

VOL. 2

NO. 76

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
MONDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1983.

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when Mobil Oil farmed out the acreage offshore to Husky-Bow Valley, the Minister responsible for offshore resources (Mr. Marshall) indicated and was quoted in the newspaper at that time saying about 865 jobs will be created by this move. Now would the hon. gentleman tell the House how he arrived at that figure, how there would be 865 additional jobs as a result of Mobil farming out acreage to Husky-Bow Valley?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the jobs, as I recall, were on the basis of information that had been given at the time, the estimates of Husky-Bow Valley. I mean, there is an intention on this acreage to conduct exploration and those were the figures. I was very glad to see, Mr. Speaker, that the bulk of them - I cannot remember the exact percentages now but I think it was in the vicinity of 70 per cent - were going to Newfoundlanders. This was as a result of, really represented an impact of the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum regulations that have been in effect for some time, and the companies being aware of them, and in cognizant of our representation to them on behalf of Newfoundlanders have become accustomed and acclimitized to the imperative of providing jobs for Newfoundlanders. We thought 70 per cent was a pretty good result and that was the way the figures worked out.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman sidetracked by question, stickhandled around it there. I asked the hon. gentleman to tell the House where these 865 new jobs would come from. There are four rigs operating on the Grand Banks now, as hon. members know, the Zapata Uglund, SEDCO 706, the John Shaw and the West Venture.

MR. TOBIN: SEDCO 706 is in Marystown.

MR. NEARY: No, SEDCO 710 is in Marystown.

MR. TOBIN: It was there this morning.

MR. WARREN: The 710. You do not know anything.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should keep quite if he does not know the facts.

Now would the hon. minister tell -

MR. TOBIN: Ask the federal government. It is the 706.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: There are already 800-and-some-odd jobs, 850 or 860 jobs on these four rigs. Now would the hon. gentleman tell the House where the additional 865 jobs are coming from?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: From exploration, Mr. Speaker, I just explained it.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman is caught boxed into a corner, hon. members can see how he tries to worm his way out of it. The hon. gentleman made a statement that there would be 865 additional jobs as a result of the farming out of this acreage. Now I am asking the hon. gentleman again, for a final time, to tell the House where these 865 additional jobs are coming from? The four rigs that are there will still be there. The Zapata Ugland, as I understand it, when the agreement runs out there is no agreement for that rig to carry on exploration and drilling, so there is going to be a reduction in jobs if the Zapata Ugland does not renew its contract. Where will the additional jobs come from that the hon. gentleman told the people of Newfoundland would come about as a result of farming out to Husky-Bow Valley?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I will just have to repeat to the hon. gentleman again, it is scheduled to come from exploration activity. If the hon. gentleman wishes to get the details of it, I would suggest that the hon. gentleman refer to the details contained in that statement that was given at the time. They were worked out on the basis of information that was given to us as to the

MR. MARSHALL: expectations of the companies as to the amount of the development, and it was on that basis that these figures were there. The information is available for the hon. gentleman and the rationale and everything, all you would have to do is consult the statement that was made by the company at the time, copies of which are available to everybody and he can figure it out.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. It is becoming obvious; the jobs the hon. gentleman was talking about are jobs that are already there and the hon. gentleman now is caught. There were indeed no additional jobs. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House how many rigs will be working on the Grand Banks this Winter?

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

MR. MARSHALL: That is not so, Mr. Speaker, it is the hon. gentleman's own interpretation of the facts. I say that these jobs are scheduled to be provided as a result of the farming with Husky Bow Valley into Mobil's acreage, into that particular acreage at the time, Mr. Speaker. You know, it was carefully and in great detail set out in that statement. The hon. gentleman, if he had a bad week last week, he obviously had a bad weekend and he stayed up overnight trying to find out little tiny things to trip the government up on. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the numbers of

MR. MARSHALL: jobs are there and the calculations of them are quite plain.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman can try to intimidate us all he wants, the hon. gentleman is quite capable of it. He is just a mean, small man with a mean mind. But, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman is it not a fact that there are four rigs presently drilling on the Grand Banks and there are 350- odd jobs there now, that there will be no additional jobs this Winter as a result of farming out the acreage to Husky - Bow Valley, that the hon. gentleman was merely talking about jobs that already exist and not additional jobs? Was does the hon. gentleman not admit that man-fashion?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that just does not happen to be so. If the hon. gentleman wants to refer to the figures and the expectations that were indicated as emanating from that farm-in with Husky - Bow Valley, the statement that was made at the time, he will find the rationale for those jobs. I do not know what the hon. gentleman is trying to prove or what the hon. gentleman is trying to establish. There is drilling out there now on the Grand Banks, he knows the number of rigs so he asks the question, how many rigs? And the next moment he get up and he says there are going to be four rigs, and he tries to use the permutations and

MR. MARSHALL: combinations, because the figures happen to be approximately the same as the number of jobs that would have been created, to give the impression that we were talking about jobs already existing. But that just does not happen to be so. Now all the hon. gentleman has to do is to look at the statement and he will see the rationale and on the basis for which the company made that particular statement and to which I referred at the press conference at that point in time. It represents the expectations of the companies as a result of that farming.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we know the Zapata Uglund is there and due to terminate the contract pretty soon. Sedco 706 is there, the John Shaw is there and the West Venture is there, so these 850 jobs are already there. Now can the hon. gentleman identify any other rigs that will be on the Grand Banks this Winter drilling in addition to the three? As we know, the Zapata Uglund could very easily leave if they do not get a new contract. So could the hon.

MR. NEARY: gentleman identify the additional rigs that he spoke about that would create these additional jobs? Could he indentify the rigs that will be there this Winter in addition to the three or four that are already there?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: My colleague, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), has given me a resumé of the jobs. He keeps an account of them, which one would expect, because it relates to his portfolio.

As of October, 1983, the jobs totalled 1,935 on the offshore. The figures are here if the hon. gentleman wants to see them. They are broken down: able-bodied seamen, assistant driller, account, helicopter engineer, etc., the total number of jobs being 1,935. I do not know what the hon. gentleman is trying to prove. I mean, all I can say to the hon. gentleman, the fact of the matter is, as far as we are concerned, the more jobs out there the merrier, once the work is being carried out in a safe, orderly and proper fashion for the benefit of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Of course, we want to see as many people as possible get jobs, but the hon. gentleman made a public statement and we are asking the hon. gentleman now to put his facts on the table. The hon. gentleman said there would be an additional 865 jobs created as a result of farming out this acreage. I want the hon. gentleman to identify the rigs where these men are going

MR. NEARY: to get the jobs. And, by the way, the 1,935 jobs that the hon. gentleman just mentioned include the crews of the service vessels, not only those who are working on rigs. Now, if the Zapata Uglund is taken away, there will be a reduction in jobs, not an increase. But I am asking the hon. gentleman to put the facts on the table to back up the statement that he made. Where are the additional jobs coming from? Can he identify the additional rigs that will be on the Grand Banks this Winter?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I repeat that these are jobs that are going to result from the expected exploration activity of Bow Valley-Husky in concert with Mobil. The reference that I made referred to their statement. I have every anticipation that this number of jobs, Mr. Speaker, will still result, and I refer the hon. gentleman to the statement made by the companies themselves and the expression of their expectation as to the number of jobs which will pertain.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we can

MR. NEARY: only come to the conclusion, if the hon. gentleman does not give us the facts we can only come to the conclusion that he was bluffing. Mr. Speaker, he made a public statement 'about over 800 jobs,' He said, 'About 865 jobs will be created by the exploration programme,' and Marshall noted that 92 per cent of them will go to Canadians and 71 per cent of them to residents of Newfoundland.'

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was recognized on a supplementary question and appears to be reading from some document. It has been established in our Standing Orders that when asking a supplementary question no preamble is required.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman in a straight question, and I hope I will get a straight answer. There are now four rigs drilling on the Grand Banks and the contract of one is due to expire shortly. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House how many rigs will be drilling on the Grand Banks this Winter and can the hon. gentleman identify these rigs?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I can say that I cannot help what impression the hon. gentleman may get and I do not particularly happen to care what impression the hon. gentleman gets. I am responding to the questions, which he has put to me, as best I can. I am not going to repeat the answer again, The answer was given and he can accept it or not accept it, that is entirely up to him. As to the number of rigs that will be drilling on the Grand Banks this Winter, at the present time we have to wait and see under what conditions the rigs are going to be drilling this Winter. Now if the hon. gentleman is asking me

MR. MARSHALL: how many are anticipated, how many the companies anticipate being put out there, other things being equal, my present information is there are going to be four.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Four, Mr. Speaker, equals the number of jobs we have now, no increase in the jobs that the hon. gentleman told the people of Newfoundland about.

Let me ask the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) if the minister can tell the House the number of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians registered with his department looking for jobs on the rigs and/or on the service vessels? What would be the number? Does the hon. gentleman have that figure with him?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Labour and Manpower.

The hon. Minister of

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) for asking me the question. As of the end of September - no, I will give him the end of October, As of the end of October the total number of people registered in the offshore is 11,580, made up of just about everything that is required on the offshore from able-bodied seamen to drillers, to bakers to barge engineers, to diving supervisors and so on. As I understand, there are four rigs that are presently working. The SEDCO 710, which is still crewed, the crew change took place on Thursday, I believe. It is still crewed. It is in Marystown right now but it is still crewed. We have the Bow Drill III, that is coming here in January. We have, of course, service contractors, that is the supply vessels, etc., we have eleven of those, and we have seismic contractors, four. The total, as I said, as of the end of August is 1,935. When the Bow Drill III comes here, that will be another at least 200 people on the rig, there will be supply vessels, which will be manned, based on it. But we have not got the complete detail as to what the total number will be before the programme is put in place.

MR. SPEAKER:
Opposition.

The hon. Leader of the

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for the information. Almost 12,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are registered for jobs on the offshore. Now could the hon. gentleman tell the House if the MED programme is still continuing, or has it been discontinued? And if it has been discontinued, why it was discontinued? And what are the chances of those who have been given the MED course, what are their chances of finding jobs offshore?

