



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 21

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas

Thursday

21 April 1988

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I would like at this time to rule with respect to the point of privilege raised yesterday by the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout).

Members are aware that the duty of Speaker with respect to a point of privilege is limited to determining whether a member has established a prima facie case of breach of privilege.

In this instance, I do not believe the hon. the Minister of Fisheries has established a prima facie case of breach of privilege.

I have examined Hansard of April 19, 1988 where the questions alleged to have given rise to the breach of privilege were asked, and also the press statement concerning the matter made yesterday by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

I believe the questions asked by the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) on Tuesday were valid questions to ask, which the Minister of Fisheries was free to answer or not answer, as he saw fit. The questions involved allegations as to matters of fact.

According to Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, Section 19, sub-section (1), and I quote, "A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege."

Concerning the press statement, I again quote Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, Section 19, sub-section (3), "Statements made outside the

House by a Member may not be used as the base for a question of privilege."

In summary, my examination of the relevant material does not disclose a prima facie case of breach of privilege.

Oral Questions

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, my question goes to the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett). Mr. Speaker, in the House yesterday I put a question to the minister, through Your Honour, having to do with a contract that was awarded, I believe in February sometime, to a consortium of companies, the parent company of which was headquartered in Paris, France. To which the minister replied, Mr. Speaker, that there were proposals requested on a global basis for the construction of that offshore floating system, or at least for the design of it.

I wonder can the minister tell the House, Mr. Speaker, if he is aware of any Newfoundland companies that had joint venture arrangements with other than French companies that were in a position to bid on that tender call, that proposal?

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, that the contractual agreement that has been entered into by this government with very creditable international/local companies will bring a degree of technology and capability to this Province seems to have somehow eluded the member opposite.

As I said yesterday, a number of proposals had been sought, received and evaluated. There are a number of reasons why this government felt in its evaluation that this particular consortium would be the one that would be asked to proceed with this particular study. This particular consortium, involving this particular French company to which the member alludes, is the only one that has developed so far the technology capable of putting in place offshore of this Province a floating production system that is of a concrete base construction, and a production technique and a technological capability that would allow this Province to benefit significantly from the industrial benefit component of this kind of a project. The normal expertise and technology that is presently known by the other proponents to the greatest extent involves steel construction technology. It involves, as stated by several of the offshore companies wishing to become involved in floating production systems for the offshore Newfoundland, the conversion of existing steel production platforms or the construction of steel production re facilities, that would in all probability see a great amount of construction activity take place outside of the boundaries of Newfoundland.

The particular technology that this particular consortium can

bring to the Province will ensure the maximization of industrial benefits, job creation and long-term benefits, and is the leading edge of technology for employment elsewhere in the world based on a construction technique that cannot be found anywhere else.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning the credibility of the company nor am I questioning its competence. I am questioning the wisdom of the minister in awarding a very substantial contract to a French company in light of statements that have been made by his colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), and his Premier (Mr. Peckford) with respect to the Canada-France boundary dispute.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is this, the company to which the contract was awarded, Bouyges Offshore, it is a French company.

The understanding is that that company made an unsolicited proposal to the government concerning the design of a floating offshore facility.

The minister, Mr. Speaker, is no doubt aware that there is a Norwegian company, for example, and I believe a company in Sweden that do in fact have the necessary expertise to engage in that kind of work, and that there are companies in this Province with whom these other two companies could have and are indeed

affiliated that could have carried out that design.

Now would the minister, Mr. Speaker, table in the House copies of the proposal call or tender call - whatever documents were involved in this action - so that we can see exactly what the specifications were, if in fact there were any specifications, and why in fact other companies did not bid on the proposal?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. BARRETT:

The gentleman opposite should know that responses to requests for proposals contain a significant amount of very confidential information, information that is peculiarly in the hands of the people who actually respond, information that in the competitive commercial world that is out there, which I presume the member has some information, some knowledge of, would prejudice and would cause great economic concern and disadvantage if that information became public.

The government, in dealing with proponents on an international or even on a local scale, has to maintain the confidentiality and the creditability of being able to seek information that will allow it to make a decision to further the aims of the government in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. It cannot do that if it is perceived or known to publicly disclose all that confidential information to which it gets access.

The member opposite should know that. I should also probably inform the gentlemen opposite, and

his colleagues, that this particular project will deliver from government funding in this Province of the total value of the project, \$187,795, and the total value of the project, Mr. Speaker, is \$1,939,000, \$1 million of which, or in excess of \$1 million, is being contributed directly by various French companies, including Bouyges Offshore. The amount of money that was being tendered, or that had been negotiated, was less than \$900,000 of that \$2 million amount, of which the amount of money that directly flows into the hands of the French company is only \$187,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how the member opposite can construe that this government is somehow influencing the international decisions of negotiations between the federal government in Ottawa and the government of France on our offshore boundary and fisheries dispute, how that can be upset by \$187,000, I cannot understand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

The last time the hon. minister's party or government refused to table certain vital information, I think the excuse used was that it might betray a patent, and I am referring now to Sprung. Now the Minister, Mr. Speaker, in his statement -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, yesterday in his reply the minister said, 'This department did, in fact solicit globally for proposals to produce a report with respect to new concepts in floating production systems.'

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
My question, Mr. Speaker, is this: If the Minister was willing to advertise globally, I presume by that he means in newspapers around the world or trade magazines, if he was willing to advertise in those magazines calling for proposals, then surely that is no longer secret information. Surely, then, the members of this House are entitled to copies of advertisements or other information that he might have released or published in various trade magazines. I ask the minister, again, would he table all pertinent information with respect to the proposal call for the design of this floating system?

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

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, how silly, how absolutely, absurdly silly can this member be! We are not tendering for paper clips, we are not tendering for envelopes. We are talking about a global community that is well known to anybody who is in the business. They only number half a dozen companies all over the world. You do not run newspaper advertising

asking for proposal for floating productions technology that will involve a concrete method of construction. That is absurd. You do not even go for a trade magazine for it. That is just something that is known. It is known by officials, by people in high technology, people who are in the industry. You can point to three, four or five different groups of companies globally. You just involve yourself in the negotiations with them. You isolate them. They are easily identifiable. You do not run newspaper ads. You do not put together a big form of requests for proposals on something that is singularly identifiable as four or five international groups of companies that have any capability at all in this type of technology.

MR. W. CARTER:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Before recognizing the hon. the member for Naskaupi, I would just like to make one brief comment. I do not want to cut into Question time. The reason I am not recognizing the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) is not because of his lengthy questions or the lengthy answers of the hon. Minister of Development. But if we are going to have a considerable number of questions and answers I think we should try and condense both questions and the answers.

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Power). On 8 May

1987, the Premier held a press conference and made a press statement which said in part, 'In addition, the government would have direct control over certain types of business decisions of importance to the Province and for this purpose will be represented on the company's Board of Directors.' He was making reference, of course, to the Sprung project. I would like to ask the minister what type of business decisions were being referred to and what does the term 'direct control' mean in this context?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Can I have the question repeated, please?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

A quick point of order, Mr. Speaker.

If I have to repeat my first question, I would still expect my supplementaries. Is that fair?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

There is no particular requirement to have a supplementary at all.

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

If the minister is awake now, we will try it again.

On May 8, 1987, the Premier, in a press conference, said the

following in part of his statement, 'In addition - referring to Sprung - 'the government will have direct control over certain types of business decisions of importance to the Province and, for this purpose, will be represented on the company's Board of Directors.'

What types of business decisions were being referred to and what does the term 'direct control' mean in this context?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the Board of Directors of the Newfoundland Enviroponics Organization, we have four persons on the Board of Directors. Obviously those members of that board will be making normal business decisions as they relate to the running of Newfoundland Enviroponics. There is nothing out of the ordinary in that. There are nine directors on the board, we have four, and obviously they will make the kind of decisions relating to marketing, production levels, and general business decisions that are made by directors of any company.

MR. KELLAND:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

At the same conference, Mr. Philip Sprung said the following, "Substantial benefits will accrue to the people of the Province in the way of nutrition, reduced

prices, and employment opportunities."

Now, I am wondering if the minister will tell us if we are now benefiting from the reduced prices that we were promised, and how would the reduced prices, if we are getting them, compare and impact on the mainland prices once we start exporting out of Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, somewhere in the future the members opposite are going to have to acknowledge that there is a very successful operation in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

We have heard on this side of the House every kind of highly imaginative situation that could possibly develop as to why this operation will not work. We have a facility in Newfoundland that has grown tomatoes and sold tomatoes at a price acceptable to the Newfoundland people who bought those products in their marketplace. They were bought and paid for by Newfoundland consumers, so somebody must have thought they were worth what we were charging.

In the case of the cucumbers, we are still producing cucumbers being sold in Newfoundland, being sold at a price that the consumer is evidently satisfied with, because they keep purchasing the product. The fact is there is going to be a lot more product on the market, Mr. Speaker.

The problems that we have had at Newfoundland Enviroponics relating to tomatoes are going to be resolved. We are going to have a large number of products on the market in Newfoundland. They are going to be sold. Newfoundland Enviroponics is going to work. We have 150 employees there in production and, as I guess I announced yesterday or the day before, we will have in excess of 150 employees as we continue to maintain our production. The activity there is going to work. The products are going to be consumed by persons in Newfoundland and outside of Newfoundland. That is the reality of it. And sometime in the near future members opposite are going to have to acknowledge those facts.

MR. KELLAND:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is interesting to note this is the first time I have heard an Agricultural Minister admit that there are some problems in the Sprung operation.

I would like to ask the minister if he is absolutely satisfied that adequate markets for the Sprung produce have been identified and developed, or does he have some reservations at this point that such will be case once full production is reached?

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern

Development.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, it is not the first time we have acknowledged that we have had some problems in getting the Sprung project to full production and capacity. I also acknowledge that members opposite have problems with their hearing, because they refuse to listen to facts, they have terrible problems with logic, and they also have a political problem that tries to make sure that anything we try in Newfoundland has to fail.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

It has to fail for the benefit of the Liberal and the NDP parties, Mr. Speaker. That is why it has to fail, so that we can get from this side of the House to their side of the House so their purposes will be served. That is the function behind all of the criticism of Sprung. When we look at the idea of having a Sprung facility in Labrador, councils in Labrador City, Wabush, Happy Valley - Goose Bay are very adamant that they want the next opportunity to have a Sprung facility.

When it comes to the point of the market for the Newfoundland Enviroponics facility, we are convinced, Mr. Speaker, that there is a market for all of the produce produced by this one facility, which we estimated at 7 million pounds but now think may be well in excess of 7 million pounds of products per year.

In Eastern Canada and in the Northeastern U.S. there are over 200 million pounds of those products imported every single

year. They are imported from as far away as South Africa, Spain, Mexico and all parts of the world. We think we can satisfy part of that market. We think we can do it, so that Newfoundland Enviroponics can make a profit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I have a question as well for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. As we understand it, Mr. Speaker, we now know that the Province's obligations to the Sprung greenhouse complex is as follows; \$3.5 million in cash equity; \$7 million guarantees to the Royal Bank; \$2 million operating loan guarantees; \$850,000 land contribution by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation; \$825,000 to the Sprung Environmental Space Enclosure Company for a total of \$14,175,000, I believe.

My question to the minister is as follows: Would the minister inform the House if the government have given or have been requested to give any further guarantees or other form of financial assistance either to the Sprung Group of Companies or to Newfoundland Enviroponics?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, we have made known

all of the information about the Newfoundland Enviroponics facility that members opposite have asked for. When we made that information known, obviously there is some concern on the opposite side that somehow we are getting taken for a big ride in Newfoundland, because we are doing this very novel and innovative industry which is not happening any place else in the world. Contrary to what some newspaper reports might say, there is not anything similar in Ontario and there is not anything similar any place else in the world. It is being done for the first time here. It is something that we have a great deal of faith in on this side of the House. We are convinced that it is going to work. If, on occasion, as we have had in the past, have to give an additional guarantee, if we have to do the lights, we are going to do whatever is required to make this a success story in Newfoundland. We are convinced that it will be. We are convinced that there will be many other Newfoundland Enviroponics type facilities in Newfoundland in years to come. The research and development capabilities of that facility, its capacity to grow all kinds of products that this marketplace in Newfoundland and in Eastern Canada and in the Eastern U.S. badly need, convinced us there is a very substantial market and we will do whatever is necessary to make the project work.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon.

gentleman did not understand the question, because he certainly did not answer it, so let me put it to him in a slightly different form.

I can assume, then, and I guess the Legislature can assume, that there have been no further obligations or guarantees of any sort given by the government to this project other than those that have been announced? Is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I will say it again. And it is very, very unfortunate, as the Minister of Development mentioned to me the other day, that it is almost impossible to get business people to come to Newfoundland to invest, because if you read a national newspaper, all you see is criticism when you try a project in Newfoundland, and how Newfoundlanders, or some persons in Newfoundland with vested interests, try and tear that project apart.

We will table in this House every piece of information that we can without jeopardizing the viability of this project. If there are any additional monies that are going to be requested or will be requested, that we as the government decide to give to the Newfoundland Enviroponics operation, when we do it we will gladly table it in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, does the minister's failure to deal with the question that I just asked him, in view of the fact that I asked him had there been any further obligations taken by the government to this project, mean that there have been some further obligations undertaken by the government?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, it is the same question asked many times around. The point is that we have made known all of our financial obligations to Newfoundland Enviroponics. As we take on any additional financial obligations with Newfoundland Enviroponics, or any other company that we assist to stay in business in Newfoundland, whether it is fish companies, whether it is hydroponics companies, we will table this information in this House, as we have done very successfully for nine year term of office of this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development as well.

