government who gave them \$1.4 million to take over the ferry service for Newfoundland. This was going to be a five year agreement tagged to the consumer

price index in St. John's. It was extended for two more years and when it finally expired the Federal Government was putting \$2.6 million into the ferry service in Newfoundland and the people of Newfoundland were putting something like \$9 million into the ferry service in Newfoundland. Now, that is a serious situation, and right now the ferry service in Newfoundland is going to cost somewhere in the vicinity of \$14 or \$15 million next year to run. Then I looked at the agreements that were signed with the Federal Government to see where we were going for the next while with the agreements that had been signed, and the one that came to mind, and was pointed out to me by the civil servants in my Department, as possibly the worse case of political patronage that was signed in the agreement, was the one for the community of Petit Forte. Right now the Federal Government are operating a ferry across the Bay from Argentia to South East Bight and Petit Forte and the Federal Government is paying \$550,000 a year for this service. What the former Government signed to take over the Petit Forte operation was that they decided they were going to spend \$750,000 up front to start the road under the ERDA agreement and the Federal Government was going to put in approximately \$6 million to build a dirt road to Petit Forte which when completed would not be up to any degree of standards. My officials tell me that the best you would ever be able to drive on it would be about sixty kilometers an hour. The other thing we were then going to do, was the Province was then going to assume the operation of a ferry service between Petit Forte and South East Bight at about another \$300,000 a year, so all

told what we were doing was we were taking over a service that the Federal Government were putting in for \$550,000 a year, we were going to put a road to the community of Petit Forte which has 114 people living in it and we were going to assume the ferry service for South East Bight, where there are another 110 people. I felt that this money was not being well spent and, for that reason, I asked that we look again at this situation to ensure that the people of Petit Forte - and let me tell hon. Members that we recognize the community of Petit Forte as we do Francois and McCallum -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. GILBERT:

- and we have no intention of doing anything to downgrade the service to Petit Forte. The service of any changes will be to upgrade the service to Petit Forte.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, before you do the adjournment motion, in the spirit of co-operation that exists between myself and my good friend, the -

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. the Government House Leader agree to stop the clock?

MR. BAKER:

Stop the clock, yes.

In the spirit of co-operation that exists between my good friend, the Opposition House Leader and myself, I would like to formally state -

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible).

MR. BAKER:

You have not been demoted already, have you?

MR. SIMMS:

I did handle the (inaudible).

MR. BAKER:

- that the intentions of the Government tomorrow are to, first of all, call Motions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

MR. SIMMS:

There is no point in listening to you; you will not follow your word anyway.

MR. BAKER:

I am just pointing this out, call Motions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Then, we move to second readings on Bills numbered 36, 37, 41 and 46. And then, we could go to Committee on Bills numbered 26, 29, 33, 34 and 48.

Now, then, this is not a commitment that we are going to do all of that tomorrow, although I would love to do all of that tomorrow.

Also, if something happens between now and then that one or two of these cannot be called, then obviously, they cannot be called. But this is the intention of Government, and I would like to point out to the Opposition that they should be ready to handle these very weighty Bills.

I would also like to mention one

other thing and go on to Monday. I would like to go on to Monday, Mr. Speaker, as well. Tomorrow, I hope to distribute Bill No. 40, and on Monday, regardless of what we have covered on Friday, on Monday, I intend to move to second reading of Bill No. 40.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. The Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, now we are seeing it coming now. Now we are seeing it coming now. As I said earlier in my statements, as I said earlier in my comments, you cannot trust the Government House Leader any longer. All deals are off, cooperation will be harder to come by, I can assure the Government House Leader, because today he tricked us, today he tricked us, Mr. Speaker, that is what he did. He told me today precisely what he has just told everybody now publicly. He gave us the order in which legislation was going to be dealt with, and that is the way we have been doing it up til now, since June, in order, in that order, not that they are all going to be done that day, he need not try to trick us into thinking that that is what the issue was about today. The issue was about what he told us in confidence and in a cooperative spirit, and today he broke his word, and that is one issue. So, I take with a grain of salt, what the Government House Leader has told us now about the order of business, we will see if he follows it, I am willing to bet he will not, I am willing to bet he will not, he will slip something in between there, you watch, mark my word. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, and much more seriously, you can laugh, you can tell me to sit down, but I

will tell the House Leader this: If he brings in Bill No. 40, as he has now said he is going to do on Monday, without following the approved procedure by agreement in this House publicly, it is an approved procedure of sending those Bills to the legislative committees for review first, then I can assure him, if he thinks that he has had a hard time on some of these minor Bills, he will have a very difficult time with Bill No. 40, let me tell him that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. The Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just very briefly, I would like to assure the Opposition through you, that the spirit of cooperation still exists and I will continue to cooperate, even though the opposition has claimed that their cooperation has been withdrawn, I am still not withdrawing my cooperation, and Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to debating Bill 40 on Monday.

MR. SIMMS:

As usual, that is precisely my point. The Government House Leader has said he does not care about us withdrawing our cooperation, but he will not withdraw his cooperation and as he has been doing for the last couple of days in particular he has been cooperating with nobody, only himself, and that is the problem.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before adjourning the House, or putting the motion, I wonder if hon. Members would agree to just a couple of minutes of making a decision, or telling the House



what the decision is re the point of privilege raised a little earlier this afternoon, so that we do not leave it hanging. The Speaker does not rule on whether there is a point of privilege, the Speaker simply rules on whether there is a prima facie case, and in this particular example, in this particular instance, the Speaker rules that there was not a prima facie case, which means that the point of privilege will not be permitted to be debated.

His Honour would like to say a couple of things about points of privilege. We have said that a point of privilege is a very rare thing to be raised in the House, and we want to make sure that we are not abusing the House by doing that. I am not suggesting that the hon. Member did. But I want to say this, that maybe when our Committee is looking at the reform in the rules of the House, this is another area we ought to look at in points of privilege.

In most other jurisdictions as well, that there is a Notice to be given of points of privilege excepting when they are raised in the House. Of course, when something happens in the House then you cannot give a Notice because it is something that came right out of the debate. But ordinarily, there is a Notice given so that we are not flying by the seat of our pants. We specialize in that kind of thing in this House with respect to emergency debate and particularly points of privilege. So what we had here today was a difference between two hon. gentlemen as to certain facts stated and not a point of privilege.

It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 9:00 a.m.