MR. SPEAKER:
Labour and Manpower.

The hon. Minister of

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say that I am a little bit surprised that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) frowns or turns his nose down at 1,935 jobs that are there and would not be there if it was left to his party because he obviously does not support -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

He obviously did not, never did support the offshore regulations with respect to the regulations we passed here in this House of Assembly.

MR. DINN: So we would have nobody working out there if it was left to him. When he was in and had an opportunity to have some people working out there, there were none working. So I am a little bit surprised that he would turn his nose down at the 1,935 who are working out there.

With respect to the MED course, the Marine Emergency Duties Course, that course is a course that still continues to go on. It involves not only people with respect to offshore oil and gas but with respect to our offshore fisheries. We have a new course that is being put in place right now called BOST, it is called Basic Offshore Safety Training, which is a two week course. That started recently and we are attempting to diversify that programme so that we can have the programme not only work here in St. John's but we can possibly extend it to Marystown and Corner Brook and so on.

MR. WARREN: About time, is it not?

MR. DINN: The hon. member who interrupts, and should not be interrupting because he should know the rules of the House, would know that it was impossible, due to the requirement of the Marine Emergency Duties course, to conduct that course anywhere but St. John's. We did not have the facilities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. DINN: We did attempt, Mr. Speaker, to do part of that course through a mobile unit. The mobile unit did not work as well as we thought it should, but there is a new course developed now which, from reports that I am getting, is probably one of the best courses put off for offshore safety training in the world. It is called BOST and we are trying to make that course available to as many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians as we possibly can.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Could the hon. gentleman tell the House if those who did the MED course will now have to do the BOST course, or will the MED course qualify them for jobs offshore? And would the hon. gentleman tell the House, out of the approximate 12,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who are registered for employment offshore, could he tell us what process is used to select employees for jobs offshore?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, let me inform, through this hon. House, all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who have the MED course, they certainly qualify for offshore. That is a three week course and it is one that is more involved, we will say, than is a requirement for the rigs. So we came up with the new BOST course. So those who have the MED course qualify. There are something like 3,500 Newfoundlanders already trained in that course. The BOST course, which is a two week course and, as I say, is in comparison to, for example, the Fraser Institute in Scotland, it is a course that is better than that one, or the reports that I get back indicate that it is better in that there are more hands on. I believe part of the course is, for example, conducted out in Freshwater Bay, and hopefully it will be conducted in other parts of the Province. Hopefulle the course can be expanded to, as I

MR. DINN:

said, the Burin Peninsula, Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Labrador, Stephenville, hopefully we can make it available to all these areas.

MR. CALLAN: Arnold's Cove.

MR. DINN: Well, I do not know if we have an institute in Arnold's Cove that can conduct the course, but we will certainly try to get people from Arnold's Cove on the course as well.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We will build the institute.

MR. DINN: We may even, as the hon. the Premier said, we may even build the institute first and then make sure that they have total access to the course.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That will be another district gone.

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, to be very clear, those people who have the MED course qualify for any job offshore with respect to safety training.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. DINN: We are continuing on with the MED course and we are bringing in a new course, as a matter of fact it has already started, called the Basic Offshore Safety Training course, which is a two week course, which involves one week or more of classroom time and the remainder of the time with hands-on training, Mr. Speaker, as I say, I am told it is one of the best in the world for the purpose for which it was intended, and I recommend it to any hon. members.

How are people selected for offshore work? Well, Mr. Speaker, this has come up many, many times before. People are selected for offshore work by the employers. Basically what happens, Mr. Speaker, is they

MR. DINN: have a copy of our registry, and people go down and attempt to or apply for jobs for the offshore. If they are registered with the department, they have, of course, a list of their qualifications, where they worked before, like the Beaufort Sea or off Labrador or off Egypt, Mr. Speaker. Because Newfoundlanders, I understand, are working just about everywhere now. We have something like 420 Newfoundlanders, because they got jobs here and had worked previously in the offshore, 420 Newfoundlanders are working elsewhere in the world, have gone on with the rigs, like the Pellerin and the Neddrill 2 that were off Labrador this year. Four hundred and twenty Newfoundlanders are now working in other parts of the world because they got an opportunity to get on the rigs here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: Thanks to our regulations.

MR. DINN: Thanks to our regulations, as the hon. the minister said, and the companies are so happy with them that they put them on permanently and take them wherever they go in the world.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: We will get that institute that the hon. gentleman referred to when Ottawa puts the money up. And as far as jobs for Newfoundlanders are concerned, when SEDCO 706 sailed into Newfoundland waters in 1968 the hon. gentleman was still going around in knee pants.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: This is the Question Period, The hon. gentleman is making a speech or making comments or doing something.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Once again I have to remind the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that he has been recognized on a supplementary question and there is really no need for any preamble whatsoever.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ; this is a new question, not a supplementary. My question is for the hon. the Premier. Would the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, tell the House what time we can expect action

MR. NEARY:

on a solemn promise that he made when he was presenting final reading of a bill to approve a Newfoundland Volunteer Service medal? He made a solemn promise to 7,000 Merchant Seamen scattered throughout this Province that a commission would be set up to investigate the possibility of designing a Volunteer Service medal, either they would get the original medal or a new medal for Merchant Seamen. The hon. gentleman indicated at the time that \$70,000, I believe, had been allocated for that project. Now, could the hon. gentleman tell the House when the Merchant Seamen of this Province can expect action on that promise that was made by the hon. gentleman?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is in the system. I will have to check to see just when we will be in a position to finalize the plans on it. The plans are well in hand. By the same token, we also have offered a unique, special medal to the foresters of the Province besides the Marine Service people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: But I will check for the hon. gentleman and get exactly where it is now and when we will be in a position to do the same thing for those people as we did earlier for the other volunteer service people who went overseas, and where we had the ceremony and so on. So I will get the exact information for him, but I know it is in the system.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Do I understand correctly then, Mr. Speaker, from the hon. gentleman that they will not

MR. NEARY: receive the original Volunteer Service medal, that a special medal will be designed and developed for Merchant Seamen? Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We have indicated on a number of occasions that one of the problems that we have had with the medal we now have minted, which has gone to a large number of people who have been overseas, who have been actually in conflict in Continental Europe, well, the foresters came back and they wished to have the same medal. And what we have indicated is, because most of the foresters were not actually in conflict, we would prefer to do another medal for them. Now, as it relates to the seamen, I would have to just check to see how many were actually in conflict and how many were not and see whether one medal can do for them. But the whole idea in the

PREMIER PECKFORD: original medal, or the medal that is now minted and all the servicemen have, were servicemen who were in conflict on land in Europe.

MR. NEARY: Are you saying the Merchant Seamen were not in conflict?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, I am not saying they were not in conflict, I am just saying that what we wanted to do was to ensure that when we gave a particular medal it was for a particular purpose of permanent people who were actually in conflict in the Second World War. Now a lot of the foresters were located in Scotland and in Northern England and we wish to do a separate medal for them. Well, they have been arguing that they should have the same medal as the people who were in conflict. All I am saying is, when it comes to the Marine people, I am just waiting rather than giving a definitive answer to see whether in fact it would be a third medal for them as opposed to the one that is already minted.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the Volunteer Service Medal for Merchant Seamen has not yet been designed, has not been sent to the mint yet, it is still in the planning stage and that is as far as it has gotten at the moment?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not have the information at my fingertips for the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). I indicated that I would get it to see just exactly whereabouts in the process at at the present moment. But I will get it for the hon. gentleman in the next few hours or by tomorrow at the latest.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like
to ask a question of the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and
Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), under whose jurisdiction
comes resettlement, moving communities and so forth. Could
the hon. gentleman tell the House how many families are now
permanently residing on Red Island in Placentia Bay?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of
Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot
tell the hon. gentleman exactly how many families are living
on Red Island. I know there have been a number. My colleague,
the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and I, along with the
member for the area, have been talking to a group of people
down there for about two years, who had resided in Placentia
primarily, and have expressed an interest in going back to
Red Island, and I understand some of them have. But in relation
to an exact number, no, Mr. Speaker, I do not know, but I can
certainly find out.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Well, I hope the hon. gentleman will find out for the next session. Perhaps the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) can enlighten the House as to how many pupils the teacher has on Red Island, which might give us some indication of how many families reside there on a permanent basis. Could the hon. minister tell the House how many teachers are on Red Island and how many pupils each teacher has now at this moment on Red Island?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, arrangements were worked out with the Placentia-St. Mary's Roman Catholic School Board for the provision of one teacher on a trial basis for Red Island for the present school year. When the arrangements were worked out in the Spring and Summer, it appeared that there would be nine school-aged children, attending grades from Kindergarten up to and including Grade VI, during this school year, and in fact nine children were enrolled in those grades in September, receiving instruction from the one teacher provided. I understand that during the Fall one of the families, which has I think five children, moved off the island on a temporary basis because the mother was pregnant and has some health problems. I have been told that the family intend to return to Red Island to live there premanently, but at the moment there are only approximately four children on the Island. That is the latest information I had from my officials, who in turn have liaised with the people at the school board office in Placentia. With the reduced numbers of students, the board was questioning continuing funding a teacher for the balance of the school year, and the last I heard is that

MS. VERGE: the board were going to be talking with the parents concerned before making final plans for after Christmas. There would be some alternatives that could be considered for instruction for the young children remaining on the Island if the number is reduced below that required for a viable classroom qualifying for a teacher, and one of the obvious alternatives is a correspondence programme.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): The time for the Question Period has expired. Before we proceed, I would like to welcome to the gallery a delegation from the Greenspond Municipal Council with their mayor, Robert Granter, Deputy mayor Fraser Harding and councillor Michael Bragg.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS NEWHOOK: This is the answer to Question 158, Mr. Speaker, from the MHA for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock).

MR.SPEAKER: Are there any more answers to questions?