I assume the hon. minister is now

entertaining questions. I think my colleagues finally woke him up. I am going to change gears a little, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

There are regulations, Mr. Speaker, governing livestock and pets coming into this Province. The minister will be aware of The Livestock Health Act which is administered by his department.

In view of the recent outbreak of rabies in Northern Newfoundland, in my district -

MR. MATTHEWS:

You do not have them, do you?

MR. DECKER:

So the minister laughs at that, he thinks it is funny, does he?

Is the minister satisfied that regulations are being adequately enforced on the North Sydney-Port aux Basques run? It seems to me that that ferry looks like a floating zoo sometimes coming into this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, just for the sake of members opposite, I was not listening to the first question I was asked because I was reading an issue with some articles about agriculture and things that are happening in this Province and in Atlantic Canada. And, it might serve members opposite well if I

send over a copy of that newspaper so that they might ask a few questions about agriculture, because they have not asked me either one since the House opened for this session.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very serious problem in Newfoundland as it relates to the rabies outbreak on the Northern Peninsula. We found several foxes that came over on the ice from Labrador that did carry rabies with them. We are very, very concerned as a government that the rabies which is now isolated to a part of the Northern Peninsula, the Roddickton area, could spread to other parts of the Province. We have undertaken jointly between my department and the Department of Wildlife in particular to make sure that we eradicate that rabies problem on the Northern Peninsula if at all possible.

That is very, very important. It is going to cost the government possibly in excess of \$500,000 to make sure that we localize that problem, because once it becomes widespread on the Island portion of the Province it can become something which would be almost impossible to eradicate.

As it relates to the regulations that we have in place to make sure that rabies does not come into the Province through the ferry system or through the airplane system, I am concerned. We have the regulations in place. I did receive a letter the other day from one person who had travelled on the North Sydney ferry, who recounted the story where her pet was supposed to be inspected and an inspector was supposed to arrive at their vehicle before getting on the ferry, but it was not done. I have since asked my

staff to make sure, and especially with this problem that we have on the Northern Peninsula, that all of our regulations are very strictly enforced while this, I guess, threat of rabies is present in the Province.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

By coincidence, Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of that same letter, and the letter refers to a complaint that was made to the minister's office back in September of 1987.

I ask the minister: Will he explain why these complaints were treated so frivolously by his department and were not checked out until after rabies had come to this Province?

The minister will also be aware that the foxes which were caught and killed are red foxes, not the Arctic fox. There has not been an Arctic fox from Labrador proven to have rabies in Newfoundland at this stage, Mr. Speaker. They are all red foxes, local foxes.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, a couple of points. First of all, I do not think I said Arctic foxes. I said foxes that were on the Northern Peninsula had brought the rabies from Labrador, not necessarily Arctic foxes but red foxes. In 1987, if there was a complaint

made to the department I am sure one of the best Ministers of Agriculture that this Province has ever had - the man is now Minister of Forest Resources (Mr. R. Aylward) and sits to my right - took action on it. When I found a complaint last week, when that letter came to my notice, I certainly gave it to my staff to follow through in every way, shape and form to make sure that this threat of rabies is localized to the Northern Peninsula, and does not end up going to Nova Scotia or other parts of mainland Canada. We also have regulations and the enforcement should be there to prevent rabies from coming to the Province from that direction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that we do follow up. We do have a very good staff, and I am sure they take all the precautions that are humanly possible to take.

MR. DECKER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, is the minister certain that rabies were introduced by Arctic fox or red fox - it is practically impossible - from Labrador? Has the minister considered the possibility that this disease was introduced by pets coming across the Gulf because the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development did not ensure that the regulations were enforced? They did not bother shutting the barn door until the horse had gone away, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, it is very unfortunate the member who asked the questions seems to have taken on the questioning technique of the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), which is always to cause alarm, always to incite and excite any kind of panic in the Province.

If the member opposite has any kind of scientific, factual information that the rabies problem on the Northern Peninsula came across on the ferry system, then I think the responsible thing to do would be to go to our chief of veterinary services in the Province to notify those persons, to notify myself, so we can take appropriate action.

There is no evidence, to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that the small problem that we have on the Northern Peninsula is going to become an epidemic in this Province. There is no knowledge from anyone that I have been talking to that it has come in on the ferry system. It is very likely a localized case, a very small case of some foxes coming across on the ice-floes from Labrador. All the scientific information has proven that that is where that comes from. If the member opposite has some information, then he should deal with it in a responsible fashion, and not this irresponsible one.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge), and it has to do with a commitment she and the Premier have made over the last eight or nine years towards introducing a new Election Expenses Act. My question, Mr. Speaker, is this: Given that a committee of this House, headed by the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), back in 1983 recommended a spending limit of \$25,000 on any individual campaign, and given that we now have the Leader of the Official Opposition's expense statement for an election, and it turns out that he has spent \$41,486.41 on the Windsor - Buchans byelection, given those two things, will the minister assure us that she will introduce legislation controlling the amount of money that can be spent on elections so that we do not have elections going to the highest bidder, as we clearly had in this case?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

I have indicated to this hon. House and to the member for Menihek in the recent past, and I will say it again now, the government has not finalized our examination of various proposals for a new election's legislation. It is a complicated business. We do have the benefit of the deliberations and recommendations of the committee, which we are considering, and we are looking at the experience of other jurisdictions in Canada. When we complete our exercise I will be in a position to indicate so to the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is to ask the minister that since Sean Power, the PC candidate in that election, spent \$34,161, and clearly is \$9000 above even the generous limits proposed by the committee, will she assure that there will be some sort of spending limit on these election campaigns? It is clear in this case that the PC Party attempted to buy it back but were clearly outbid by the Liberal Party, which seems to have the big bucks. Will she assure us that we will have a spending limit before we go into any other elections?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, of course it is impossible for me to give that assurance. It is a matter for the government as a whole. The government as a whole will agree on any changes in our elections legislation and as the appropriate time, if I am still Minister of Justice, I will introduce it in the House of Assembly. Certainly, it is an issue that we have been considering.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:

As other members have clearly indicated, we have raised this on previous occasions. A year ago it was also raised, and at that time the minister stood and indicated that the enforcement divisions of

this legislation are faulty.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
My question to the minister is this: Since the enforcement provisions are by her own admission not enforceable in law, and therefore even this minimal amount of reporting could have been dispensed with by the individual members concerned, could she assure us that at least that enforcement provision will be brought in before this session of the House of Assembly prorogues, dissolves or whatever it is likely to do?

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, again I cannot give that assurance. It is something that we will take into consideration. But I will point out again that there has not been a practical problem in that candidates have for the most part voluntarily submitted election expenses lists. In the case of recent Windsor - Buchans byelection, all three candidates have filed statements of election expenses.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, my -

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:
Just for clarification, perhaps I have incorrectly recorded the starting time of Question Period, but I had 3:05 as the beginning.

I just checked with the Clerk at the table and that would indicate that the time has expired for Oral Questions.

MR. SPEAKER:
Obviously, the Speaker was having a little snooze today and the time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

I took a note that it was at 3:05, but I forgot to watch the clock afterwards.

At this stage I would welcome to the Speaker's gallery members of the Royal Canadian Legion from Branch Number One and Branch Number Fifty-six.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. PEACH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Housing.

MR. PEACH:

I have some answers to four questions on the Order paper, questions 33, 44, 100, and 142. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary for me to read those five or six pages of answers because they are repeats of some 150 questions that are already on the Order paper.

Petitions

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition that I would like to present on behalf of 308 persons who have signed a petition appealing to the government.

I would first like to present a petition that will enable me to present this petition. "To The Hon. House Of Assembly Of Newfoundland And Labrador. We, the undersigned, do petition the hon. House of Assembly to give its support to a petition with 308 names on it, calling for the inclusion of the term sexual orientation in the Newfoundland and Labrador Human Rights Code."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LONG:

That is a copy of the petition with three signatures on it, including myself and the member from Menihek.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the prayer of the petition that I am asking the House of Assembly to support. It reads:

"Ontario has joined Quebec in prohibiting discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and the Yukon has given second reading to similar legislation.

"It appears Ottawa will soon 'take whatever measures necessary to ensure that sexual orientation is a prohibited ground for discrimination in all areas of federal jurisdiction'." The quote is a reference to a statement made by the hon. John Crosbie.

"We, the undersigned, encourage the government of Newfoundland and Labrador to include the term sexual orientation in the Newfoundland Human Rights Code."

That is a petition, Mr. Speaker, that I am asking the House of Assembly to give its support to, and I would like to take a few minutes to outline the spirit of the petition, and also talk about the context in which it comes forward.

We have received from the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) earlier in this session an indication that her department will be presenting legislation called, An Act To Amend Certain Acts Having Regard To The Canadian Charter Of Rights And Freedoms. This proposed change in legislation from the Minister of Justice does not, at this point, give us any indication whether the issue that is brought forward in the petition will be included.

There has been a long process over the last number of years of consultation undertaken by the

Department of Justice to review all necessary changes to our own act, given the adoption by the federal government of the Canadian Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms.

The minister, I am sure, will be aware that this has been a very critical issue to many people concerned with human rights, and many other groups in our community. We have seen in the last number of months that the governments of Ontario, Manitoba, and the Yukon have joined the Government of Canada in bringing in legislative amendments to include the term sexual orientation as a grounds for prohibiting discrimination.

The intent of the petition is to present to the minister further representation by members of the human rights community, if we may put it that way, who are quite concerned about changes that the minister will be introducing in this session governing our own Acts with respect to the Charter of Human Rights.

I would like to make reference, Mr. Speaker, for the record, to a brief that was presented a year ago, and copies were given to our office, to the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) from the Gay Association in Newfoundland and Labrador.

The preamble to the text of the brief begins with a quote from the United Church of Canada, the working unit on social issues and justice, the Division of Mission, in a brief that was presented to Parliamentary Committee on Equality Rights when they were considering the adoption of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. I quote from the United

Church submission.

"Citizens whose sexual orientation is gay or lesbian ought not to be excluded from the protections afforded to all other citizens through either neglect or failure of governments to develop the legislation that would provide that protection. To leave one group of citizens beyond the pale is a dangerous precedent. In a democracy it is equally dangerous to leave the decision about inclusion or exclusion of any particular group from human rights safeguards to the will of the public at any moment in history."

That, Mr. Speaker, is a quote taken from a text of the United Church of Canada's submission to the federal parliament. There are other submissions included in the brief to the minister from the Canadian Psychiatric Association, and a very lengthy list of groups and organizations across Canada who have adopted, in one form or another -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker, by way of conclusion, I would say to the minister that this is a very significant issue for many people, certainly many people in my own district who have made representation to me. I would hope that the minister will be able to rise in her place today and give support to the spirit of the petition, as well as the members of the Official Opposition.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I thought somebody on the government side would respond to it. I wish to speak to it.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

Are you going to speak to it?

MS VERGE:

Yes.

MR. FENWICK:

I am sorry.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I was pausing to wait for a member of the Official Opposition to respond.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

I would like to thank the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) and the petitioners for this petition. It is a very significant issue. It is one that I, as the minister responsible for the Provincial Human Rights Code and the Human Rights Commission, have been addressing. I have appreciated the input on the subject I have received from the Gay Association in Newfoundland.

The brief which the member read from is quite a comprehensive and well researched presentation. It is a submission which the government, as a whole, will address as we move ahead to improve and strengthen our human rights legislation. In doing this we are conscious of the contents of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We have watched

recent legislative changes in other provinces like Ontario, Manitoba, and the Yukon Territories. The Province of Quebec was the first jurisdiction in Canada to include explicit human rights protection without regard to sexual orientation.

The federal parliament has not made this change to the federal Human Rights Code, but I understand it is something that the federal government is considering.

Again, I thank the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) for bringing this petition to the House of Assembly.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

If a member of the official Opposition wishes to support the petition, I would gladly sit down and allow them to have the time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are a member of the Opposition.

MR. FENWICK:

Well, it is unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important in this particular petition, and with the human rights we are talking about, to be very clear about what we are talking about here. The fact of the matter is, I do not think anybody here is asking to promote a different sexual orientation. This is not the purpose of it, and in that respect I think the

response of people like Grant Devine, and other what I call extremely backward Premiers, to the announcement of Svend Robinson, one our colleagues in the federal caucus, is, in our -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Is he a friend of yours?

MR. FENWICK:
Yes, he is a friend of mine. I think he is a very courageous person, and he has a right to be a member of the House of Commons, even if he does have a different sexual orientation. And that is just the point we are trying to make.

The problem we have, Mr. Speaker, is that we tend to categorize people, and we automatically dismiss them when they have a sexual orientation that is different from ours. That, Mr. Speaker, creates incredible difficulties in their lives, and it is a situation that we cannot tolerate on an institutionalized basis. What we are asking the minister and this government publicly, is to state that this is not grounds upon which people can be discriminated against for the purpose of employment, for the purpose of housing, and for the purpose of any social or any generally available programmes.

I am extremely disappointed that the Leader of the official Opposition or any of the members of his caucus did not rise in their places to support what we consider an absolutely critical human rights issue. I am disappointed they have not done that.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. HISCOCK:
The Leader of the NDP said that nobody on our side wanted to speak to this. The leader got up and said, 'I would like to speak to it,' and we did him the courtesy of letting him speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. If the hon. member would like to speak to the petition, we, on this side, would certainly be prepared to give leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
I have already ruled there is no point of order.

MR. SIMMS:
What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we are prepared to give the hon. member leave if he wishes to speak to the petition. That is often done, frequently.