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR.ROBERS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of some 254 of the men and women who live in the communities of Conche and Grandsois in my constituency. Grandsois, as some members may know, is sometimes referred to as St. Julien's. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is very succinct and very straightforward. If I may read the document which has been signed by these men and women, it says: 'Complaints have been forwarded to council' - that is the community council at Conche - 'about long distance telephone calls made to Roddickton hospital in which patients have been put on hold for a considerable amount of time, thus

MR. ROBERTS: having to hang up and pay for an unproductive phone call. Anybody who thinks Roddickton hospital should have a toll free number please sign below! And, as I said, 254 of the men and women in these communities have signed this petition and I am very pleased to present it in their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is quite straightforward. Conche for many years had a nursing station. Last year, because of the savage cut-backs inflicted by this government in the health care field, the nursing station at Conche had to be closed, as were a number of other facilities throughout the Province. The people of Conche then were required to look to Roddickton for their medical services. Roddickton is about twenty miles away over one of the worst roads in the Province, a road which the Minister of Highways (Mr. Dawe) has consistently and constantly ignored at some considerable effort to himself, I have no doubt, over the last few years. No work has been done on it and the road is in appallingly bad shape. These people accordingly, Mr. Speaker, have to look to Roddickton for their medical services. The doctor does come to Conche to hold clinics regularly, as do both public health nurses and, I understand, station nurses do, regular nurses as opposed to public health nurses. The clinics have to be booked. The Grenfell Regional Health Board, which is responsible for the delivery of health care services in the area, has an appointment system, a booking or appointment system and that requires a telephone call from Conche to Roddickton. That is a long distance telephone call in that you have to go through the operators or direct dial but, in any

MR. ROBERTS: event, you have to pay the toll rates for long distance charges, it is not covered in your monthly bill. The people in the community have on many occasions told me of this kind of treatment and the petition is the result of their frustration and their wish that the situation be corrected. There are two possible solutions that I would suggest to the House, Mr. Speaker. The first is the one which the petitioners signed and that is a toll free line, a zenith number so-called, or some kind of system whereby the people in Conche may once again have that which they always had, namely, the ability to get in touch with their medical services without having to go through the long distance operator and incur the charges. Alternately, Mr. Speaker, a much improved communication system in the station at Roddickton would meet the need because, as Your Honour will doubtless recall with stunning clarity, the first words of this petition were that these people call and they are put on hold and then nothing happens and eventually they hang up or the line goes dead and the call is gone for naught. I support the petition. I assume the Minister of Health (Mr. House) will wish to say something on it, but I do wish to say in fairness to him that this strikes me as being primarily a matter for the Grenfell Regional Health Board at St. Anthony. I have been in touch with the board to send them

MR. ROBERTS: a copy of the petition and to let them know of the way these people feel and to let them know that I share these feelings and request some action be taken. The Minister of Health's (Mr. House) role at most would be to provide that board with enough money to enable them to provide the services that the people in the area need and deserve. Mr. Speaker, let me say simply this is yet another example of what happens when you start trying to cut the amount of money made available to health care; the people in Conche have been seriously inconvenienced because of the government's failure to provide the board with enough money. I urge the minister to do whatever he can to make sure that his flint-hearted colleague, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), takes some of the extra \$16 or \$17 million that we are getting from Ottawa under the revised calculations in the EPF programme and use that to apply towards health services and restore some of the monies which were cut and thus enable the boards throughout the Province, not just in my district, to continue to deliver health care services at at least the level they had reached before the savage cuts were inflicted by the government last year. I support the petition, Sir.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I rise just to respond to the petition. I suppose when a person is going to address a petition he is expected to support it. It is not a topic that has come to my attention before. First of all, I want to comment on some of the inflammatory statements made by the hon. member who presented the petition: The savage cuts by this government, the savage cuts, Mr. Speaker, and I do

MR. HOUSE: want to get into debate because we are not supposed to debate, but a 12 per cent increase is not a savage cut, in my estimation. That is what was given last year. And, of course, all boards, I guess, were given the same relative amount of money. It was not the government's decision to close the Conche clinic, it was a result of the board looking at their priorities and saying that this particular clinic was not the most necessary adjunct to the system. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, one would have to look at this and all I can say now is that I will be in contact with the board on the matter but, you know, if we had to insist that there be toll free numbers for all existing services throughout the Province, and many communities have to make long distance calls for appointments - some hospital boards do not have appointments, people just go there and wait. I think the idea to have an appointment system is good. Of course, this is something that you could not insist that a board do, any more than you would insist that it be done by all boards throughout the Province. I think if we look at it from that point of view of there being one thing that perhaps should be clarified, people should not be put on 'hold' and left to 'wait', that is the kind of thing that a board might have control over.

The other point is that it is not an exorbitant cost for people with their share of medicare to have to place a long distance call. I do not think it warrants any drastic action, but certainly I will be taking it up with the board, particularly about the fact that they are put on 'hold' and have exorbitant costs for a particular call.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented by my colleague the member for the Strait of Belle Isle. I do not need to elaborate on what my colleague already said except to say, Mr. Speaker, this is another indication of the pain and suffering that is being caused sick people in this Province as a result of the restraint programme implemented by the administration there opposite.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who just spoke now will have no excuse in the future; the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will have no excuse for curtailing the delivery of health care programmes in this Province any further, there will be no excuse for user/pay fees. The hon. gentleman just got an increase in the established programme of grants from the Government of Canada, another \$19 million, I believe, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Finance said \$15 million, but the figure that I heard quoted from Ottawa was an additional \$19 million for post-secondary education and for the delivery of health care programmes in this Province. So there is no excuse, Mr. Speaker, to make the sick people in this Province suffer any longer. The hon. gentleman now should be able to provide the necessary funding to the Grenfell Health Board and to all the other hospital boards around the Province, enough funding to be able to take care of sick people in this Province. There are tremendous waiting lists in the various hospitals throughout the Province and the hon. gentleman can stand there in his place day in and day out and tell us that there is no pain or suffering, Mr. Speaker, but we are not prepared to accept that. I do hope that the point has been sufficiently made and that the new funding will be able to take care of some of the problems outlined.

MR. HOUSE: There is no new funding.

MR. NEARY: There is new funding, Mr. Speaker. There is an additional \$19 million - a large portion of it going to health care in the Province. So I hope the point has been sufficiently made and that the minister now will act in a humanitarian way and not try to help the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) balance the budget on the backs of the sick and poor people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

On motion, the following bills were read a third time, ordered passed and their titles be as on the Order Paper:

"An Act To Consolidate The Law Relating To Compensation To Workers For Injuries Suffered In The Course Of Their Employment". (Bill No. 80).

"An Act To Amend The Hospitals Act, 1971". (Bill No. 76).

"An Act Respecting The Registration Of Nursing Assistants". (Bill No. 75).

"An Act To Amend The Environmental Assessment Act". (Bill No. 73).

"An Act To Control And Regulate The Distribution And Use Of Pesticides". (Bill No. 72).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting Defamation". (Bill No. 70).

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I moved the adjournment the other day because I wanted to show the House

MR. NEARY:

the difference between how we debate on this side of the House and how members there opposite debate these matters. My hon. colleague, when he talked about slander and libel, refused to be baited by hon. gentlemen there opposite, declined to mention specific instances or cases in this hon. House, and I think because he refrained from singling out members there opposite who are continuously downgrading this House, continuously lowering the decorum of this House, continuously slandering and libeling members on this side of the House and people outside of the House, I believe my hon. colleague gained a great deal of credibility in his debate.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, we were somewhat taken aback - I suppose we should not have been - when the spokesman for the government side of the House, the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) stood in his place and started immediately - here we were, talking about a bill on defamation and the member for St. John's North, in the debate, started to slander and libel members on this side of the House again. Now, we can understand why that happens because we see it every day in this House from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): On a point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: I cannot allow this to pass, Mr. Speaker, but the bill under debate - and the bit I was speaking on was Section 12 which talked about immunity of the press in reporting matters that went on in this House, and this could not be debated, not sensibly debated without

MR. CARTER: bringing up instances in the past where people's reputations had been blackened and where, I think, the immunity of this House had been used improperly. And I specified that while there were other members over there who were frequently guilty, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was the most guilty of them all. I reiterate that now and I think it is quite clear, and I do not see how I could debate that bill otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

To that point of order, I rule that it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. CARTER: It sure is!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if you have heard the story about the hon. gentleman going over to the Health Sciences Complex and offering his brain for science. And the doctor over there said, 'We would be glad to have it because we have been looking for one that has not been used.'

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman just did exactly the same thing again in his point of order, did the same thing again, squirted his poison across the House. The hon. gentleman is continuously berating and slandering and libeling the former Premier of this Province, Mr. Smallwood. He is continuously at it.

MR. ROBERTS: And Mr. Moores.

MR. NEARY: And not only that, but he does it privately with another former Premier and sometimes not so privately, Mr. Frank Moores, Mr. Speaker. So if I were the hon. gentleman, I would just sit back in my seat and say nothing, Mr. Speaker. I know he gets a bad example

MR. NEARY: from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). Because, as I said before in this hon. House, I suppose one of the lowest, Mr. Speaker, one of the lowest levels that you could stoop to in this House, or anywhere else, I suppose, even in a bar, about the lowest level you could stoop to would be to attack somebody's mother! And we had one hon. gentleman there opposite who -

MR. CARTER: Name names.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the Government House Leader, who attacked an hon. member's mother. And we all know the results of that, Mr. Speaker. We all know the results of that. And, Mr. Speaker, do you think that the hon. gentleman learned anything from that, learned a lesson from it?

MR. NEARY: No, he did not. Small men with small minds, Mr. Speaker, -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: I think for the information of the members who were not present in the House at the time, or were not associated with the party or were not around at the time, it should be recalled as a matter of record who was expelled from the House at that time. It was not the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall).