Orders of the Day

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, Order 3.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Observance Of Remembrance Day." (Bill No. 1)

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I rise today to present this bill on behalf of the hon. the Premier, who unfortunately is not able to be here today to present it himself, which he wanted to do. I, therefore, have been given that responsibility and I accept it with a great deal of pride. As I say, I am honoured to do so.

I also want to, as Your Honour has already done, extend a welcome to the very large delegation seated in the Speaker's Gallery, representing the Royal Canadian Legion. Branch 1 and Branch 56 have the largest number here, I think. I have also been told there may even be a representative from the Mount Pearl Legion, although I do not know if that is confirmed or not.

In any event, we are delighted to have them here.

MR. BARRETT:

Branch 1 is in St. John's West, by the way.

MR. SIMMS:

I see. Branch 1 is in St. John's West, I am told. Anyway, we are delighted to have them here. This is historic, I guess, to a certain extent.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to briefly explain the purpose of the Bill. It is to provide, obviously, appropriate recognition and appropriate respect for those individuals who gave their lives,

or suffered injury, in the service of their country during the First and Second World Wars, as well as the Korean Conflict.

The Royal Canadian Legion, itself, had made representations to the government requesting revisions to the old Remembrance Day Act. The purpose of those representations was to ask the government to do this so that we could ensure that the spirit and the meaning of Remembrance Day is preserved.

Mr. Speaker, we are going further than simply revising the old act. We are, in fact, repealing the old act and replacing it with this brand new piece of legislation, this brand new act. This Bill, and this act, will provide official recognition - this is extremely important, because the old bill did not have this, the old legislation - of the Poppy as the symbol of Remembrance Day, and it will also ensure that Remembrance Day is always observed on 11 November. That is very important, too.

Mr. Speaker, the preamble to the bill is extremely important, as well, in that it reflects a commitment to Remembrance Day in the minds and the hearts of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, and ensures that this day will continue to be a significant reminder to all young people who have not, and hopefully never will, experience the horrors of war.

The legislation itself is not complicated, it is not lengthy, but it is certainly significant and important.

Mr. Speaker, before I actually move Second Reading of the bill, I would like to read the preamble of

the bill. As I just said in my comments, the preamble really reflects the commitment to Remembrance Day in the minds and hearts of all Newfoundlanders. It says, "WHEREAS our heritage of freedom and human dignity has, under Providence, been preserved through the unselfish devotion of those who sacrificed health, limb, and life itself in World War One, World War Two and the Korean Conflict;

AND WHEREAS the eleventh day of November has traditionally been set aside throughout the Province as a day to be kept and observed in each and every year under the name "Remembrance Day";

AND WHEREAS since our heritage of freedom and human dignity was forged through sacrifice, suffering and death our leaders and educators are urged to keep before our youth the meaning and significance of Remembrance Day and the need for a commitment to human worth;

AND WHEREAS it is fitting that on Remembrance Day the people of the province should pay grateful tribute to the memory of those who have died, cherish those who have suffered grievous injury, and dedicate themselves anew to the maintenance and furtherance of the great ideals hallowed by those sacrifices". That is the preamble, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the preamble really says it all.

I have explained what the Bill will do quite succinctly and clearly. I do want to mention before I sit down that we indeed have a veteran ourselves, I believe, within the government benches. The member for Trinity - Bay de Verde is a veteran -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

- and we are extremely proud to have him in our caucus and in this House. I am sure I speak for all hon. members when I say that.

I may also say, incidentally, there are numerous other members in the House, certainly on this side and perhaps on that side, as well, who are ex-servicemen and very closely associated with the Legion in many respects, in many ways. I know the member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) is very, very active and

MR. DAWE:

The Minister of Health (Dr. Collins has just gotten an award from the Russians.

MR. SIMMS:

I do not know if I will mention that, but I suppose that I could.

DR. COLLINS:

The Russians were on our side then.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, all right.

The Minister of Health, I am told, recently received a significant award from the Soviet Union. At the time they were on our side, I might say. And I know there are other members in this House who have been honoured, Mr. Speaker, by their own respective Branches of the Legion, have been made honorary members and so on.

It is an extremely significant and extremely important piece of legislation and I urge all hon. members, as I am sure they will, to support this particular Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

The Sergeant-at-Arms.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, yes! I almost forgot our friend the Sergeant-at-Arms. How could one forget him? He has performed his duties magnificently.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

And our commissioners, of course, not to forget our friends who look after the security of the galleries, and who perform their duties well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I am very proud, on behalf of the Premier of the Province, to move second reading of the Remembrance Day Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to express support on behalf of the official Opposition for this Bill. It is entirely appropriate that we should ensure that nobody in the future ever forgets the tremendous sacrifice paid by a few people so that the vast numbers of us that remain, and came into being after, could enjoy the kind of freedom that we do.

And none of us should ever fail to recognize just what the value of

their contribution to us was. None of us should ever fail to recognize the tremendous price a great number of men and women paid so that we can stand in this House today and have the freedom to say and think the things we want to say and think.

When we harken back to fifty years ago and bear in mind the threat that existed at that time to our free world, we cannot fail to recognize just how much those men and women contributed to most of us, with the exception of one or two hon. members who were much too young to have looked after our own interests at that time. But we ought not to fail to recognize that. It is entirely fitting and appropriate that this House should ensure that one day at least every year is set aside for the perpetual remembrance of the contribution those men and women made to us.

I join with the Government House Leader and the Speaker in welcoming to the gallery today a good contingent from the Royal Canadian Legion. We are very pleased to see them, as we are pleased to see every day the smiling face of our Sergeant-at-Arms and the men upstairs who look after the galleries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

But at the same time that we do this, we should not overlook a story in The Evening Telegram today that notes that Newfoundland Korean war veterans have never been invited to participate in the contingent that goes, I believe once every five years, to Japan and Korea as a commemoration for

the contribution made by our former servicemen in the Korean conflict.

The price that many of them paid is no less than the price that a great many servicemen paid in the last war or in the First World War, but they tend to get forgotten. It seems that, in particular, the legionaires from Newfoundland who participated in the Korean conflict have been totally forgotten as the federal government, or whoever decides this on behalf of the federal government, has never seen fit, according to the story in today's telegram, to invite legionaires from Newfoundland. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a national disgrace.

The individual who is quoted in this story, Mr. Greening, says that, 'We would attend but we have never been asked. I guess there is not much we can do about that.' Well, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of this House, I think, perhaps, there is something we can do about it. With the leave of hon. members opposite and our friends down at the other end of this side, I would ask that we agree to introduce a consent resolution, and pass a consent resolution very quickly in this House and send that resolution -

MR. TULK:
'Simms'!

MR. WELLS:
I would like to have the attention of the hon. the Government House Leader. Perhaps the hon. the Minister of Health is looking after it, anyway, he is very attentive to the matter.

I say this seriously: If the Royal Canadian Legion members in

Newfoundland are saying that they feel there is nothing very much they can do about it, then surely the very least this House can do is step in and try and do whatever it can do about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
What we can do, Mr. Speaker, is pass a resolution with the unanimous approval of this House to ask the federal Minister of Veterans Affairs to ensure that in the future there are representatives from those who served from Newfoundland in the Korean Conflict on the next and all following contingents that go to the commemoration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
Clearly, Mr. Speaker, I endorse the comments of the hon. the Government House Leader with respect to the purpose of this bill and what it will achieve. We should be acting in unison in ensuring that the day is always recognized and followed on the day when it occurs, so that it is special and set aside to pay tribute to those who sacrificed so much. Nobody who exercises the rights and freedom that we exercise in this country today should ever, at any year in the future, fail to pay the proper tribute to those who earned it for us. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief comment to add our party's support to the resolution, and also to welcome our distinguished guests who are sitting with us today in the Speaker's gallery.

I might congratulate the government House leader for bringing forward the bill as the first item of legislation to be brought in in this session. In particular, I think the wording in the preamble as read by the House leader is a quite finely crafted piece of legislation. The preamble, I think, makes the case quite eloquently that the action that is being taken by passing such a bill is indeed called for and is something that all Newfoundlanders should be very proud of, and that all three parties in the House of Assembly can come together and pass such legislation.

I might say, on a personal note, that I am very proud to represent in my district an historic area of the City of St. John's, which includes the War Memorial on Duckworth Street, and which is the site of the annual Remembrance Day Parade. I have made a point in the last two years of returning to the site of the Remembrance Day Parade and taking in the ceremonies. I say returning to the site, because when I was a younger man, at age thirteen and age fourteen, I was a member of an air cadet squadron here in the city and so I spent many years, every Saturday morning and every Wednesday night, going down to Pleasantville and participating in activities of the air cadet squadron. I might also add, on a

personal note, I take some pride in these matters, perhaps because sometimes I think this in party, on this side, we are misunderstood and misrepresented in debate on issues concerning war and peace.

When I was a member of the air cadet squadron here in St. John's, the 510 Lion's Club squadron, one year we won the award for the best squadron in Canada, the McGillivray Shield. So it was in my formative years, during those days that I took a lot from the experience of being in the air cadets and the military forces, learning public speaking, leadership skills, and so on. It is in that spirit that I am now, today, proud to represent, as I say, the historic district of St. John's East, which includes the War Memorial on Duckworth Street.

I might say that I had for the first time, on November 11 past, the opportunity to visit the Pleasantville Legion Club and to meet some of the members of that club at a reception. The occasion for visiting there was an invitation to the reception which I received when I attended the Officers' Mess reception on November 11.

I might just say as a final note that for my part, in representing the area of Pleasantville and being aware that there is a Legion club there, and being a person who is engaged in a very public way in debate around the issues of war and peace, the debate we had yesterday on the proposed NATO base, and the ongoing debate about the promise of nuclear powered subs, it was a learning exercise for me to go to the Officers' Mess on the day of November 11 and spend two hours having a very animated discussion with active

members of the Armed Forces, one or two of whom I went to high school with. We had a very lively discussion about the policies of the New Democratic Party and the position of our leader, Ed Broadbent, and my own position as a member of the House of Assembly who must do my best to represent the interests of people who live in Pleasantville, who are voters, and for whom I make representation in the House of Assembly.

With those brief words and that personal note, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add our Party's support to the bill and say that we join with all hon. members, with pride, in giving our full support to the bill marking Remembrance Day, and also in welcoming with pride the members of the Legion who are in the Assembly today.

(Break in Tape - Inaudible)

MR. TULK:

I wonder the hon. the House Leader would address himself to the question - he is listening, I presume - that was put by the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks, and if, perhaps, he would give a commitment to the people who are sitting in the gallery that indeed, within the next couple of days, we will see that action is taken to convince the federal government, or whoever the powers that be, that they should do the right thing?

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:

That within the next day or so we can get together and put together that resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

I thank you very much.

Perhaps I can address that question momentarily.

First of all, I just want to say in summation that we on this side are delighted with the support for the bill by members opposite and by members down in the corner. I know that the Royal Canadian Legion appreciate the support of the Legislature on this very, very important matter and a very, very significant issue.

I neglected in my opening remarks, in introducing the bill, of course, to, for the benefit of members on the other side of the House, particularly, because I guess members on this side are very, very familiar, and I would expect members of the Royal Canadian Legion would be very familiar with the fact that this government has had in the past an extremely good relationship with the Royal Canadian Legion. We have had many, many dealings with the Provincial Command, the Provincial Executive on many, many issues.

I do know, for example, that we have, on occasion, assisted the Legion at their request with some help to send delegations made up of various sectors of society, not only veterans, but I remember school students and, in fact, I believe representation from the government to, I guess, Vimy Ridge.

MR. YOUNG:
Beaumont Hamel.

MR. SIMMS:
Beaumont Hamel, where they laid wreaths at memorials. We have helped the Legion in that regard on a couple of occasions, at least.

I know that we work with them closely in assisting them in their annual convention and providing whatever little help we can. I was reminded by one member of the House, and I would be horsewhipped if I did not mention it, and I am sure the members of Branch 1, probably, are quite familiar with it, that a few years back, in fact, government provided the land, I believe, to the Branch on which it was able to construct its present Legion building.

So, for all of those reasons we are obviously very supportive on this side, and obviously from the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for St. John's East, they, too, are very supportive.

Not to belabour it, but I do want to address the issue that the Leader of Opposition raised in his remarks. Of course, we on this side are not concerned at all about debating a matter that comes before the House. We encourage it. We welcome it. Any member can bring forth whatever item he wishes to bring forth.

In this particular instance, I would only say that we would prefer to consult with the Royal Canadian Legion first before any action of that nature was to be debated in the House, because we often and frequently are guided by their views and opinions; they are the experts in these matters.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
We have not had request from the Royal Canadian Legion as the government to pursue the matter the hon. the Leader of the Opposition raised. I know he read it in the newspaper. But we have not had a representation. If we do get one, as the government we will be happy to act on it as we often have and always have, in fact, in the past.

If members opposite wish to pursue the matter, of course they are quite free to do so, but I would, as I say, hasten to add that they should obviously have consultations if that was to be the case.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I trust the day will be remembered for some significance to those who are in the gallery, in particular, representing the Royal Canadian Legion. It certainly is an historical day for us and a significant day. We are happy we were able to respond in a positive manner to the request made by the Royal Canadian Legion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Observance Of Remembrance Day," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 1)

MR. SIMMS:
The next item, Mr. Speaker, is Order 4. Bill No. 16.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Internal

Economy Commission Act." (Bill No. 16)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, very much.

This next piece of legislation is the result of an ongoing representation, shall I say, and ongoing dialogue, ongoing communication, ongoing correspondence, particularly from one side or one corner of the House, on the question of Opposition representation, in particular, on the Internal Economy Commission which is the body that deals with matters related to the finances of the Legislature and the administrative issues that arise from time to time affecting the House of Assembly, its offices and its staff.