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

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who was expelled from the House at that time did a very honourable thing when he went across the House because his mother was insulted by that hon. gentleman, which is about the lowest level to which you could stoop. Not only in this House, but if you were downtown in a bar you would not insult a person's mother and call her the names that the hon. gentleman called her, Mr. Speaker. It is about the lowest that I have ever seen in this House in my twenty-one years.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there is no protection. There is no protection against that sort of thing. The hon. gentleman stood up the other day and I had to ask the Chair for protection against wild, low, rotten statements made by the hon. gentleman. And I have no protection against that sort of thing. I could stand in this House, I could say the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is bringing messages from the Mafia and the Chair will not protect the hon.

MR. NEARY: gentleman, and that is tragic and unfortunate indeed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: When you are lying you know.

MR. NEARY: So you see what we are up against, Mr. Speaker. Then they stand over there—my hon. colleague raised the question the other day about immunity in this House. Then members on the government side speaking for the administration, because every time a member over there stands he speaks for the administration, he is supporting the administration. If he does not agree with their policy he has to move himself away, separate himself from the administration.

MR. TOBIN: Do not be so foolish.

MR. NEARY: So every time a member speaks he is speaking for the administration. And my colleague made such a good point that obviously hon. gentlemen there opposite resented it. They tried to belittle it. And how did they try to belittle the point made by my hon. colleague, Mr. Speaker? They tried to belittle it then by using slander and libel, by being vicious and treacherous, by squirting their poison across the House at members on this side to try to undermine the credibility of a recommendation that was made by my colleague. And, Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting for the press in the future to take a note, just note from this day forward, just note, take a mental note, of who starts the personal attacks in this House, of where the character assassination originates from. It will be interesting for them to make a mental note and watch what happens during Question Period in this House when you are boxing ministers in, when you are cornering them, Mr. Speaker, and they have not got the answers. Just watch the slime and the poison they squirt. Just watch it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: Listen to the adjectives now, slime, that is not a word you use in this hon. House.

MR. NEARY: That is the only way I can describe some of the words that come from the lips of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), as slime, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): On a point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: It has not been established, Mr. Speaker, whether slime or slimy is parliamentary or not. I would like to have a ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order. I did go through Beauchesne, pages 105 to 108, I cannot find the word 'slime' or 'slimy'.

I do not think it would be parliamentary if one hon. member called another hon. member slimy, but it could be considered in the context the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is using it, he is saying -

MR. NEARY: Words.

MR. SPEAKER: - words are slime. I cannot rule it unparliamentary.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Leader of the Opposition. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I must say -

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible) I would like to hear what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) will say then.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it does not make any difference, but I hope I can motivate the hon. gentleman to get up on his feet and apologize for all the wild, irresponsible, untrue statements that he has made in this House over the years about people. The only one that I have ever seen in my day, twenty-one years going on twenty-two years in this House, the only one who attacked a member's mother. I do not think you can get much lower than that in this House, Mr. Speaker.

Now having said that, having established the fact that my colleague made a good point. I am not so sure, Mr. Speaker, that I would agree 100 per cent with what he said. I am more inclined to agree with the opinion of The Daily News editorial this morning, that we should have some freedom in this House, we should have some.

MR. ROBERTS: And we can agree that people outside should be allowed.

MR. ROBERTS: We can agree that people outside should have protection. That I will agree with 100 per cent.

MR. BARRETT: He is some glad you are here today 'Ed', you really helped him out.

MR. ROBERTS: Not as glad as Witch-hunt Willie is that you are here.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in that regard our hearts beat as one. As far as cross-examining ministers and raising matters involving members of this House, because we do have rules and regulations, and we do have protection in this House, and we do have disciplinary action, I believe that particular

MR. NEARY: aspect of our immunity should remain intact, Mr. Speaker. But as far as people outside the House are concerned, I think that they should be protected against slander and libelous statements and statements involving their character that are made in this House.

Then the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), you were not here the other day, got up and said the reason that he would not like to see the sessions of the House televised is because somebody's character may be attacked in this hon. House.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have to rise to another point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: The point of order I was making, Mr. Speaker, was entirely in line with the enlightened editorial that The Daily News published and that was that people outside this Chamber do not have much protection. And it seemed to me that if members of the general public did not show the requisite amount of fear for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) there was always the implied threat that he would blacken their names in this Chamber. And if it were done on live TV this certainly would be a very dangerous thing to allow. So, Mr. Speaker, I just rise to correct that point.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, the hon. member used the point of order as a point of clarification and there is no point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have to say that in all my years as a member of this House I cannot recall one statement that I made in this House that I would not make

MR. NEARY: outside the House, And I have made statements outside the House and I believe as a result I have been the victim of at least three times, if not four times, of having writs of libel served on me for statements I made outside the House, and not one of them ever got to court, Mr. Speaker. The irony of it is that not one of them were proceeded with.

MR. TOBIN: How much did it cost you?

MR. NEARY: It did not cost me anything because I ignored them. All they were designed to do was to stop debate, because once the matter went before the court then we could no longer debate that matter. And that was the whole purpose of the exercise, to try to silence the Opposition. And the same thing could happen, of course, if we took away our immunity in this House, that if somebody wanted to cut off discussion or debate on a particular matter all they would have to do is put it before the court and that would be the end of it, we would not be allowed to raise it anymore in this House. And I hope that does not happen, Mr. Speaker, because in trying to rectify a situation we could very easily make it worse. Because those who could afford lawyers would go downtown and hire lawyers. The members who have fat wallets could

MR. NEARY:

hire lawyers who say, 'Well, let us lay a charge of slander or libel, even though we know it is not going to hold, just to shut off the discussion. We do not want to hear any more about it, and once you put it before the court then you will not be allowed to talk about it anymore.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if they have taken away the government common room or taken away their offices from them. There seem to be an awful lot of meetings going on over there and, I must say, it is interfering with the decorum of the House, Mr. Speaker.

So, although my colleague made a very valid point, we were very disappointed that members there opposite then started to get personal again in rebuttal to the debate from this side. They cannot seem to stand a recommendation or a good idea or a good suggestion from this side of the House. They cannot stand it! The hon. gentleman cannot stand anything that is Liberal! It turns his stomach, Mr. Speaker! And if we score a good debating point on this side of the House, then certain hon. gentlemen there opposite resent it, they hate us with a passion! Some members will even go as far as to say, 'Do not be seen talking to that crowd outside the House!' I have heard that. 'You are not talking to him, are you? You are not speaking to him? You do not talk to Liberals, do you?' A very strange attitude for people to have, Mr. Speaker, indeed! In a democracy, you would expect members to be a little more broad-minded. You would expect their thinking to be of a little higher standard, on a higher level. So I hope that we debate this matter in a common-sense way, in a good atmosphere. That is a very valid point, something that should be looked into, something we should not rush into,

MR. NEARY: but something that we should take a good hard look at down the road to see if we can make changes that will improve the situation in this House.

I think that is why my colleague raised it the other day and, Mr. Speaker, we expect a favourable reaction from members there opposite and not watch them take advantage of the situation to get up and launch a personal attack on somebody on this side of the House. They are past masters at it! They are artists, real artists!

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): On a point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: No one launched a personal attack against the hon. gentleman that was not thoroughly justified. It was thoroughly warranted. As far as I am concerned, he is the reason that this bit of legislation was brought before this hon. House and, you know, if the cap fits, he has to wear it.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I rule there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I remind the Chair that this is the third time that the hon. gentleman has broken the rules of the House in the last six or seven minutes. The hon. gentleman cannot stand criticism. Mr. Speaker, I would put the hon. gentleman in the class of an aristocrat or a snob. The hon. gentleman looks down his nose at anybody who is not in the upper echelon. He looks down his nose at these kinds of people, and the hon. gentleman has no reason to do that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOUSE: Oh yes! He is paranoid.

MR. NEARY: No, not paranoid, but if you are not in the hon. gentleman's class, if you are not upper-class in the hon. gentleman's eye, then he looks down his nose at you, Mr. Speaker. That is what he is doing during this whole debate. And he does not know the rules of the House. Three times in the last five or six minutes he has gotten up on a point of order on which we did not even have to comment. The Chair said, 'Sorry, there is no point of order. The hon. gentleman just took advantage of the rules to express a point of view.'

MR. CARTER: To clarify.

MR. NEARY: Not to clarify,
Mr. Speaker.

I heard the other day the story of why the hon. gentleman got flicked out of Cabinet, why he got flicked out of Frank Moores' Cabinet. I do not suppose you could find a more delightful, charming, individual on the face of this earth than Frank Moores, easygoing, happy-go-lucky, and not a vindictive man.

MR. NEARY:

And it is a good thing he was not. But, Mr. Speaker, he was forced to throw the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) out of his Cabinet - and I believe that is a first in this House, too: we had his colleague who attacked a member's mother - and we had another member there opposite who was flung out of the Cabinet for insulting one of the denominations.

MR. CARTER: Not true.

MR. NEARY: Not true?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for St. John's North on a point of order.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, we can allow a certain amount of latitude, and I grant you that the claw marks have been filled in in the former Minister of Education's office but, Mr. Speaker, I will not sit here in this House and allow a remark like to stand. I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw it. I insulted no denomination ever.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order, I rule that there is a difference of opinion as to whether an hon. member insulted anyone. There is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: That is four times now, Mr. Speaker. That is four times the hon. member has challenged the Chair, four times the hon. gentleman has been wrong; it has been four times, Mr. Speaker, that he has been told by the Chair there is no point of order. But anyway I am not going to belabour the point, because I think I have said enough, Mr. Speaker, to justify the point my colleague raised the other day, a very valid point, something we should look at, something that we would welcome on this side of the

MR. NEARY: House and I do hope that some time in the foreseeable future that there will be steps taken to remedy the problem that my colleague referred to the other day when he was speaking in this debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise in debate because the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) is not available today and he asked me to respond to a couple of the points that were raised by the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

If the hon. the minister now speaks, he will close the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, as I say there are just a few points and I shall attempt to be brief with respect to it.

First of all, this is my understanding of the points, I was not listening as closely as my colleague was, but my colleague briefed me on it on Friday but this is what I understand to be three of the main points made by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle. First of all, he asked why the limitation in the act was there. I am advised that this act is a uniform act, it is meant to cover every province of - well, it does not cover every province of Canada, but each province has laws in it which are the same as the provisions of this particular act. It was thought to be wise for the same limitation periods as well as the same rules to apply to publications in all provinces of Canada.

MR. MARSHALL: This decision was arrived at as a result of the meetings of the Ministers of Justice when this particular provision was being considered. So that is the reason why we see the limitation period, set out in the act as it is, of three months and one year from the time a person became aware of the defamation.

Another point made by the hon. gentleman was he wanted to know why there was a definition in the bill that restricts newspapers to being defined as newspapers who are published at least twelve times a year. I am advised with respect to that, Mr. Speaker, that the reason for it is that this bill gives a certain amount of protection to legitimate newspapers which are being published on a regular rate. The protection given is given in the area of what is known - I do not want to get into long comments on the law with respect to it; both the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) exchanged sufficient debate on that - but it does give protections on the basis of the law that applies to

MR. MARSHALL:

there that the protection of the act is to come to newspapers that publish, as they are defined, at least twelve times a year. And then there was the provision on retroactivity. The only other point that was made was made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) on this matter of legislative immunity. The only comment which I have with respect to that is that, you know, these are matters of balancing interests and, quite frankly, the way it is now, the way it is supposed to work, obviously it does not work. Certainly nobody denies that people should be protected from libel uttered through the mouths of member in this House, but whether the protection should come from the courts or whether it should come from this House is the question. It is my opinion that the protection ought to come from the House itself. With all due respect to the judges of the courts, and, of course, we all have the greatest of respect for the judges of the courts, I would much prefer that the elected representatives of the people police themselves in such a way that this type of thing does not happen. And I would say that if members of this House had the feeling when they get up to say something that they would be liable for a suit for defamation, there would be an appreciable number of people in this House who would have to be very guarded about what they said. Now that might be deemed to be an advantage - some people might think, yes, they should be guarded - but on the other hand, as I say, it comes to a matter of balancing interests, and the members of this House should not be so constricted that they are apprehensive of speaking their mind clearly lest it be greeted by an action through the courts, a court action. And believe you me,

MR. MARSHALL:

I think quite a number of them would follow ; not necessarily that they will be well grounded, but anybody thinking that he had a grievance would take an action against the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) for some simple thing he may have said which may or may not have been libelous. And I think the way in which this matter should be decided is the same way when it was set up as envisaged , that there should really continue to be immunity to members of this House. I am not going to get into the long lecture given by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) or the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) with respect to it, there is no point in getting into that, but the fact of the matter is, it is quite obvious, that in this House anyway this protection is not taken seriously. So I think, Mr. Speaker, the sanctions are there in the rules of the House. Perhaps we need to change the rules of the House to make the penalty more specific and more direct when this type of thing occurs. But it would seem to me that there is good

MR. MARSHALL:

virtue for the argument that elected members of a parliament or a legislature should continue to enjoy immunity, that immunity should not be used for the purpose of defaming people but, if it should be done, then the House has the remedy in its own hands. So those are the four remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am making in closing the bill on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), and I have much pleasure in moving second reading of this bill which has been quite extensively debated and is one that the Minister of Justice has brought in after a great deal of work and a great deal of thought by himself and his - I do not like the word 'counterparts,' I do not think there is a counterpart of our Minister of Justice in Canada, but, yes, we can call them his counterparts in the other provinces because they are not Liberals. I think we can call them counterparts. But, anyway, it represents a significant piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, as so many of the pieces of legislation that have been brought in in this Fall session are, despite the way they are being decried by hon. members opposite. Now there will be certain pieces of housekeeping legislation that will come up, certainly, but that is necessary. But, by and large, all the bills that have passed this House and will come are bills of substance that are here for a reason and are here for the benefit of the people of Newfoundland and this Defamation Act is one such example. I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting Defamation," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 70)

Motion, second reading
of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And
Labrador Housing Corporation Act," (Bill No. 4)

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. Minister of
Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, it gives
me great pleasure to introduce this legislation which
is quite simple and straightforward. Basically all
this bill does is expand the membership of the board
of directors of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing
Corporation by one person and that person to be a
representative of the physically disabled in the Province.
This fulfills the commitment that I made to groups
concerned with the care and the welfare of physically
disabled persons in our Province during the International
Year of the Disabled. In accordance with this commitment
I am therefore very pleased to bring forward this minor
amendment to the Act which will provide that physically
disabled persons will be represented on the board. I
might add as well that the corporation, over the past
number of years, has given due consideration to the
needs of such persons and we are making every effort
and being conscious of the need of providing housing,
both in our economic rental units but primarily in our
public housing units which are designed to accommodate
persons who are handicapped, particularly those who are
in wheelchairs and who require special care. So we have
made efforts over the past number of years to accommodate
these people and to be very much aware of their needs
and this particular piece of legislation goes one step
further in ensuring that in order for us to carry on
with that line of thought and to ensure that we have

MR.WINDSOR: accurate information and advice on such issues that we have a representative of those people on the board of directors. So it gives me great pleasure to move second reading.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward): Before I recognize the hon. member,it gives me great pleasure to welcome to our House of Assembly on behalf of all members today Mayor Frank Marsh and a delegation from the Garnish town council from the district of Grand Bank.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are going to support this bill to have a physically handicapped person appointed to the board of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. I thought,Mr. Speaker, that we may open up the debate a little bit on the subject. I do not know whether this is the time to do it or not,but I notice here lately

MR. NEARY: that there are an awful lot of ads appearing in the newspapers for houses that are being offered for sale by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, not being privy to the information of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, I can only assume that these are houses that are repossessed by the government. And I am wondering if the hon. gentleman could tell us, when he is closing second reading of the debate, why we are seeing so many Newfoundland and Labrador housing units offered for sale in recent days? What is the reason behind it? How many units have been repossessed in the, say, last year or so? That would be an interesting figure for us to have, Mr. Speaker. And would the hon. gentleman tell us also in establishing a rental base for the rental of their properties which is calculated on the gross income of a tenant, does the corporation make any allowances in adjusting the monthly rent under special circumstances of a tenant who may have, for instance, unusually high expenses because of a health or a medical problem in the family? I am thinking of a kind of expense that could affect drastically the monthly income the tenant earns. So could the hon. gentleman give us the answer to these two questions, Mr. Speaker? I do not know if my colleagues have anything to say on this matter, but these are the only two questions that I have to ask.

We have a lot of things to say about housing in this Province when we get an opportunity to debate housing, Mr. Speaker, in a more comprehensive way, we will be doing so because we think the whole thing is a shambles a complete shambles. But I do not think this is the time to do it while we are debating this bill. I merely would like to have the answer to these two questions, Mr. Speaker. I will just repeat them for the benefit of the hon. gentleman. I think he has

MR. NEARY: made a note there. How many houses have been repossessed in the last year and are these the ones that are being offered for sale in the newspapers? And is it the procedure of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation to calculate a tenant's monthly rent after they take into consideration a severe health or medical problem that may exist in the family that would drastically affect their income? I wonder if the hon. gentleman could give us the answer to these questions?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I want to add an extra question for the minister to answer in closing the debate. First I agree with my hon. colleague, we are also in favour of having a disabled person on the Board. Will there be a member dropped from the Board to make room for this person or will this be an extra person on the Board? And if so, in coming to voting procedures, is there an odd number now on the Board or can the minister tell us exactly the number of the people that is presently on the Board, including this disabled person?

The minister did say that they were quite concerned for some time, and it was his intention to have a disabled person sitting on this Board. I might add also to the minister that I believe the credit here does not go to the minister or to this government; the credit goes to Mr. Doug Vickers and the Disabled Association in the Province. Those are the people who have made numerous representations to this government for improvements, improvements in access to commercial buildings as well as improvements to buildings that are leased by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing to assist the disabled people. So I think the credit should go to the people who have taken the initiative to suggest, to the minister and his

December 12, 1983

Tape 3909

PK - 3

MR. WARREN: officials, changes in
the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Act by appointing a
member of the disabled

MR. WARREN: people in this Province on the board, I think it is a step in the right direction, and hopefully many other things will happen in the minister's department that will greatly help and assist the handicapped people in this Province.

Again, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) did mention about the number of houses that are for sale. As recently as last week, three of my constituents had their houses taken back by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, which left some eighteen members of the family without proper housing. With all due respect to the minister's department I believe those three families were given every benefit of the doubt to pay up. I am just wondering if there are other cases throughout the Province where individual families owe so much money to the minister's department, as, for example, those three families did? It takes so long for action to be taken. I understand that the minister's department referred to the courts way back last Spring, and it took the courts some six months to act in those three individual cases. Subsequently, instead of being thrown out of the houses in June or July or August when the weather was more suitable, they were thrown out in the middle of the Winter in sub-zero weather with five or six feet of snow on the ground. So I am just wondering if there are many other people throughout Newfoundland and Labrador who are given as much leeway as those three families were given? In all fairness to the minister, I admit we would probably kick about it if we heard talk every day of people being kicked out of their houses. But then again, I have to pay for my house, and if the means are there then surely goodness those people living in Newfoundland and Labrador

MR. WARREN: homes should be liable also to pay their rent or their mortgage, whatever the case may be, on at least a reasonable basis. At least they should make every effort. Probably the minister will state there are a lot of people renting from Newfoundland and Labrador Housing who are probably taking the corporation for a ride, just getting in there and staying in there as long as they possibly can. I suggest to the minister that maybe those three families in Nain in my district were given all the rope that they could use, were probably given too much leeway, so perhaps the minister should tighten things up. It is government money, it is taxpayers' money, so I suggest that probably the courts should be asked to process these cases faster. With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, we support the bill.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to add a few words to the comments which were made by my colleagues. Of course, as other members who have spoken have indicated, I too support this legislation and compliment the minister on it. I just would like to ask a question, which maybe the minister can answer and maybe he cannot, but I have noticed throughout the Province in the last few years a lot of the public buildings, both federal and provincial, particularly the new ones, have made access easier and made efforts to accommodate those people who are handicapped or use wheel chairs or other devices to get around.