I believe it is fair to say that the Premier engaged in correspondence, if not dialogue, with the leaders of the two parties opposite. Most of the correspondence the Premier had, I think, with the Leader of the NDP was initiated by him. I also believe the Premier may have had a word with the Leader of the Opposition on this particular matter to determine his feelings.

MR. WELLS:

Correspondence.

MR. SIMMS:

And some correspondence.

MR. WELLS:

Correspondence.

MR. SIMMS:

Okay. Correspondence.

Essentially, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here today, the first time since Confederation - I am not even sure there was an IEC back in those days. There may have been somebody charged with dealing with the administrative responsibilities associated with the House - this has ever occurred. So I am delighted to be able to stand here today on behalf of the government and introduce this bill which will, for the first time, give Opposition representation to the Internal Economy Commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am assuming that there will be substantial support for this move. I am assuming there will be considerable support for this move. The Leader of the NDP, for example, back in February of 1987, a little over a year ago, wrote to the Premier about a number of matters related to the Internal Economy Commission. One item that he raised at that time, which we have not dealt with here and we may some time in the future, dealt with the reporting of what happens at an Internal Economy Commission meeting. I am not sure that that would shake the world, or if people would be all that excited about it anyway, but, in any event, that is not a matter that we have dealt with in this particular piece of legislation. I will say that at the outset in case the member has not read it, and I would suggest that he will be quite surprised and so on.

However, the pertinent quote here Mr. Speaker, is this one: He says in his third paragraph, 'I point it out to you, because I believe that it is a major lack of good will on the part of your government not to have Opposition representation on the Commission

that decides how the Legislature is to be managed'. Now, that is a direct quote, Mr. Speaker, from the Leader of the Opposition's letter to the Premier, February 5, 1987.

It is a major lack of good will on the part of the government not to have Opposition representation on the Commission. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to say to the member for Menihok today that the government-

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMS:

No, no, the Leader of the NDP.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You said the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, I am sorry! I meant the Leader of the NDP.

I am happy to say to the Leader of the NDP today, and to members of the House, that we have, in fact, taken his recommendation to heart, that suggestion, and we have acted on it, and here today you will find as you read the Bill that the Internal Economy Commission will indeed have Opposition representation on it for the first time since Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into all the kerfuffles that went on over the last year between the Leader of the NDP and the Premier. I have all the correspondence here but I am sure he will get up and debate it and argue it and so on. But he will have his day, and he can certainly do that. He is welcome to do that. And even the member for St. John's East, Vladimir they call

him, if he wishes to rise in the debate may do so as well.

But I want to tell you now, Mr. Speaker, what will encompass, or what will make up - I cannot think of a big enough word to use - the Internal Economy Commission from here on in. At the present time, by the way, it is made up of your Honour, the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, and three members of the Executive Council, as appointed.

MR. TULK:

It is in the note.

MR. SIMMS:

I do not have a note.

MR. TULK:

The explanatory notes.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, the explanatory notes here.

MR. SPEAKER:

After "Now reads:" Right?

MR. SIMMS:

No, I do not see that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

No, it is here. "Consisting of the Speaker and the Chairmen of the Committees..." Right there on page 2.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, yes. But I was summarizing for members, I did not want to read all those big words and parliamentary terms.

It is made up of the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and three members of the Executive Council, or three Cabinet Ministers, for those who are not aware of what Executive Council means. That is what it is presently made up of.

Mr. Speaker, with this significant

move here today the Commission will be made up of the Speaker of the House of Assembly, the Deputy Speaker of the House of Assembly, two members of the House of Assembly who are members of the Executive Council - two Cabinet Ministers, in other words - the Government House Leader, who will automatically be on it now, and the official Opposition House Leader in the House of Assembly, who is the member for Fogo. And, Mr. Speaker, not only are we giving one Opposition representation to the Internal Economy Commission in the person of the Opposition House Leader, we are going further than that and we are saying that we will also have on the Commission one other member of the House of Assembly who sits in Opposition to the Government, to be designated from time to time by the members of the House of Assembly who sit in Opposition to the government.

So there can be one more member from the Opposition and as soon as the Opposition, members who sit opposite, give us a consensus on who that person shall be, then he or she shall be - well, there are no shes, all the shes are on this side - he shall be appointed to the Internal Economy Commission.

And, Mr. Speaker, the other pertinent points are: In the second week of every session and from time to time thereafter, the Speaker shall inform the House who the members of the Commission are. Four members will constitute a quorum; it covers if there is a problem with the Speaker being absent for whatever reason, sickness or otherwise, the Deputy Speaker, a very capable individual himself, will preside over the meetings of the Internal Economy Commission. The Deputy Speaker,

for the record, is the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening).

The Clerk of the House, the distinguished lady who sits at the head of the table in the centre of the floor, will be the Secretary, or in her absence, for whatever reason, one of the Clerk's assistants. Now, that is the makeup of the Internal Economy Commission.

One other significant thing we have provided for in this legislation, which will become effective after the next election, after the new General Assembly is formed after the next general election, is in this Section 2. It will become operative. I just want to briefly tell hon. members what is contained in Section 2 of interest to a lot of people.

It says, Mr. Speaker, under this Section 2, "The Speaker, after appropriate consultation, shall within sixty days of a general election or where necessary at any time between general elections," so it can also be done between general elections, "appoint an independent commission," that is a commission of inquiry of sorts, "of not more than three people to make an inquiry and a report respecting the indemnities, allowances and salaries to be paid to members of the House of Assembly."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Well, the hon. member is going to have difficulty with this bill if he supports that aspect of it and is not too happy about the first part.

Mr. Speaker, that is always a

problem that we face. In all honesty and realistically speaking, we have not addressed that issue properly, I suppose, in the past. We have done it on an ad hoc basis. The government has taken an initiative from time to time.

We did have an enquiry, in fact, back after the 1975 general election, of independent people, made up of very dependable and reliable people. And, then recently, we had a Select Committee report by members of the House of Assembly, which was not totally accepted. Really it has been done in an ad hoc fashion. I believe this is a proper and significant move.

Sixty days after an election, or where necessary between elections, the Speaker will appoint an independent commission of not more than three to do an inquiry and bring back a report on the indemnities, allowances and salaries to be paid to the members of the House of Assembly.

Those persons, incidentally, shall have all the powers, all the privileges and all the immunities of persons appointed as commissioners under The Public Enquiries Act. That covers any question that might arise of that sort.

Finally, those persons in that committee shall deliver their report, containing the recommendations, to the Speaker within ninety days of that commission's appointment. So, there will be fairly quick action on the matter and it will not be delayed unnecessarily.

The Speaker, further, upon receipt of the report shall implement the

recommendations as soon as possible after he has received it, after the Commission of Internal Economy has received it. It must be received by the Commission of Internal Economy and then, as quickly as possible thereafter, it must be implemented.

Perhaps one of the most significant things in there is Sub-section 13.(5) of Section 2 which says, "The recommendations contained in the report referred in this section shall be final and binding." So, there will be no argument or no debate. Well, there can be but there will be no point because the recommendations shall be final and binding.

Mr. Speaker, I know a member or two on this side have an interest in speaking to this for a few moments. The member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) indicates he has an interest in speaking to it for a few moments and I know there may be a few others, so I will not take up the full hour that I have allotted to me for the introduction of bills. It is not necessary. I will just, at this point, move second reading and then we will see how the debate carries on.

I move second reading.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the full hour in dealing with this bill either, as the President of the Treasury Board and Government House Leader has just said. But there are a few issues that we have to deal with here and

that we should debate, a few things that should be said about this bill. I will try to say them in as short a time as I can so that other people can make relevant points and perhaps we can get on with other pieces of legislation.

I would say to the President of Treasury Board, to the Government House Leader, what we are looking at here is something that brings us in line with the rest of Canada.

If you look, for example, at a comparative studies of Canadian Legislatures which was put out in 1986, you will note that there were, I believe, only two provinces in 1985 - and that has since been changed - that did not have this type of body, some sort of internal economy body.

In 1986, of course, the Nova Scotia Legislature put in place a Board of Internal Economy. At long last, in 1988, our provincial government has now decided to bring forward some legislation.

You would swear, to hear the Government House Leader speaking, that he did it entirely without being pushed, without being asked, and that the government did it purely out of foresight on their own part. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth.

I remember, as an Opposition member in this House, meeting the Premier one particular day on the elevator, I think it was in 1981, and proposing to him that we should have an Internal Economy Board. He then asked me if I would send up the relevant information to him and I did that. Then, of course, Tools for the Job was put in place to look

at members benefits and so on. I believe the member for Fortune - Hermitage and the member for Terra Nova were the two members from this side on that Select Committee of the House.

It is interesting to note that the two amendments we are making to this piece of legislation today are the same two amendments, almost word for word, or two of the recommendations that the government turned down in October, 1985 when this report was put together. So the point has to be made that we are some two or three years behind Nova Scotia and that it takes us three years to put into legislation a recommendation that was made by a Select Committee of this House some four or five years ago.

So the Government House Leader, in speaking to the bill, should not try to create the impression that this is something that his own government has dreamed up on their own. It has been done over a long process and it is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, it is long overdue from another point of view too. It is no secret in this Legislature that the government we have served under since 1979, at least, has been somewhat less - the word is not generous - than gracious in terms of supplying Opposition members and in giving Opposition members the type of research facilities that they need, the type of offices that they need, and the type of secretarial help that they need, just to mention a few.

One would hope that by putting Opposition representation on this Internal Economy Commission we will now see a change in the almost kind of - I think the

member for Fortune - Hermitage would agree with me - begging that you have to do in this place to even get a tight roof over your head.

MR. J. CARTER:

You have done fairly well so far.

MR. TULK:

The hon. member for Port de Grave a couple of years ago, in order to draw attention to the kind of office that he had to work in, had to bring in two wastepaper baskets that he had been using to catch the leaks down in his office when it rained.

Of course, people like the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), who sit on the government side, and perhaps who rarely comes into his office to do anything - he answers two letters a year, I understand. I think that is his average, an average of two letters a year from his constituents - those people see no need for office accommodations. For some reason or other this government wanted, until the recent past, to keep a thumb down on the Opposition.

Hopefully, that kind of -

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

When I hear my name taken in vain, I feel it incumbent upon me to rise and defend myself at the very moment that I am attacked.

The House Leader for the Opposition suggests that I do not care if the Opposition is properly

housed or not. The point is that they are incredibly well housed and well looked after. I have not had that much to say about it. I think that they are doing extremely well, and to suggest that I would throw them out in the cold is wrong and malicious.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. It is just a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I am glad to see that the hon. gentlemen is awake. It is a rare occasion when he is.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, hopefully those two things will be taken care of as we see Opposition members sit on a board that governs this Legislature, its accommodations and benefits for members.

Hopefully, we will now see input and a different attitude displayed on the part of government and on the part of the people who sit on the Internal Economy Commission towards the members who serve in this House.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to support this legislation. But I want to talk about the make-up of the Commission of Internal Economy as it is now being proposed by the government. We are going to support, as I said, without amendment to the legislation. As I said before, and as I have indicated previously, there is no doubt that this a vast improvement over what we have.

But I also want to try and clear up a cute little trick that I believe the government House

Leader believes that the government has performed. I saw some mischievousness on the face of the government House leader when he stood up and said we have now put in place an Internal Economy Commission which will have, not only the Opposition House Leader on it, but as well, another Opposition member. That is how the legislation is proposed.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:
I do not think we can play that game with this one. He is running back to his seat. The hon. gentleman was just getting comfortable.

But the look of mischievousness was on the government House Leader cannot be allowed to pass. I want to lay out for this Legislature the position we believe the government should have taken in this piece of legislation. The government House Leader stood in this place and said we are going to recommend that the official Opposition House Leader become a member of the committee and one other member of the Opposition.

It is interesting to note that the hon. gentlemen followed the two recommendations in Tools for the Job almost to the letter, with the exception of this one.

MR. SIMMS:
I do not see that.

MR. TULK:
You probably did not even see the bill.

In any case, it is interesting to note that he followed it almost to the letter with the exception of this one wee recommendation.

Instead of having one member of the Opposition on the Internal Economy Commission, the report, Tools for the Job, indicated that we should have two members of the Opposition, plus the official Opposition House Leader.

It is also interesting to note, and I say this to the House, that if you look at the correspondence that went on between the present Leader of the Opposition and the Premier, the recommendation of the present Leader of the Opposition to the Premier was that -

MR. SIMMS:
Which letter?

MR. TULK:
I will give the hon. gentleman the date. The date was October 29, 1987.

It is interesting to note that the Opposition House Leader suggested as his first suggestion for the structure of the Internal Economy Commission, that it would be made up of the Speaker, the government House Leader, the official Opposition House Leader, one minister, and one private member from each recognized party.

In other words, in this present Legislature you would have to have two members besides the Opposition House Leader. Now, that ties in perfectly with Tools for the Job in this present House. If there were four parties -

MR. SIMMS:
Are you going to read the rest of it?

MR. TULK:
Oh, yes. I have no problem with the rest of it.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) would be acceptable?

MR. TULK:

We will not say that would be acceptable, but this is our preferred structure, as set out by the Leader of the Opposition for this Internal Economy Commission.

Now, it is interesting, as I said, that the government, the Premier, and the Cabinet, choose to say, 'No, we want one Opposition member.' Why did they do that, Mr. Speaker?

I think the Government House Leader has some fear of what the NDP could do to him. He did not want to see them represented on anything because of what happened in the last election in this Province where he almost got smacked in Grand Falls. He has some little thing going against them.

MR. SIMMS:

I do not have a little thing, I hate them.

MR. TULK:

Do you? Does it keep you awake at night?

MR. SIMMS:

Absolutely.

MR. TULK:

I would suggest that it probably does.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, he says, 'Instead of having two, let us put on one member from the Opposition,' hoping to throw the ball in the court of the official Opposition to deny them the right to serve. So, Mr. Speaker, we accept this amendment with some reservation.

But to show that we are fair, that

we believe when its time comes the NDP should have representation on the Internal Economy Commission, we have said, let us alternate. Let us take one year with a member from the official Opposition and a member from, in this case, the NDP caucus. That is to be entirely fair to them. That was suggested by the Premier and accepted by us. We agree that that should be the case. Of course, then the Leader of the Opposition went back and told the Government House Leader how he could put that in place.

MR. SIMMS:

In fact the Leader of the Opposition, I believe, even offered to flip a coin.

MR. TULK:

So I want to say to the hon. Government House Leader, he should not try to lay traps. I want to say to the NDP, that indeed, if he has a quarrel about his representation on this Internal Economy Commission, his quarrel is not with the Opposition, his quarrel is with the Government House Leader for not taking our first recommendation that you have at least one Opposition member from each recognized party in the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the second part of this amendment deals with something again that Tools for the Job recommended should be done. Of course, we have no quarrel at all with accepting the fact that there should be somebody other than the government, in this case, who will make recommendations on the benefits that members should have and the type of accommodations they should have. This Legislature should be the master of its own fate. We believe that. It should determine

its destiny. It should determine what is going to happen to it. It should determine what is required to do the job. We see the Internal Economy Commission and, in this case, the Speaker as the right person in whose hands that should be.

Mr. Speaker, of course we see also that if the Speaker of this Legislature recommends certain benefits for members, it should not be left up to whoever the governing party is, regardless whether it is the Liberal Party, the P.C. Party, or the NDP Party. Once the recommendations are made by an independent or commission made up of three members, then it should be implemented.

We have seen all too often in this House where we have had certain commissions that have been struck to look at, not only benefits for members but other things as well, and where the report of any commission of inquiry or whatever, comes back, it is put on the shelf, gathers dust and little action is taken. In this case, I think the recommendation has to be put in place almost immediately. That is as it should be.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, having laid out those few guidelines, I want to say to this House and the Government House Leader that we are prepared to accept those amendments that are made to the present Internal Economy Commission Act and, of course, we will be voting for it.

Thank you.

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Parsons):
The hon. the member for Bonavista

South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on this important piece of legislation, because it is a chance to deal with issues pertaining to us as individual members of the House of Assembly, our benefits, privileges and salaries.

I note with interest that Section (2) of this bill gives the Speaker the authority to appoint a commission sixty days after the next general election. The purpose of that commission will be to inquire into and report upon the allowances and salaries to be paid to members of the House of Assembly.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the issue of payment to members of the House of Assembly is, of recent months, a very major controversial topic publicly. It is because of the fact that one member of this House has chosen to take an extra salary over and above what he is paid as a member of this House. Today, without casting any innuendo, I am going to talk in actual facts and I will quote and give the facts as I see them. Of course, any member of the House can refute them if they think they are not facts. But I want to give the situation exactly as I see it and what is now occurring.

No member of the government side of the House over the years - I have been here for sixteen years now - could ever receive extra pay from government without some type of special legislation being passed. A member could not take extra pay or be paid in any way,

whether it be for parliamentary assistants or a parliamentary assistant to a minister without some special legislation brought before the House of Assembly and passed accordingly.

The pay of a member of the House of Assembly is not great. We know that. I have known it for some years. When I came in first, for example, it was only around \$12,000 a year, I recall.

MR. MATTHEWS:
\$10,000.

MR. MORGAN:
\$10,000, my friend says.

MR. MORGAN:
I went from there to \$12,000 and slowly built up to about, right now, I do not know what the exact salary is. It is around \$30,000 something a year.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible) sessional.

MR. MORGAN:
Well, \$30,000 actual salary.

Adding on the extra benefits, you can talk about approximately \$40,000. Many members of this House of Assembly gave up careers and half decent salaries to come into this House of Assembly to serve their constituents and to serve their Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:
I know some in the Opposition who gave up jobs who had better pay, better income for their families than what they are now receiving serving their constituents and serving Newfoundland.

MR. TOBIN:
The press are all in.

MR. MORGAN:
In other words, they have a loyalty and a dedication to public service in Newfoundland, and rightly so. That speaks well for any member of this House who does exactly that.

But, Mr. Speaker, when a member receives extra salary, if it is coming from government and appropriately approved by this Legislature, there is nothing wrong with it. It is quite legal and proper.

But if a member chooses to receive an extra salary from some unknown source, and I repeat that, Mr. Speaker, because it is a very important point and it is a very, very sour point with me, and here is why. I have sat in this House for over a year and a half now making less, to be exact. I did an interview with one of the media today to be carried on Sunday-afternoon on View From The Hill, by the way, that I gave the facts.

I have been sitting over a year and a half in here drawing a salary \$22,000 less than what my actual pension is. Now, not a pension from the House of Assembly. It is not all that. That is a big pension. But I paid up all my pension premiums from telecommunications. I worked there for almost ten years. I bought up my premiums from teaching days and I bought up my premiums from working at the university.

Putting it altogether with my ten years as minister and my sixteen years now, going on seventeen years as a member of this House of

Assembly, my pension is \$22,000 more than my actual salary. So I am giving up money to be here like many other good friends of mine in the Opposition and on the government side, as private members, in particular.

But some members and a certain member, and I am referring to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells), we know well who we are referring to - let us be up front - says he cannot. I do not want to say Morgan is saying something, I am quoting a national news story from Toronto. It is in the national media. One media here carried it from Toronto, a story from the Ottawa Bureau of the newspaper media. I can table this, Mr. Speaker, if required to do so.

I quote, for example - I want to get this right now - Mr. Wells, the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly, told *The Toronto Sun*, "the Party agreed to pay him the money so he could earn as much as the Newfoundland Supreme Court Judge when he took the leader's job last June."

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to appoint, as we are doing this through legislation, an Internal Economy Commission, and members from the Opposition are going to be there, and if in return the Speaker appoints a special commission to look at the salaries of members of the House, does this mean that the Liberal Party is now going to promote that members of the House of Assembly to serve in here, and to serve their constituents and to serve their Province, are going to have to have a salary of \$125,000 a year, the same as a Supreme Court Judge?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sure.

MR. MORGAN:

Well, it is a matter of debate. Maybe members of the House deserve that much money. That is not a bad debatable question, maybe members do deserve it. They go through a lot of punishment at times as politicians, away from home, travelling. Maybe members do deserve that much salary. I am not going to argue that they do not deserve that much salary.

Mr. Speaker, my argument is, and I am going to say it quite adamantly, despite any threats to me not to bring up the salary issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the situation is that the Liberal Leader in this Province, sitting as a member of this House, is drawing \$50,000 a year and not one member of the House of Assembly, to my knowledge on this side, has ever indicated as to who they ever thought it was coming from, what individuals. It is coming from certain businessmen. That has already been made known.

But this story, as of the last two days nationally, is confusing the issue substantially. This story says - we will use the right terms here now, to quote the story - that a senior Liberal Party official told the *The Toronto Sun* the money for Mr. Wells comes from the Liberal Party of Canada.

To go on to quote, Mr. Speaker, he says that federal tax credits for these donors are involved.

MR. TOBIN:

Say that again.

MR. MORGAN:

I am quoting a federal Liberal Party source, there are federal tax credits involved. There are tax credits given to certain businessmen and are not going into the trough of Revenue Canada because tax credits are given to these donations or donors that is going to pay the salary of the Liberal Leader, a member of the House of Assembly. This is what the federal Liberal Party official is saying.

Meantime, in all of this, the provincial President of the same Party, he is in the same story and he is also sitting on the National Executive for the Liberal Party and he says, 'No, no, no. There is no way that the federal Liberal Party of Canada is paying \$50,000 to boost up the salary of the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly in Newfoundland. No, no, no, way it is not being done.'

Mr. Speaker, who is right? Who is right if the Liberal Party of Canada is not paying, as Mr. Whelan says, if they are not paying, and if the Liberal Party of Newfoundland is not paying? The confusing part is that Mr. Whelan says, and this is more interesting, he did not deny - and I want to quote him to be accurate - but Mr. Whelan confirmed that 'money is raised by party fund raisers and he could not entirely rule out that federal tax credits are available in the arrangement.' So the local President of the Liberal Party is confirming, as well, that some federal tax credits are available to those donors.

Mr. Speaker, that is a most

serious issue and here is why. Those donors, those businessmen - I know it is a sore point with at least six members of the Liberal caucus, a very, very sore point. I am tempted to name those six, but rather than cause problems in their caucus right now, I will not name them. But I know six.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Name them! Name them!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, they are losing control over there now. They cannot take this debate anymore. They are lowering the decorum of the House. The leader is no longer in control over there.

Mr. Speaker, rather than name these six people, let them in their conscience feel out what is going on. Do they really know themselves what is going on, when a federal party official says something different from the provincial party?

Now, when we come down to the bottom line, let us find out, Mr. Speaker, once and for all if any members of this House are getting extra salaries from outside the House and who is paying them. Mr. Speaker, if I was aspiring to become Minister of Fisheries tomorrow morning - I am not, because I am not running in the next election and it is well known - and I was now sitting as a private member and drawing a salary from some businessman out there involved in the fishing industry, well, I think that when I became Minister of Fisheries there would come a time, Mr. Speaker, and rightly so, when IOUs would be called. Those who pay the piper call the tune.

I do not know why the Leader of

the Opposition is digging this hole so big for himself politically in the Province, because all he had to do - he was drawing a total \$125,000 from party funds before he became an elected member, and I found nothing wrong with that. If the member for Windsor - Buchans did not run for election, stayed outside the House and his party paid him, there is nothing wrong with that, in my view. But when he came into the House as an elected member, aspiring to become Premier of the Province, and he was drawing a special salary from certain hidden businessmen, hidden donations, nobody discloses from what source - Mr. Turner is not going to give out \$50,000 when he wants to hire an organizer for Atlantic Canada and cannot afford to hire him. He cannot afford to hire an organizer for Atlantic Canada for the federal party, yet, at the same time, pays \$50,000 to the Leader of the Opposition in salary.

So it is down to the question, Mr. Speaker, should members be allowed under the law to accept salaries from other sources, salaries paid by people who are not known to members of the Legislature and the Speaker and this Commission we are talking about, this very important Commission. For example, should the Internal Economy Commission not know what benefits a member is receiving indirectly or directly? Yes, Mr. Speaker, indeed they should know.

How can they deal with the issue, for example, of whether a member of the House can be given a government car, or a person can be given a certain allowance to travel, whether it be a member, a parliamentary assistant, employees of the House or otherwise? So,

Mr. Speaker, this Internal Economy Commission, I would say, have, in many cases, a very onerous responsibility when making decisions on the spendings of various parties, in this case three parties, and benefits for individual members.

Mr. Speaker, today I am going to appeal to the Leader of the Opposition, and I am going to appeal in a most sincere way, because of all the conflicting stories. Today, I think, the Premier released a press release on the very matter, and rightly so. The man is not just aspiring to become a parliamentary assistant, he is not aspiring to become a minister, he is aspiring to become the Premier of this Province, and if he is going to receive some special benefits not available to the members for Bonavista North, or for Twillingate, or for Waterford - Kenmounth - the member for Waterford - Kenmounth maybe fortunate, because he has a very successful business, I think, and he can carry on until he gets defeated again. But other members may not have businesses, and I know other members do not have extra salaries and are earning less now than they could be earning if they were not in politics, not in this House of Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would now like to announce that there are three questions for the Late Show at 5:30.

The hon. the member for Gander is not satisfied with the answer given on education funding. The hon. the member for Port de Grave is not satisfied with the answer

given by the Minister of Fisheries. The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle is not satisfied with the answer to his question to the Minister of Education.

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am willing to say further that the issue is greater than salary, because the taxpayers of this Province pay the hon. Leader of the Opposition; pay for a car allowance, pay for some travel through his office vote. If that is so, and it is fact, why is it, Mr. Speaker - what I say now I will say outside the House - that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has to accept free, complimentary airline tickets to travel from businessmen when the taxpayers are paying for them? Why does he have to accept free hotel accommodations when he is travelling on his own business, working to become Premier of the Province? These are pretty fair questions. I can tell the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that they are not just being posed by this member here, they are being posed by the general public, and rightly so.

If the Internal Economy Commission in their investigation of members' benefits find that the Leader of the Opposition has not got enough money to properly and adequately do his job, well, let the Opposition put forward representations in the proper way and get funds, through the House of Assembly, adequate enough to let the Leader of the NDP over here do his job adequately, to let the Leader of the Opposition do

his job adequately, and to let all members of the House do their jobs adequately. Let them do it that way when they need extra money rather than go out and indirectly accept gifts, donations and contributions from people who are hidden behind the curtains, with regard to the public of Newfoundland knowing who they are.

I would say, and other members, I am sure, will speak in this debate, that I am convinced that if it is looked at closely it is against the rules of this House to accept gifts of that nature, especially with regard to monies to have that member lobby for certain things. In particular, it is against the law for a member to accept money from any individual, or individuals, and lobby for that individual while he is a member of the House. That is a most serious breach of trust in this House of Assembly, or any other parliament throughout the world.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is a high crime.