MR. HODDER: But I am not sure under which department this type of legislation - there must be some legislation that backs it up - comes under. Every once in a while you are in some establishment where you run across what you might consider a dangerous step and it is readily noticeable that handicapped people would have difficulty navigating, and sometimes it is dangerous to an ordinary person, much less someone who is handicapped, is in a wheelchair or other device, as I say. I would just like to ask the minister or any other minister on the other side of the House who might comment on this, because, particularly in privately owned buildings and privately owned business establishments such as hotels, stores and that sort of thing, the same move does not seem to have been made by government to accommodate handicapped people. And I would ask the minister when he stands to close the debate, or other ministers over there who could tell me, just exactly what the government is doing to rectify this type of situation in the private establishments in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): If the hon. the minister now speaks he will close the debate.

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, just to very briefly respond to some of the questions asked.

The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked a question relating to a number of ads advertising houses for sale. I would say that some of these houses that are being sold are houses that have been re-claimed, no doubt for lack of payment; others are units

MR. WINDSOR: which are no longer required by the Corporation. They may have been units which we were administering for staff of other departments of government, perhaps doctors or nurses or teachers in rural Newfoundland or whatever, and no longer are these houses required and we might be disposing of them. But certainly some of them at least would be houses which have been repossessed.

MR. NEARY: About how many?

MR. WINDSOR: I do not have an exact number. I would suggest, though, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the large portfolio that we do have across this Province, that the number of houses repossessed is extremely low. I think the hon. gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was quite accurate when he said that in fact, if we err, it is on the side of the homeowner in that we are probably much too lenient in taking legal action and having these tenants removed for the obvious reason; Mr. Speaker, we are most hesitant to turn somebody from his home, in some cases to have him lose any of the equity that he might have put into the home, and he may not have alternate accommodation available to him. I would be quite prepared to say that in every case that I have had a request to look into and that I have looked at personally, I have been more than satisfied that the Corporation has gone the extra mile and has given this person every possible opportunity. And, as I said, if we are at fault, we have probably been much too lenient and probably should have taken action much earlier. And I am talking about people who are in arrears on mortgages as much as \$5,000 and \$6,000 and \$7,000 before they are -

MR. WARREN: \$8,000.

MR. WINDSOR: That is right, \$8,000 is certainly not impossible.

MR. WINDSOR: So I think at that point in time, Mr. Speaker, it certainly is appropriate for us to take action. We would always consider the circumstances involved in the family. If it is a short-term problem, if a person has been normally gainfully

MR. WINDSOR:

employed and has normally been a very consistent payer of mortgage fees and is now going through an unusual time, If there has been an illness or if the person is unemployed but it would certainly appear that he or she would expect to be employed again in the near future, we certainly use a great deal of leniency. But in many cases it becomes obvious to us that this person just does not intend to pay the mortgage and obviously the taxpayers of this Province should not be supporting that kind of person. To the hon. gentleman's second question, the basis for determining the rent paid is on the gross family income, Mr. Speaker. We cannot consider special circumstances such as medical problems or other special costs that a family may be involved in. That is a situation which must be, and quite properly should be dealt with by other departments of government, such as the Department of Social Services, for instance. The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation is not a social agency. We are a landlord, we operate housing stock in this Province on behalf of government, basically on a cost recovery basis in accordance with the federal/provincial programmes. We do not have any mechanism or any programme which allows us to consider such things as the individual problems of a family. These are more properly addressed by the Department of Social Services and such other agencies, which in many cases do provide funds. In fact, in many of our public housing units, and in our rural and remote housing units, a great portion of what is paid to the corporation is paid by the Department of Social Services on behalf of their clients.

MR. HODDER: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. WINDSOR: Yes.

MR. HODDER: If Newfoundland and Labrador Housing is not a social agency, why does Newfoundland and Labrador Housing get into the type of housing they are in? For instance, I can see no reason why Newfoundland and Labrador Housing should be in the type of business that private enterprise can readily do, I see no reason why they should be in that type of business. For instance, I think in terms of, say, Fort Pepperrell or the Harmon Complex or the complex in Goose Bay, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing is now in a situation where they are doing the work of private enterprise, but perhaps not as efficiently, I would agree that if it were a social agency, and these apartments were for the disadvantaged, then I can see government being in it, but I see no reason for it being in there if it is only doing the job of private enterprise.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his question because it gives me an opportunity to explain just a little bit about the difference in housing programmes that the corporation does have. As it relates to social housing, let me try to clarify here that we do have a social programme in that public housing or social housing is indeed a social programme, but it is by way of a pre-determined programme under a federal/provincial agreement. We do not have the flexibility to look after short-term needs and special needs of individuals. Our programme is a subsidy programme geared to the gross income of the family unit,

MR. WINDSOR: so anything over and above that that is required and daily needs of the individuals is something that must be addressed by the Department of Social Services or some other agency. So that is what I mean when I say we are not a social agency. We are providing social housing, but it is in accordance with a firmly pre-defined programme with set rules and regulations under the federal/provincial agreement. The hon. gentleman is referring to what we would normally call our economic housing units. These are not subsidized units; these are units such as we see in Goose Bay or in Stephenville or in Pleasantville or in Churchill Park. These are economic rental units which are on a full cost recovery basis. There are a number of reasons why government, or the Housing Corporation on behalf of government has been involved in these. Certainly it is quite obvious, I am sure, that when the facilities at Goose Bay were turned over to government, therefore we operate them; the facilities at Harmon were turned over to government, therefore we have been operating them. I would agree with him that we should not be competing with private enterprise where there is clearly no need for the Housing Corporation to be involved, and that is precisely why we are selling units in Goose Bay, we are selling units in Stephenville; many of these economic rental units are for sale and many have been sold. And I think I announced recently when I was in Goose Bay that an additional fair number of these units would in fact now be put on the market as it becomes feasible to do so. In some case where you have units that have common services, such as one central heating system and one central electrical system, it is very difficult to that unless you

MR. WINDSOR: sell a block as an apartment block. You cannot sell them as individual units. But in the case of Stephenville, we have identified a considerable number of units, mainly the duplex units that are there, many of which now have been sold and many are available for sale, in the first instance to the present tenants, if that tenant wishes to purchase the unit then he may purchase it; if that tenant moves out, then we have the option of putting that unit on the open market. Never will we ask a tenant to vacate because we wish to sell that unit; we have not, and have no intention of doing so.

But, Mr. Speaker, generally speaking why would government therefore be involved in economic housing? The first reason is just that, that we inherited those units and we have been operating them and providing rental accommodation in areas where perhaps private enterprise would not be interested in providing such accommodation. Once we have identified a real need by the private sector, then certainly government should move away from it and allow the private sector to do it.

The second reason, Mr. Speaker, is to provide a leveling effect on rents. If you leave private rental accommodation to the private sector, and if there is a very severe shortage of rental accommodation, then indeed the private sector has a monopoly and you will find a great deal of pressure for rents to increase. So by having an economic rental stock, government is in fact providing some leveling effect on undue increases of rent. Of course, the Residential Tenancies Board has a similar function, Mr. Speaker, and there is some arguments to be said for that.

MR. HADDEN: How many members on the board now.

MR. WINDSOR: There are now ten members on the board. If the hon. gentleman had read the explanatory note,

MR. WINDSOR: his question, 'Would this be an additional member?' would be answered. The note says, 'Will provide for an appointment of an additional member.' That is the whole purpose of this legislation, to increase the number of members on the Board of Directors from ten persons to eleven and to ensure that one of those persons will be a representative of the physically disabled in the Province. So that is the answer to that hon. gentleman's first question.

Credit for disabled persons, should perhaps go to the Hub and Mr. Vickers. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, let me be the first to congratulate Mr. Vickers, who is a constituent of the great historic district of Mount Pearl, on the job that he and his colleagues are doing on behalf of handicapped persons in this Province. I certainly concur with the hon. gentleman's remarks in that regard. But I would, however, say, Mr. Speaker, that this corporation has made great strides in the past number of years to provide housing that is suitable for the physically disabled. We do now have a considerable number of units that are designed specifically for handicapped persons. In fact, we have gone one step further and we are encouraging, for example, groups which are building homes under the co-operative housing programme, which is a federal programme, nevertheless we do provide assistance from time to time, and one of the first, if not the first - perhaps the second - co-op housing development that was undertaken in this Province, undertaken, again, in Mount Pearl, I think three of those units are bungalow units, most of them are semidetached duplex units but three of those units in fact are bungalow units which are clearly designed for handicapped persons and in fact are now owned and occupied under that programme by handicapped persons. So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, although I recognize full well the contribution made by the groups, that we have in the past been making tremendous efforts to help these

MR. WINDSOR: persons as well, and this piece of legislation is just another indication of our concern in that regard.

The hon. the gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) asked me are firms other than individuals given the same amount of latitude. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that wherever it is deemed appropriate government takes whatever action is required to recover amounts that are owed to it. But I would suspect, as I indicated earlier, that we are probably a little more lenient on these private individuals than we might be on firms who are in arrears obviously because they have no intention of paying it.

MR. WINDSOR: The hon. gentleman for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) asked me about the Accessibility Act, That was a piece of legislation that was put through this hon. House, I think a year or two years ago, which now requires all public buildings over a certain size, and residential units, apartment buildings in particular, which have greater than a certain number of units and which are greater than two stories in height, as I recall, to have accessibility; in other words, that they be designed to accommodate persons who are handicapped. I think that is a tremendous and a very far-seeing piece of legislation. I think it is of great advantage to handicapped persons in this Province and I think it is probably in fact one of the best pieces of legislation of its kind anywhere in Canada. It does not necessarily deal with present situations. It is designed primarily to deal with new construction, although in many cases government buildings, when renovations are being undertaken, are now being redesigned certainly with the Accessibility Act in mind. And, in fact, owners of private buildings are complying with the spirit of this act and are, in fact, making renovations so that their building is much more accessible to the physically handicapped.

MR. NEARY: Who is responsible for that?