MR. MORGAN:

That is right. It is considered a high crime, under the parliamentary rules. It is written in the rules! So we are not talking about anything petty. It is not petty at all. A few of the Opposition members who are maybe supporting it, I do not know, may laugh and smile, but it is not petty. It is not a petty issue. And whenever this commission is appointed to look at the salaries and benefits of members, after the next general election, and the Speaker is put in the Chair by Premier Peckford - that is how it will be again after the next general election, there is no question about that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He might not be there.

MR. MORGAN:

He might not be there. He might not be there.

When that commission is appointed, maybe that commission - not the Internal Economy Commission now, the special independent commission to be appointed by the Chair - should look at laying out firmly rules and laws that prevent members of the House of Assembly from taking hidden donations and contributions from outside the House to boost up their salaries. That is not a bad suggestion for that commission to look at. If not, why is it fair for a Minister of the Crown to perform all the duties that the Minister of Transportation, or the Minister of Fisheries, or the Minister of Health have to perform; go out and do all the travelling they do working on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and the people of Newfoundland and draw - what is a minister's salary, totally? The Minister of Health can probably tell me.

DR. COLLINS:

(Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN:

About the same as a MHA. So you double the MHA's salary and the minister's salary and bring in a total of somewhere around \$70,000 or \$75,000, maybe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No. No.

MR. MORGAN:

\$65,000, I mean. So, a Minister of the Crown does all the work and has all the responsibilities on \$65,000, and was doing it for less than that over the years. When I

was Minister of Transportation and Communications, back in 1975, 1976 and 1977, it was not anywhere that then. We did it with less money, and travelled the Province and did our duties properly and adequately.

But what the people are now saying is that the man who draws the same salary as a minister - I think the leader of the Opposition is drawing a little more than a minister in salary, and he has a car from government. He has all these benefits and he cannot work within the confines of that kind of salary limitation, which is placed on all ministers and the Premier, he needs an extra \$50,000 a year. Well, maybe he can show the Internal Economy Commission and the Special Task Force, when it is appointed, that it is necessary for him to have that \$50,000 a year.

And if he can show that and prove that in a proper way, maybe he should get it, and ministers should get more money as well, but not be accepting it from an indirect means, as I said earlier, from hidden sources. And that is all I am saying.

I will say again, Mr. Speaker, before I give other members a chance to speak, in particular the Leader of the Opposition, because this is all to do with him, the press reports are out, the media reports are being carried. I am not making any innuendo. I am not casting aspersions. I am merely quoting the facts. And the facts are out there. All I want, and I think most members of this House want, and I would say many members in the Liberal caucus would want, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Wells) to come clean and say, Yes, I needed \$50,000 and here is the source.

Because right now, Mr. Speaker, one source says it is the Federal Liberal Party of Canada, the President locally, in Newfoundland, says, no, it is not the Liberal Party of Canada. So, where is it coming from? That is all we are asking. Let the member for Windsor - Buchans clearly tell this House and tell the public where it is coming from. Where is it coming from?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think if it had to be looked at in a serious way why leaders would want more money - the leader of the Opposition is leading a team of how many members over there - 16?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Fifteen.

MR. MORGAN:
Fifteen. He has his members with their own travel allowances paid by the taxpayers, and they can go out and do their jobs in their respective districts and help their party at the same time. But the Leader of the NDP has only one person with him. Maybe the justification is for the NDP to get more funds. I do not know. Maybe it would be.

AN HON. MEMBER:
A good point.

MR. MORGAN:
Maybe it would be. But it is the kind of question that should be addressed by that task force, whenever it is appointed. I will not be on the task force, I will not be in this House, because I will not be running in the next election, but whoever -

MR. BAIRD:
You could be in Ottawa.

MR. MORGAN:

- the Speaker chooses to appoint, and it could be members or maybe people from outside the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I pose these questions and I pose them because I think the hon. the gentleman, despite the fact that he cannot always be believed - as I said yesterday, I will stand always on the truth. I stood in this House for sixteen years and I have yet to be proven to be a liar. I have yet to be proven to be a liar, after sixteen years. Sixteen years!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:
It took almost seventeen years for one man to come into the House to call me a liar. One man, after sixteen years in here.

I watched him on TV last night - 'a liar. He is lying.' Well, Mr. Speaker, I will say again I have been here in this House and I have been representing my people of Bonavista South over the years and I have dealt many issues as minister and not as minister, and there is not one person who can look me in the eye and tell me that they ever proved that I was lying. And this gentlemen over here cannot prove that I am lying, and let the public decide who is playing the little games - who is playing the little games - in this Province?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have never stood and condemned a member of the House of Assembly before because we are all peers. But I am today going to say something which I will say outside of the House any time. The hon. gentleman I met with yesterday morning in his office in this

building does not deserve to become Premier of this Province. I say it right from the bottom of my heart, he does not deserve to become Premier of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

And that is a pretty heavy statement to make.

MR. BARRETT:

My feelings precisely.

MR. MORGAN:

That is a pretty heavy statement to make, but I make it and I will stand by it. Politics do not mean mean a row of beans to me anymore. I am not running anymore. I am not running. I am a free man. But I am not dead, Mr. Speaker. I am a Newfoundlander and I will always stand for Newfoundland. And those who stand for Newfoundland, I will stand with them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

And I will never support those who are against Newfoundland. Also, Mr. Speaker, I will never stand with someone I cannot trust.

MR. CALLAN:

That grinning is called bravado.

MR. MORGAN:

I will never stand with anyone I cannot trust. I will not go any further with that comment.

But I will close my comments, Mr. Speaker, and note what I am saying at the end of the debate for me, this part. I will sit down by saying I have made no innuendoes, I have made no accusations, I have

only spoken on the facts. And what I said I spoke from here, and I will stand by it any time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to address the issues in the bill, as we should on second reading.

This bill is a good bill. It is not perfect, but it is good. It starts to deal with the issue properly. There was some correspondence exchanged last Summer and I will give the Leader of the NDP the credit he deserves; he had written Premier Peckford before I became Leader of the Liberal Party and copies of his correspondence with the Premier were made available to me. When I had an opportunity to deal with it, to discuss it with other members of the Liberal Party and consider the issue in general, I wrote the Premier on October 29 and told him what our views were and acknowledged that I was aware of the concern that had already been expressed by the member for Menihek, and told him of the difficulties we were having in terms of having the concerns of the Opposition put forward.

I made a suggestion that the Internal Economy Commission be constructed of the Speaker, the Government House Leader, the official Opposition House Leader, one minister and one member from each of the parties represented in the House, one private member. If that proposal, I told him, did not

find favour, but that was our preferred one, we were prepared to accept any one of three others. Well, that was a total of four, and we told him our preference was in the order in which they were set out in the letter.

The fact is he chose not to recommend any one of them. He came up with an entirely different alternative, the one that is now proposed. I do not know why he suggested in his letter, when he wrote in reply to me on November 6, that there would be one private member from the Opposition side. He then said, 'I think this is a fair proposition and would like for both of you to give it serious consideration' - that is the hon. member for Menihek and myself - 'perhaps the Opposition MHA could alternate between your two parties.'

Well, while I was not very happy with the proposal, it was a lot better than we had up until now. So I wrote him back on November 16 and accepted the proposal and told him we were prepared to alternate, and we were prepared to flip a coin to see which one would go first. So we have agreed with the proposal as a compromise, although our preference was clearly that each individual party have one representative on the Internal Economy Commission.

Now, I am going to table this correspondence so that it will be available and in the record.

Mr. Speaker, the second clause in this bill deals with the question of salaries of MHAs. I think what is a reasonable method of determining that salary has been recommended; it comes from the committee that considered it sometime ago and made a

recommendation. I believe it reflects that recommendation totally, so I see nothing wrong with it. It seems, to me, to be a reasonably appropriate way to deal with it.

Now, I want to deal with something else. I want to deal with the dishonest, hypocritical, supercilious picking and innuendo.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. WELLS:
If the word hypercritical is unparliamentary, I will withdraw the word, Mr. Speaker.

What I am talking about is somebody -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WELLS:
I will withdraw anything that is unparliamentary, and I will find other words suitable.

What I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, is somebody who does precisely, exactly the same as a person he criticizes for doing the same thing. Whatever you call that beast I do not know, but whatever it is, that is what I am talking about. That is what I am talking about. Whatever you call that individual, or person, or whatever it is.

Now let me deal, first and foremost, with this question of salary. I am not receiving any extra salary as an MHA. I am not receiving any extra salary as a Leader of the Opposition. I am, and I stated from the beginning, in receipt of a salary from the Liberal Party as its Leader, in exactly the same way as the hon.

the Premier is in receipt of a salary as the Leader of the P.C. Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

That is what I am talking about. Now, what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of man who would write this. I am talking about the kind of man who would write this.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order to quote a couple of lines from -

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker that is not a point of order. I ask you to call the hon. member to order.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is a point of order. Sit down, boy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sit down! Sit down!

MR. PATTERSON:

The hon. Leader was bought like a bullock hoof and hide/ by the little tin gods on the mountain side.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, if that is going to persist, I would ask you to name the hon. members who participate in it. Because these hon. members

have for weeks been sniping and sniping constantly. Now, I am prepared to answer.

MR. PATTERSON:

Tell us who you are getting the salary from.

MR. WELLS:

They do not want to hear the truth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

We do.

MR. WELLS:

It is quite obvious they do not want to hear the truth. I am prepared to answer. Just let them be quiet, and they will get the truth.

MR. MORGAN:

It is long overdue.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

What I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of man who could write this today. I was amazed to see a story on Mr. Wells' \$50,000 Salary Supplement in the April 20 edition of The Toronto Sun newspaper. The story points out that 'Mr. Turner and the Federal Liberal Party...', and he goes through. I do not need to read that.

MR. MORGAN:

Why not?

MR. WELLS:

I do not need to read the whole lot of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Read it.

MR. WELLS:

I have no problem with it. He is just quoting what has already been

quoted by the hon. member for Bonavista South.

I want to deal with what he says at the end. "If Mr. Wells wants to be Premier, he should be his own man with no IOUs outstanding. He has to come clean. Right now we do not know where he is coming from."

Now, I am coming from the same place the Premier is coming from.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
Or, Mr. Speaker, does he think the stork brings him the money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
Or the Easter Bunny.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:
The hon. gentleman is now proving again what I have always thought of him.

AN HON. MEMBER:
It is the principle of the thing.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. WELLS:
That is not a point of order.

MR. MORGAN:
He is attacking a member of the House who is not here to defend himself. He is now attacking the Premier, and the Premier is not here to defend himself. It is quite unfair what the member is now doing, attacking the Premier when he is not here to defend himself.

MR. YOUNG:
And it is not true, what he is saying.

MR. WELLS:
I will wait for tomorrow. I am not finished.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, I would ask hon. members to show a modicum of courtesy and fairness and let me say what I have to say without interruption. I listened to that hon. gentleman make some of the most scurrilous, unfounded remarks that anybody could imagine, and I sat and listened to him. Now, I did him that courtesy. If he does not have any courtesy, Mr. Speaker, would you please name him and remove him so that the rest of us can get on with the business of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to bring to the attention of the hon. member that he has now used several unparliamentary comments, and before the Speaker had to rule him out of order he withdrew them. He has now used another one, he made reference to the scurrilous comments of the hon. member.

I refer Your Honour to Page 110 of Beauchesne. 'Scurrilous' is a comment and word that has been ruled unparliamentary, as Your Honour will be able to see. I suggest the hon. member should restrain himself. If he is going to debate and speak in debate, let him to it in a civilized fashion and not use unparliamentary terms.

MR. WELLS:

On the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WELLS:

I did not call the member scurrilous. I talked about the comments and my statement was, I consider the comments to be scurrilous because they are unfounded, and the hon. member knows they are unfounded. I do not think that that is unparliamentary. If it is, I will most certainly withdraw, but I do not believe that it is.

MR. TOBIN:

Three times today you have had to withdraw something in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

That comment has been withdrawn.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say it clearly for everybody, is exactly what the situation is. The Premier is paid a salary. He has admitted that publicly.

MR. MORGAN:

Just his salary.

MR. WELLS:

Is there a difference? Is that the highest price you could get for him?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Is there a difference in principle, or do the members know what principle means? There is no difference in principle, there is a difference in amount. And the Premier may indeed be overpaid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

The Leader of the Liberal Party is not getting enough I guess, is he?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

That is right.

MR. TULK:

He is worth more.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the House that I did not personally seek the

leadership of the Liberal Party. I have not for fifteen years, when people came to me to ask me to do it.

Let me tell the House this - maybe the hon. member for Bonavista South has a poor memory - one of the first people in this House who stated they would endorse me as Leader of the Liberal Party and would give me total support is the member for Bonavista South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
But, now, that was fifteen years ago.

MR. SIMMS:
He did not know what he was saying fifteen years ago. That was fifteen years ago.

MR. WELLS:
That was fifteen years ago, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member and I stood at a hotel out near the airport and he told me - he was then a member on the Conservative side of the House -

MR. MORGAN:
Fifteen years ago, I was a minister.

MR. WELLS:
- and a minister. He said, 'If you were leading the Liberal Party, I would be in the Liberal Party supporting you.' That was his statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order.

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, I do not recall ever meeting the member other than Wednesday of this week.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

That is not a point of order.

MR. MORGAN:
On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I do not think it is acceptable for an hon. member to get up to make an explanation on a point of order. If the hon. member has a point of order, I will listen to him, but the hon. member has not been making a point of order up to now.

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:
Not an explanation, but a point of order, Sir. Let me make it.

The hon. gentleman made an accusation, timid as it is, that I had meetings with him fifteen years ago and that I would like to see him as Liberal Leader.

MR. TULK:

That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would love to have him as Liberal Leader and I do now, but I never did say that I would ever support him.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is not making a point of order and as far as the Chair is concerned, the hon. member is interrupting.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

If the hon. members would sit back, they are going to get the whole story.

I am not being paid any extra salary as a member or as the Leader of the Opposition. The Liberal Party is paying me in what I take it is the same manner as the PC Party is paying the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN:

Not according to this.

MR. WELLS:

Look, I remind the hon. member that the same newspaper he has been waving around all day wrote a story about him jigging salmon and that was untrue! That was totally untrue!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Why is he citing that as authority? That story was totally untrue when it was written!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

So much for that paper.

MR. WELLS:

So much for The Toronto Sun. It wrote a totally untrue story then and it wrote another one today.

MR. SIMMS:

Now we see you shed your skin.

MR. TULK:

Now you are getting your own medicine.

MR. WELLS:

Do not believe everything you see in papers. This particular story -

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are wasting a lot of time in this House when we have thousands of Newfoundlanders out there looking for work. I think the Leader of the Opposition could end it all, come clean, tell us who is giving him \$50,000 a year and that would be the end of it.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order. I am trying to make an address to the House in response to what has been weeks of totally unfair, unbased, improper innuendo and shouts across the House. I am trying to deal with it. The members keep rising on so-called points of order, totally frivolous, no points of order involved. My time will be used up and I will not be able to deal

with it.

So I ask the Speaker to remove from the House everybody who does interrupt in that way and allow me to speak.

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order. The hon Leader of the Opposition said he raised a point of order and I wish to speak to it.

Now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition's response and answer, if you clearly recall what he has been saying today in the few minutes he has been trying to speak, every occasion that somebody says something, 'Mr. Speaker, you should remove that hon. member.' What he wants is to kick everybody out of the hon. House. That is no way to deal with matters.

If the Leader of the Opposition wants to handle his situation and try to explain it, let him do it but he is beginning now to show that he is about to bust a gasket. I would like to hear him say what he has to say in a more civilized fashion, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. It is impossible for the Chair to know just what an hon. member is going to say or the point he is going to make until he actually does make the point. I do not have anything more to say at the moment.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has just about one minute left. Then we will have to adjourn.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I will address this tomorrow. I see by the clock that the time is run out for the day and I am going to move the adjournment of this debate until tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

The debate is adjourned by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Debate on the Adjournment
[Late Show]

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander was not satisfied with the reply he received from the hon. the Minister of Education.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A few days ago questions were asked in this House of the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) based on comments that appeared in The Sunday Express over the weekend. The minister, first of all, started by saying that the report was correct. After that, Mr. Speaker, we assume that what the minister said to have said in that article was in fact correct, according to the minister.

Mr. Speaker, let me set the background. In this Province there are tremendous problems in education. We have more per pupil discretionary funds being provided to urban schools, and specifically St. John's schools, than to schools in the rest of the Province, in mostly the rural areas of the Province. We have

rural school boards, Mr. Speaker, that are near bankruptcy. These boards have almost no discretionary funding and every cent they can get their hands on has to be used to pay the light bill and pay the fuel bill. There is very little left over for the other aspects of education. Some of them are deep in debt and have tremendous problems even getting the few meager supplies that they have the few dollars to buy. The reason they cannot get these supplies, very simply, is that they owe the supply company so much money. They will not send them out. So there is a very serious problem in rural Newfoundland, not in urban Newfoundland, not in St. John's, but in rural Newfoundland, a very, very serious problem.

Couple that, Mr. Speaker, with the fact, that the minister agrees to and agreed to in the article, that students in urban areas do better academically than students in rural Newfoundland. So here we have, Mr. Speaker, the undisputable facts. It is as simple as that.

We have the lack of funding in rural Newfoundland and we have the inadequate academic success in rural Newfoundland. So how does the minister look at this problem? As Minister of Education for the whole Province, how does he look at it?

Mr. Speaker, he said in the report that one problem was a problem with teachers. That it was not necessarily the discrepancy in funds, but one problem was a problem with the teachers. He said many things about the teachers, but two things, in particular, I questioned him on.

He said, 'The more qualified teachers try to move to St. John's and try to move to urban Newfoundland.' I do not have the article in front of me right now. 'The more qualified teachers try to get to the urban centers.' That is his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, that gives the image that the more qualified teachers are out there and they are really anxious to get out of the situation they are in in rural Newfoundland. They cannot wait for the day that they can move into a large school in St. John's, number one. The implication was this contributed to the difference in the success rate.

He used another word, Mr. Speaker, that I could not believe, because I know the minister. I have known him for a few years. I was thinking he was going to deny having used the word. 'The more able teachers try to teach in St. John's.' It is one thing to talk about the qualifications, but it is another thing to try to say that it is the more able teachers who try to teach in the urban centers.

How does the minister know who the able teachers are? What is the yardstick he uses to measure which teachers are able and which are not? Does it have to do with qualifications? Does it have to do with the rapport that the teacher has with a class? Can it be measured by the academic success of the students? Is that what we use to measure the ability of a teacher? Are these the things that are used?

Mr. Speaker, it was that word, more than any other, that got me upset. When I asked the minister about this particular statement,

he did not answer it. He did not indicate how he had come to the conclusion that the more able teachers want to come in here. The ones that are satisfied to teach in rural Newfoundland are not as able. That is the implication that comes from that. It is a shocking statement and I want an explanation for it. I want to know how he could measure the ability of these teachers.

MR. MORGAN:

Do not believe all you read in The Sunday Express.

MR. BAKER:

I say to the member for Bonavista South, do not believe all you read. I understand that. However, that is why the very first question to the minister was, 'Is that article accurate?'

However, Mr. Speaker, my time is up. I will give the minister an opportunity to reply because I am very, very concerned about that kind of attack on the teachers in rural Newfoundland.

If I had time to go on, Mr. Speaker, I could mention the fact that he mentioned that home life maybe has more to do with the success in schools than the money that the minister is not providing to these rural schools. That is a totally different matter that I wish I had another half hour to get into it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

First of all, let me comment on some of the hon. member's preliminary remarks when he talks about the problems with funding education in the Province, as in all provinces, and particularly the discrepancies that exist between urban areas and rural areas.

I think in the past few days we have dealt with that matter, and the member, being a former school teacher and keeping abreast of what goes on in education circles, and, in fact, being my critic for quite some time, even though he did not think it was important enough to ask too many questions at the time, although the problems were out there then. The new critic apparently has got him on the ball, or the new leader, maybe. However, it is good to see education getting the attention it deserves. I think we also have been giving it the attention it deserves. That is, perhaps, why more and more people throughout the Province and within political circles are starting to pay attention to it.

Yes, there are needs out there in the educational field, as in all other fields, and I am not going to get into that, but just to say, perhaps, to the hon. gentleman, in relation to that part of his question, some of the things we have done just this past year.

The increase in the equalization grant that they complain about or the grant which was instituted by us, loudly proclaimed by the school board people in the field, realizing it would take some time to put it into full effect to equalize the discrepancies between what we can do or what they are getting right now themselves and

what they could get if they were in a more lucrative area, financially speaking, that grant this year was increased by 80 per cent, \$4.5 million above and beyond what they can raise themselves. That is significant.

The per pupil grant that the boards get was also increased this year from \$245 to \$255. They also held on to what we call a declining in enrollment factor grant where the population is rapidly dropping in schools. They get a fair amount of dollars to make up for that loss because the plant is still there to maintain, the heat and light and everything else.

We also added an extra fifty units to the supply of teachers that are out there, part of a five-year plan for to put 250 extra teachers into the system to address unique problems.

The main thing, I think, is the elimination of the 10 per cent that they had to put on capital construction, and that has saved them. If we had done that ten years ago, none of them would be in the position they are in today.

And we also put in over a \$250,000 on the new distance education programme to help the students and teachers in that very area that he talks about.

Along with that, we have put a lot of money this year into bursaries to train and re-train teachers so that they can hold onto jobs, especially in French teaching, whereby in the past we have had to bring a lot of people in from outside the Province. We want to make sure as more and more positions open in that field, our

own teachers can take positions there.

In relation to the remarks that I made, I suppose the Leader of the Opposition certainly put in perspective when he said, 'do not believe everything you read in papers', but I did say in the House myself that I will stand by what I said. Now, if people were to read the item from which all these quotes come, an item that was printed in The Sunday Express Sunday past, they will realize that a tremendous amount of the interview is there direct in quotes by me, my words, as I said them, or at least I agreed that I said everything that was printed, or pretty close to it. I presume it was taken directly from the tape.

But the one phrase that the member zeroed in on, a phrase which talked about the more qualified people, the more experienced people trying to get to the large centers, that is not news to him, or to me, or to anybody else. That is not news to him, or to me, or to anybody else because he knows that. When he had the small school study done or commissioned, the person who did it clearly pointed out and others as well - the school boards out there will tell you - it is hard to get teachers to go to small, not to rural areas, to generalize, to small, remote communities quite often. Sometimes people from the area want to go home and teach. I can appreciate it.

But given the choice, most people, perhaps in all fields, will go for the larger areas because of the style of life, and so on, in the area, and the benefits for themselves and their family and their children. That is a fact.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. HEARN:
If I could have thirty seconds just to finish. To finish quickly, the boards will tell you out there that quite often they have to bring people in from outside the Province to go to these remote areas, and that part is factual.

The less able, if you would look at the paper - he said he did not have the paper from which the quotes came - the section that says he acknowledged that urban students generally do better academically and so on, 'but he says due more to inexperienced and less qualified teachers that are hired in rural areas than government funding.'

That is not a quote of mine, that is not in inverted commas. It is a generalization from our conversation on people going to small schools. So that part is not a quote of mine.

MR. SPEAKER:
I have two further questions here. I do not know how they were called. One was for the hon. the Minister of Education and the other was for the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

I will call on the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, two days ago in this hon. House of Assembly I asked the Minister of Fisheries a very, very important question, and a very, very clear question. The question was exactly as I am going

to read it from Hansard: "Was the Minister of Fisheries aware that a member of his government" - I should have said a member of this hon. House - "was involved in marketing" -

MR. J. CARTER:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. J. CARTER:
The member wants to quote Hansard. Everything in this House is recorded by Hansard, and now the hon. gentleman is reading what is already in Hansard. So we will have a recording of a recording of a recording. This is absurd!

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
I do not need to read Hansard, Mr. Speaker. I can quote the question very clearly. Was the minister aware at the time that an MHA of this hon. House was involved in the marketing when he announced the programme? If not, when did he become aware? That was my very clear question.

I asked that for a very special reason, for a very important reason. Because, number one, the minister was fully aware at the time that the \$1 million was implemented for two reasons. Reason number one, to help the poor fishermen of this Province who had just come through a very, very bad year. Number two, it was

implemented to help a Third World country where we have millions of starving people and where they cannot avail of the fish and the food that is so needed because of the high price. Those are the two reasons why this programme was implemented.

I also asked the question for a very clear reason, because it is very clear that members of his department were upset about which way the marketing was going to be done, because \$750,000 of the taxpayers' money had already been implemented and passed by the hon. Speaker and by members of this House, in the Estimates Committee, to avail of markets. That is very clear. That is in the budget. That is in the Estimates Committees. That is in the records of this hon. House of Assembly for anybody to read.

Now, did we have any markets established? Did we have any taxpayers' money of this Province and any Canadian taxpayers' money involved to establish markets? That is the question. Yes, very clearly there were markets established and there were markets opened up. The taxpayers' money, some \$50,000 plus the provincial taxpayers' money and hundreds of thousands of dollars, \$300,000 plus, of the federal taxpayers' money was involved in an agency to open up the markets.

Where? I will quote from *The Nigerian Chronicle*: The headline says, "Canadian experts to help fishing industry in CR" (Cross River, Nigeria).

"The seven-man mission, led by Mr. Charles James Morgan, a member of the Canadian House of Assembly --"

MR. MATTHEWS:

Canadian House of Assembly?

MR. EFFORD:
Yes, Canadian.

MR. TOBIN:
That story is some accurate.

MR. EFFORD:
Well, it is very clear. What was the purpose of that delegation if it was not to go into the Third World in an attempt to develop markets? It was lead by the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) himself who said very clearly that he was a member of that committee, and the purpose of that committee was to go into the Third World and to develop the market.

Let us forget the M.H.A. for Bonavista South, let us forget that he even existed, which we all wish we could.

MR. MORGAN:
I am going to be around for a while yet.

MR. TULK:
Threats, threats.

MR. EFFORD:
The minister himself, my question was to the minister and let us not get away from the issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
My question was not concerning who it was. It did not matter what company was involved in the marketing. It did not matter who it was. The fact was that we had already spent taxpayers' money on marketing. We had always spent

taxpayers' money on going into the Third World, into Nigeria. That is the important issue here.

The fact is that the member for Bonavista South was on that delegation. My question to the minister is very clear, and at a later date we will go into the other issues. Was the minister aware, and did any of his officials of his department advise him? That is the question I want the minister to deal with this afternoon. Did members of his department advise him not to get involved with an M.H.A. of his own caucus or of his own House involved in marketing?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
Did they see it as very improper and not a proper procedure to follow? That is the very question, Mr. Speaker, that I want the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to address. That is the answer we were looking for the other day.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I said the other day when this particular question was raised, although they tried to skate all over it yesterday, the thrust of the question. The thrust of the question, Mr. Speaker, is obvious to the blind. The thrust of the question is obvious to anybody who, in addition to being blind, is dumb and everything else. The thrust of the question is the hon. gentleman over there. We all know that.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me deal in fact with some of the questions raised by the hon. gentleman this evening. And let me -

MR. TOBIN:
What gentleman?