MR. WINDSOR: I think that is under Consumer Affairs. It would be either Consumer Affairs or Public Works. I think it is Consumer Affairs that the Accessibility Act comes under.

DR. COLLINS: Labour and Manpower.

MR. WINDSOR: Labour and Manpower, sorry, right, my colleague is correct. It is under the Department of Labour and Manpower under the Safety Division.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks it gives me great pleasure indeed to move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Housing Corporation Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 4).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Health) Act". (Bill No. 22).

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 22.

MR. TULK: You have one hour.

MR. GOUDIE: One hour.

This is a very minor amendment and hopefully it will not take an hour that the hon. gentleman from Fogo suggests. But the act itself, the Livestock (Health) Act regulates the movement of livestock into the Province. And for the purposes of controlling the transmission of diseases, we want to redefine the word 'livestock'. Apparently it is not broad enough at this point in time to encompass dogs, cats and species of wild animals. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, here is a heavy piece of legislation now, I tell you. Here we are about twelve days before Christmas in session and what kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker, are we talking about? We are talking about a bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Health) Act". Now if we wanted to we could have a lot of fun with this bill. We could say that this bill is very descriptive of the administration. In this act they are defining 'livestock' as horses, mules, asses, swine, sheep, goats, fowls, ducks, geese, turkeys -

MR. SIMMS: Liberals.

MR. NEARY: - Tories and other useful domestic animals; and any animal of the bovine

MR. NEARY:

species, by whatever name known, and farm-bred fur-bearing animals." Mr. Speaker, a true description if I ever saw one of the administration there opposite. But we are getting into the Christmas spirit so we are not going to be unkind to hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker. We could poke a lot of fun at them if we wanted to on this bill. The only thing I want to say about it is that it is not the heaviest piece of legislation ever brought before this House. The administration there opposition for a month now have been forcing the Opposition to debate bills mostly of a housekeeping nature. They have refused to debate the horrible state of the Newfoundland and Labrador economy. They would prefer to talk about mules and asses and turkeys than they would about the Newfoundland and Labrador economy.

MR. WARREN:

It is Christmas, and turkeys.

MR. NEARY:

That is right. The only justification they can have for bringing this bill in, Mr. Speaker, at this particular point in time is that we are going to be here until Christmas anyway and we will all be able to eat our turkey knowing that it is free from disease, Mr. Speaker.

So here we are, the administration refusing debate on the incredible financial mess in this Province; instead they would prefer to talk about goats, Mr. Speaker. And when it comes to jobs for young people, they would rather talk about horses and swine than they would about creating jobs for young people in this Province. Mr. Speaker, they have refused to talk about the pain and suffering they have caused to the sick people in this Province, they refused to talk about that, but they have elected instead to talk about farm-bred fur-

MR. NEARY:

bearing animals.

They have refused to talk

about the only issue in the last election, namely an offshore agreement. Instead of talking about that and telling us when they are going to deliver on that promise, Mr. Speaker, instead of talking about that -

MR. MORGAN:

Never mind that! Get down to

work!

MR. NEARY:

- they would prefer to talk

about mules. Mules, Mr. Speaker. Mules. I can say one thing, if there is ever an administration in this world, if there is ever an administration elected in this Province that knows about mules and asses and swine and sheep and goats and ducks and turkeys, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMS:

We sure do!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

- it is most appropriate, Mr.

Speaker, it is most appropriate that this administration should be the ones to amend the Livestock Act to include all of the animals that I just mentioned. It is very appropriate indeed, Mr. Speaker, not because we are getting near Christmas, because if there was ever an administration elected in Newfoundland that is an expert on mules and asses and swine and sheep and goats and turkeys it is hon. gentlemen there opposite. They are the experts, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER:

The farmers would not agree.

MR. NEARY:

The farmers might not say it

but the people of Newfoundland would say it.

MR. TULK:

'Steve', go right through

their ranks and find one example of each.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think you could start up in the upper end of the House, work your way down towards the rail, and you will find a horse, certainly you would find one end of a horse, you would find mules and asses and swine and sheep and goats -

MR. HODDER: And turkeys.

MR. NEARY: And turkeys.

MR. HODDER: Mostly turkeys.

MR. NEARY: Mostly turkeys, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: There is no doubt about it that hon. gentlemen there opposite are the most qualified to bring in such an act. I do not know what category I would put the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) under here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Frogs.

MR. NEARY: No, we do not have frogs. I do not know what category we would put the hon. gentleman in. I would not say under bovine species, that would be being very unkind to the hon. gentleman. But they are certainly well equipped down there and they have the qualifications and they are the experts, Mr. Speaker, and if it was not getting so near Christmas, and I was not in such a charitable mood, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - I could poke all kinds of fun at hon. gentlemen there opposite over this bill.

MR. WARREN: Here is 'Haig'.

MR. NEARY: The member for Harbour Grace, what would he fit under? He would fit under not "mules", no, turkey. He would probably fit under the category of a turkey.

MR. WARREN: No, reptile.

MR. NEARY: No, we do not have reptiles here. So, Mr. Speaker, we are going to whole-heartedly support the bill. We congratulate the experts -

MR. TULK: Any skunks, 'Steve'?

MR. NEARY: - no, no skunks here. The hon. gentleman left out a few. As a matter of fact we are sort of tempted to amend this legislation to say, 'horses, mules, asses, swine, sheep, goats, fowls, ducks, geese, turkeys, and Tories.'

MR. MORGAN: And Liberals.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour may not accept the amendment. So, Mr. Speaker, I think some of

MR. NEARY: my colleagues may wish to speak on this bill which indicates the priorities of the administration. They will talk about anything under the sun. They will talk about mules and asses and turkeys, but they will not talk about the economy. They will not talk about an offshore agreement, they do not want to see or hear tell of it. They will not talk about all the pain and suffering and anguish they have caused the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, instead they want to talk about something as silly as the things that we see in this bill. But, as I said, I have to congratulate them and, Mr. Speaker, the reason I congratulate them is because there is no other administration in our whole history, no other Premier, and I believe we have had twenty-seven or twenty-eight premiers and prime ministers in this Province, no other gentleman is more qualified and more competent to introduce a bill in this House referring to mules and asses and swine and sheep and goats and turkeys as the hon. gentleman that heads up this administration.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words concerning this bill. I notice that fish or reptiles are not included in the new act. I am just wondering, only just recently a man from Sunnyside received some fruits or vegetables or something from the Southern part of the United States and in one of the containers there was a reptile. There was a reptile in one of those containers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Fisheries would just close his little trapper there for a few minutes. Mr. Speaker, I believe if the minister is going to bring in such a major bill, I think the least he should do is try to cover reptiles because I think, as this gentleman in Sunnyside found out, he discovered a very interesting object in a case of bananas a while ago and it was diagnosed as some sort of a reptile.

However, at the same time the new act will mean instead of using all the names of the different kinds of species it is going to be consolidated into two or three words meaning wild animals and birds. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know it is a bit difficult for the wild animals

MR. WARREN:

to get to the Island portion of the Province Province because it is separated by some sixty miles of water. However, I do not think those sixty miles of water would bother the birds too much. If he is going to include birds, I would suggest that probably he could confine his remarks to a number of species of birds. 'Whether captive or not' - now, maybe the minister could explain that, whether someone is going to bring it in in a cage or whether it is going to fly in. Now, if it flies in, I do not think the minister has much jurisdiction over where it lands or how it flies in.

While speaking on the Livestock Act, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the minister - I am sure the minister is aware of it, but maybe some of this colleagues are not aware of it - of the terrible regulations, the ridiculous regulations that are imposed on Labradorians in order to send even their pet dog or their pet cat out to the Island portion of the Province for examinations by veterinarians.

About a month ago, an individual from my hon. colleague's district, because there was no veterinarian service in the area, was obliged to send his dog to Gander for necessary examination by a veterinarian and for medication, and this gentleman was compelled to pay \$59.40 to send a five pound live animal from Goose Bay to Gander while, at the same time, Eastern Provincial Airways could send an animal of the same weight from Gander to Toronto for only half that cost.

MR. SIMMS: Was that EPA?

MR. WARREN: EPA, yes, and whether it was Air Canada or whomever - I do not care which airline it was - I think it is ridiculous and another discrimination that the Labrador portion of the Province has to encounter.

MR. WARREN: Furthermore, I would suggest to the minister, and I am sure he would agree, that the population of Happy Valley - Goose Bay and surrounding areas does warrant a full-time veterinary service now.

About four or five years ago there was evidence of rabies amongst the animals in Labrador and subsequently, anyone transporting his pet from Labrador to the Island was required to have the animal examined and inoculated. I would think the minister, by this time, should have an up-to-date report on the rabies situation and, if rabies are no longer in evidence, maybe it would not be necessary for Labrador residents to go to the trouble of having their pets inoculated before sending them to the Island.

MR. SIMMS: That is a good topic for Provincial Affairs on Saturday night.

MR. WARREN: Well, Mr. Speaker, speaking of Provincial Affairs, I would suggest to the hon. the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) - I learned he watched me with intense interest about two weeks ago - that he should watch the programme again this Saturday night and I will give him a good example of how this

MR. WARREN:

government has ruined the lives of Newfoundlanders. By all means, look at television again this Saturday night after the hockey game and I am sure the minister will gather that there will be a lot of common sense spoken. By the way, Mr. Speaker, I will not be on Provincial Affairs, one of my colleagues will. I just want to let the minister know.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I was distracted by the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms). Again, Mr. Speaker, as my colleague said, there is an example, Mr. Speaker, he is just acting like an ass

Mr. Speaker, in closing naturally we are going to support this bill. Let us hope that the minister when he stands up and closes the debate will try to illustrate the discriminatory action of the airlines and of this government as it pertains to Labrador people who have pets and want to bring them to the Island portion of the Province, for there are restrictions in place at the present time. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, if this livestock act is going to cover cats and dogs - as the minister says, it is going to cover cats and dogs - maybe in due course the minister could include an amendment to the bill making it mandatory for all councils in the Province, whether they are incorporated or non-incorporated - there could be local improvement districts, there are several of them in the Province - make it mandatory that every single individual council or improvement district in the Province would have a dog control act. For example,

MR. WARREN: now, at the present time, there are a lot of towns and districts in the Province that do not have any dog control acts and they are becoming a nuisance. So maybe the minister could, in due course, make it compulsory that all elected councils, communities would make it compulsory to have a dog control act, so that not only would you protect the species of cats and dogs but you would also protect the most valuable species, and that is you and me. I will support the bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. GOUDIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, under that scathing attack I am not sure whether I should try and deal with all of the points raised or not. However, I shall try. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), I think, was referring to disease-free turkey, that we could take consolation in the fact that we would be able to dine upon disease free turkey for Christmas. That really does not come under this particular act. Although I suppose I would be fair in speculating that the hon. Leader of the Opposition will probably dine on disease-free turkey this Christmas, no doubt well stuffed with Mount Scio savoury.