MR. RIDEOUT:
Well, I have to choose but to call him that. But let me also say that I will be saying some things that I am sure that the hon. gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) will hear for the first time.

Let me go to the question 'Was I aware' dash, dash dash, 'when I announced'? Let me answer it. I will answer it quite plain and plump. Mr. Speaker, when I went to Cabinet in August of 1987 to look for a Special Warrant, not the \$750,000 that was in the estimates of the department because that was already committed for ongoing programmes. If the hon. gentleman had looked at the Special Warrants that were tabled in this House on opening day he would have seen it, a \$1 million Special Warrant.

MR. EFFORD:
And probably the year before.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is now showing us how stunned he is. The Special Warrant from the year before had already lapsed. I have to go look for another one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, when I went in August of 1987 to look for a Special \$1

million Warrant for a mackerel and herring programme, I did not know that any member of this House or this side was involved in a marketing company. I did not know. But after the programme was approved before I had announced it, I had heard from a processor that there was a member of this House involved.

And it was the minister, Mr. Speaker, talking about the staff and the officials, it was the minister who called in his officials and said, 'I have heard this. Do you think there is any problem with this?'

MR. EFFORD:
Oh, come on.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Listen cocky, go get them and put them in a court. I run my department. I might not know everything, but I called them in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
I know who I called in, and I can name who I called in, and I can tell you the advice was that, 'No minister, because you are paying this subsidy to the fish processor, not to Mr. Morgan and his marketing company or Mr. Joe Blow and his marketing company, or to Mr. anybody else.' That is what this minister was told. Now you can go on a 10,000 stack of bibles and I can bring in too those stacks of bibles the people I brought into my office and ask them. So, do not go trying to play to the gallery for something that I know I did.

There were other things done after that as well, for which if you asked the appropriate question you

will get the appropriate answer. But I called the officials to my office and said, 'I have heard this. Do you think there is any problem with this programme?' The programme was not announced then, the programme had been approved. I told the hon. gentleman what they said. The advice was that the regulations are that we have to pay the subsidy to the licenced processors and it is not a problem.

And it was not a problem. I never heard from the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker. No communications from him whatsoever.

MR. MORGAN:
None whatsoever.

MR. RIDEOUT:
I had telegrams from processors in the Province who ask me if we were going to bring in the same programme that I had brought in in 1986. I had telegrams from those people and I said, 'Look, we will look at it and when we do, we will let you know.'

In terms of the mission to Nigeria, back the year before that, Mr. Speaker, there was no taxpayers money from Newfoundland, as far as I know, involved in that mission.

MR. MORGAN:
It was all federal.

MR. RIDEOUT:
There was no contribution from my department in terms of the cost of the mission. That is all I know. There was no contribution from the provincial Department of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:
Simmons was supposed to go and could not go for health reasons.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The Food Aid Development Association (FADA) asked me to send a representative. FADA asked me to send a representative and I sent Mr. Karl Sullivan our Director of PLanning, on that mission for which I received a report and so on. But there was no contribution from the Department of Fisheries to that mission, so I have nothing more to say about that.

Mr. Speaker, they are the facts. If somebody else has facts that are different from them, I will deal with them at the same time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN:

Bring out your Cape Island boat.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, over the weekend we saw a unprecedented, unusual and I should say a unprovoked attack by the Minister of Education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

I would like to be able to be heard.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

I see the importance that they put on education in this House, Mr. Speaker, they will not let anyone ask a question on it.

An unprecedented, unusual and unprovoked attack by a Minister of Education on the NTA, on teachers, presidents of the NTA, past and present, an attack on parents, an attack on school trustees and a downright insult on some members of my own district in White Bay, when he says "You know", and this a quote which the minister already admitted is right, "if you are down in a classroom in White Bay and you have not got the necessities that you need, it is enough to get you going." Where is White Bay that the minister speaks with such almost spite and attack on White Bay, as if that is good enough for the people down in White Bay, to not have the necessities of teaching? Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about 'out there' as if it were Mars or Jupiter or something.

What the members of the NTA were talking about was - the newspapers have been full of it: "School boards in a financial crisis." You can pick up any newspaper you like. "School board financing in Newfoundland, a system in crisis." "Boards are rendered impotent." "School board trustees lay the facts on the table." There are no affluent school boards.

Mr. Speaker, if I had an hour I could go on for an hour or more on just the headlines alone.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave.

MR. DECKER:

Did someone say by leave. Will you give me leave?

MR. MORGAN:

Your leader is not here, so carry on.

MR. DECKER:

The minister gets up and tries to play with statistics. Here is a quotation which the minister keeps throwing in every now and again. He used it here in The Sunday Express article. He was talking about how in 1985 each member in the labour force in Newfoundland spends \$3,023 on education. The Canadian average, he says, is only \$2,617. This is to prove that somehow we are better than the rest of Canada.

Surely goodness the Minister of Education is aware that the rest of Canada has only about 8 per cent unemployment. Newfoundland has 20 per cent unemployment. Is it any wonder that a bigger percentage of our income must be spent on education? That is quite simple. I would take it the minister was not a mathematics teacher. I would take it his math is not much better than my own, if that is the way he is going play around with his figures.

Mr. Speaker, he talks about equalization grants. The fact of the matter is the gap is still widening. Burgeo is worse off in 1986 and 1987 than it was in 1985 and 1986. That is what is happening to education.

Now, I ask the minister to get up and admit that the real reason for the disparity in educational funding - I am talking about discretionary spending - is because of school taxes. Now, it was a loaded question. It was a question which contained accusations and I stand by it, and I am glad to stand by it, because the fault is school taxes, Mr. Speaker.

The only way school taxes would work would be if we had one

dispensing agency. Then all Newfoundland would be treated equally. But the present system leaves Burgeo with fifty-six dollars per student and it leaves some of the Avalon Boards with over \$200, Mr. Speaker. That is the problem, school taxes, and I ask the minister to admit it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, all my colleagues, even the gentleman opposite know that I do not get perturbed very often, but the former two critics, the member for Eagle River and the hon. member for Gander, over the three or four years that they were asking questions, the few that they did ask, I do not think I ever got upset in my response to them.

Every time the hon. member asked the question, I have this awful tendency to get very upset and go back at him. Particularly, today, because if there was ever a day that I feel a bit perturbed it is today. When I realize that he talks about funding and input from Newfoundland, and no, I am sure we do not apologize that we, as Newfoundlanders, put more of our money into the funding of education than anyone else in Canada.

In total, perhaps, we do not contribute as much, but per earned income we put more than anybody else into education. I do not

mind that there is a part of my salary, more than anybody else in Canada going into education.

What does perturb me today, perhaps, is I realize that part of my salary might be going to pay the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

If the Leader of the Opposition's salary is being paid by gentlemen who get tax credits, that actually means that all of us are contributing. Now, that really perturbs me because if we have extra dollars to go in to the poorer schools in the Province in our education system, I have no argument with that, but certainly, not into the Leader's pocket.

The hon. gentlemen mentioned I referred to White Bay. Maybe it was the section of White Bay that my hon. colleague, the Minister of Fisheries represents. Whether it was White Bay, or Green Bay, or any other place, I referred to areas that only have small rural schools that are having problems. We recognize that.

I also, in the same statement referred to St. Shott's. St. Shott's is in my district. So, I certainly, in anything I said there, neither criticized nor downplayed the effort made by the people in the field. I pointed out realistic problems that are out there. Things have been read into it, perhaps some words that are there are not quotes of mine, can be taken out of context, I have no problem with that. As the hon. Leader says, 'You do not believe everything you read.'

If we are to believe that what is

printed in relation to him is not true, certainly, I can also submit to the hon. gentleman that everything is written there that I did not say may not necessarily be factual.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is now 6:00 p.m.

MR. HEARN:

There will be another day.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

I just remind members, Mr. Speaker, tonight I guess they are doing forestry for an hour or so, and then fishery, tonight here in the House. We will have a statement tomorrow on next week's schedule. There is one other major announcement I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair. I would like to inform all hon. members of the House, and indeed the entire citizenry, and the press, and the commissionaires, that at 1:00 p.m. on Sunday, NTV, on its *The View from the Hill* will interview the illustrious member for Bonavista South. I know nobody will want to miss that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

On motion the House, at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 22, at 10:00 a.m.

Index

Answers to Questions
tabled

April 21, 1988

Hansen

Question: #44 Mr. Furey (St. Barbe) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

(a) How many persons are on your ministerial staff?

Answer: There are two (2) people on staff.

(b) How many of these persons were appointed by Order-in-Council?

Both people were appointed by Order-in-Council.

(c) Each title and Salary applied to that title.

There is an Executive Assistant on staff on the SA 02 Pay Scale and a Secretary on the HL 12 Pay Scale.

(d) A job description for each Order-in-Council appointment.

The regular duties associated with each position.

(e) Were any of these jobs advertised in order to give the unemployed the chance of applying?

Both jobs were filled in accordance with Public Service Regulations.

Question: #100

42524

Mr. Furey (St. Barbe) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) Is the vehicle the Minister currently drives purchased by the Department or leased by the Department? In either case, did it go to Tender?
- (b) Provide a list of the companies who tendered on the vehicles and the amount of their bids.

Answer:

The vehicle the Honourable Minister currently drives was purchased by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and remains the property of the Housing Corporation. Telephone quotations were requested from Hickman Motors Ltd., Regatta Ford Ltd. and Woodford Motors Ltd., and Hickman Motors Ltd. was the only outlet that had such a vehicle in stock fitting the specifications, therefore, the vehicle was purchased from Hickman Motors.

Howard

Question: #33 Mr. Aylward (Stephenville) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

How much money has been spent on industrial land development, and in what areas of the Province?

Answer: The following is a listing of expenditures in industrial land development from the Corporation's inception in 1967 up to and including December 31, 1987.

<u>Location</u>	<u>Amount</u>
St. John's	\$16,623,000
Carbonear	470,000
Corner Brook	1,468 000
Clareville	531,000
Deer Lake	415,000
Gander	469,000
Grand Falls	722,000
Port aux Basques	9,000
Springdale	294,000
Wabush	477,000
Windsor	<u>64,000</u>
Total	<u><u>\$21,542,000</u></u>

Question #142

Mr. Fenwick (Menihek)-To ask the Honourable the Minister of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

(a) A list of all individuals appointed in his Department since April 2, 1985, that did not go through the Public Service Commission, were not subject to an advertisement and a competition.

(b) The names of the individuals appointed into each of these positions.

Competitions for positions at Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation are not administered by the Public Service Commission but rather by the Corporation's human resources staff. Like the Public Service Commission, the Corporation posts positions internally, advertises externally and conducts a formal job competition process. It also maintains a bank of job applications from individuals who wish to be considered for employment with the Corporation when openings occur. For recurring seasonal work a recall procedure is in place pursuant to the terms and conditions of two collective agreements.

In summary, there has not been a single applicant since April 2, 1985, that went through the Public Service Commission as the advertisement and recruitment of all positions have been carried out by the professional human resources staff of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

CONTENTS

Thursday, 21 April, 1988.

Point of Privilege:

Mr. Speaker, rules no prima facie case.....1048

Oral Questions

Offshore Production System:

Ministerial awareness of Newfoundland companies
involved in joint ventures with companies other
than French in a position to bid. Mr. W. Carter,
Mr. Barrett.....1048
Requests relevant documents be tabled.
Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Barrett.....1049
Requests pertinent information on the proposal.
Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Barrett.....1050

Sprung Project:

Meaning of 'direct control' in May 8, 1987,
press coverage of government directors on the
board. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Power.....1051
Benefits to province 'in the way of nutrition
reduced prices...employment benefits.'
Mr. Kelland, Mr. Power.....1052
Adequate markets identified and developed.
Mr. Kelland, Mr. Power.....1053
Additional guarantees or financial assistance.
Mr. Tulk, Mr. Power.....1054
No further obligations or guarantees than
those announced. Mr. Tulk, Mr. Power.....1055
Have further obligations been undertaken.
Mr. Tulk, Mr. Power.....1056

Rabies Outbreak:

Enforcement of regulations concerning
animals coming to the province by ferry.
Mr. Decker, Mr. Power.....1056
Rabid foxes killed on the Northern
Peninsula are local red foxes, not Arctic
foxes. Mr. Decker, Mr. Power.....1057
Possibility rabies introduced by animals
brought in by ferry. Mr. Decker, Mr. Power.....1058

Election Expenses:

Assurance sought that legislation will be brought in. Mr. Fenwick, Ms Verge.....	1059
Seeks spending limits before next election. Mr. Fenwick, Ms Verge.....	1059
Seeks strengthening of enforcement provisions of present Act. Mr. Fenwick, Ms Verge.....	1059

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

Minister's office status, department vehicle, land development cost and individuals appointed. Mr. Peach.....	1060
---	------

Petitions

Human Rights legislation:

Mr. Long.....	1061
Ms Verge.....	1063
Mr. Fenwick.....	1063

Orders of the Day

Order 3, Second Reading, Bill No. 1:

Mr. Simms.....	1065
Mr. Wells.....	1067
Mr. Long.....	1069
Mr. Simms, concludes debate.....	1070

On motion, Second Reading of Bill No. 1, passed.....	1071
--	------

Order 4, Second Reading of Bill No. 16:

Mr. Simms.....	1072
Mr. Tulk.....	1075
Mr. Morgan.....	1080
Mr. Wells.....	1088

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

Mr. Baker.....	1095
Mr. Hearn.....	1097
Mr. Efford.....	1099
Mr. Rideout.....	1101
Mr. Decker.....	1103
Mr. Hearn.....	1104

Adjournment.....	1105
------------------	------