MR. NEARY: I was going to say I do not know if I could eat that savoury or not.

MR. GOUDIE: I would most certainly think so.

MR. NEARY: You cannot depend on that, it might be full of ground glass.

MR. GOUDIE: He also read off the definition of livestock and indicated that it referred to certain or all hon. ladies and gentlemen on this side of the House when referring to mules, asses, swine and geese

MR. GOUDIE:

and so on.

One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, for the redefining of the word 'livestock' under this particular legislation is to include a couple of particular animals which may or may not be resembled by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Just as examples, there are skunks and racoons. I just thought I would mention that.

MR. SIMMS: That is not a bad description.

MR. GOUDIE: Well, I just thought I would throw it in.

The gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) suggested that I should in some way or other ensure that town councils, be they a local improvement district, whatever the definition might be, should have a Dog Control Act. The Dog Control Act as it exists provincially comes under the responsibility of my department, and obviously it is a provincial matter. But as I understand it, subject to correction by my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook), each municipality, I believe, has the power or can be empowered to adopt their own regulations within their own town. So obviously I do not have any direct input into that. But there were a couple of other questions.

I think the gentleman from Torngat Mountains suggested I institute some kind of regulation concerning veterinarians in Labrador, or at least deal with that matter. In terms of my responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is impossible for me in that dealing with veterinarians in the Province I only have the authority to deal with veterinarians as it relates to the agricultural industry. When it comes to pets and that kind of thing, then that is a different item all together and is, I suppose, dictated by the profession itself. They set up wherever they feel they can make money and there is a veterinarian who visits occasionally Labrador. But in terms of ministerial responsibility, I have none in that regard.

In relation to rabies, the gentleman, if I understood him correctly, suggested that the regulation governing the need for certification for Labrador

MR. GOUDIE: huskies when moving them from Labrador to the Island part of the Province, or any other part of Canada, not require certification. That is all well and good if you look at that Breed of dog only. But I just need to remind the hon. gentleman, I am sure, for the need for that kind of regulation still in that three years ago there was an outbreak of rabies in wild animals in Labrador and then that disease in turn got into some domestic animals. And in concluding the debate and moving second reading, perhaps I can just tell of a very brief incident which occurred in Hopedale three years ago. I was in the community of Nain working on this problem of rabies in wild and domestic animals, and it was all brought to our attention when two Brothers in Nain skinned a wolf which had been rabied and cut themselves and they went through a rather painful twenty-one days of inoculation, etc.

DR. TWOMEY: Do you know what the treatment is for rabies?

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, exactly. But during the two or three days I was in Davis Inlet, we also had a report from Hopedale that a domestic cat there had contacted rabies and we in turn sent a message to Hopedale asking that the carcass be forwarded to Davis Inlet and we could in turn forward it to the laboratory at Sackville for analysis and see if the domestic cat indeed did have rabies. We were somewhat surprised about three hours later when we received a message from the owner of the cat which supposedly had rabies which said, 'Sorry, unable to forward cat, Shot with twelve gauge too close'.

I move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Health) Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 22).

Motion, second reading of a bill,
"An Act To Amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1973". (Bill No. 23).

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Rural,
Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This one is much more significant
than the piece of legislation that just went through and I am
sure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary] will be gratified
about that.

It deals with two matters, Mr.
Speaker, the amendments that we want to enact here and one
has to do with the appointment of members to various commodity
boards. Usually boards are comprised of

MR. GOUDIE:

both farmer and non-farmer members, depending on the board itself. Some farmer commodity organizations have made the suggestion to me, and to government through me, that rather than I as minister appointing all members to a board, that their representative, that is, the representative of a farming community or the agricultural community, if you will, be appointed to the board through election of their own peers. And one amendment would allow that to happen. I could appoint certain members and other members, although appointed by government, would be appointed after they had been recommended through an election process by their own peers in whichever commodity it is which is regulated by a given board.

And the other proposed amendment to the Natural Products Marketing Act deals with the setting up of stabilization funds. And just to explain briefly, some hon. members may be aware that the hog industry and the broiler producing industry is in a little bit of a difficult situation right now, in that the price of feed and the cost of transporting feed, etc., has gotten so high that Newfoundland Farm Products in purchasing the various products cannot justify paying the price which is needed to cover the costs of producing pork or chickens or whatever. And you, Mr. Speaker, are fully aware of that personally in your own district.

So the suggestion has been made for some time that a stabilization fund should be established whereby producers in good times can contribute into a fund which can be drawn upon during bad times to help carry them over, rather than government having to offer a direct subsidy all along the way. And without getting into great detail about

MR. GOUDIE: the make up of a stabilization fund, it is possible that the federal and provincial governments can have financial input into such a fund as well.

But these are the two amendments that we propose, Mr. Speaker, and I move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if we are going to support the bill or not. One section of it, the stabilization programme, yes, by all means we support that part of it. But before we indicate whether we are going to support it or not, I would like to ask the minister a couple of questions. Are there going to be commodity boards or commodity board, one particular board, or is there going to be a board for every commodity? If so, what we are going to have is the minister's department practically controlled by a dozen or so commodity boards. The paragraph here says, 'Constitutes commodity boards for the purpose of administering any scheme'. Now I am sure the minister using the word in the plural, 'boards', is indicating in the foreseeable future there could be several boards. Now I believe that the same number of gentlemen and ladies who are going to be appointed to one commodity board surely goodness could deal with another commodity. As far as I can see, all the minister is doing here is getting a little avenue ready maybe to use in a partisan political way to make appointments for people who are friends of his or friends of the government or something like that. We see no reason to oppose the one board section. As for the stabilization programme,

MR. WARREN: I have been having some discussions with the hon. the member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) on that I believe the unfortunate thing about the minister's department, as it pertains to the Egg Marketing Board, Farm Products Board and the Livestock Act, as it pertains generally to the agricultural section of his department, is that in some cases, like the Egg Marketing Board, two or three producers here in this Province have all the say as it pertains to egg production. Mr. Speaker, I was reading in the newspaper recently about this young fellow Williams in the Goulds who is having a heck of a time getting started, getting even moral support from the minister's department - and it is not the minister's fault, the fault is with a couple of those monopolies -

MR. HISCOCK: I do not agree with that anyway. I agree with the minister.

MR. WARREN: If the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) is against what I am saying, he will get a chance to get up and say it afterwards.

If, Mr. Speaker, an individual like, for example -

MR. MORGAN: So he is the man on the Labrador Coast.

MR. WARREN: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) can have a few words to say afterwards too, Mr. Speaker. I would like to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! Order, please!

I would just like to remind all hon. members that the hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, anyone in this Province wishes to go into egg production, sheep raising or raising cows for resale,

MR. WARREN: then I do not think there should be anything other than the ordinary inspectional requirements. Should boards controlled by two or three individual, high-powered people stop that individual from progressing? This is what is happening. This is exactly what is happening to this young fellow Williams in the Kilbride area. He wants to progress but the Egg Marketing Board has stopped him. I will not name who is on that board, Mr. Speaker, who control it on both sides, who control the number of hens that a farmer can have and at the same time these same individuals are the people who have X number of hens producing. I think it is very unfair to anyone else. If the board was made up of outsiders, if the board was made up of independent people outside of those people who own the hens, but unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it does not work that way. It is like the minister said the other day in response to a question, it is almost like a double whammy. It is a double shot. The guy who owns the hens and the guy who is on the board are the same person and that is unfortunate. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the minister, when he is setting up those Commodity Boards will take that into consideration. And the same thing with the

MR. WARREN:

stabilization programme. The stabilization programme is going to do good. It is going to help those producers who have a bad year, that is deemed under the minister's act, or under the minister's department, as being in that category. But what about the guys like Williams, and what about the many other guys who want to get ahead in this Province? However, because of the stringent regulations that the minister's department has instituted find it very difficult to progress. I believe, as was said in the editorial of The Evening Telegram a little while ago, that we need more than the minister saying he is going to look into the matter. I think, as Mr. Williams said, maybe it is time for a public enquiry and let us uncover how two or three or four or five of those egg producers are, excuse the pun, Mr. Speaker, are hogging the market and not permitting individuals throughout the Province to go forward and to progress favourably.

I believe the hon. minister will agree that instead of us in this House trying to assist guys like Williams, we are bringing more eggs than necessary into the Province from PEI and Nova Scotia. Because we have people in this Province who want to get into the area of egg farming but their hands are tied by the minister's department. For example, Mr. Speaker, and the minister can vouch for this, one of his constituents has a small egg farm there in Happy Valley-Goose Bay and he cannot meet near enough the demands of the area.

MR. NEARY: He will have to put the hens on two shifts.

MR. WARREN: He cannot meet the demands up there, Mr. Speaker - and the minister will agree with this - still and all every week, practically every time EPA flies into Goose Bay from Halifax there are eggs by the dozens.

MR. NEARY: He will have to get the hens on three shifts.

MR. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the minister let us not be too stringent. If our friend wants to have more hens, let him have as many hens as is necessary to supply an abundance of eggs to those concerned. And the same thing for Mr. Williams out in the Goulds: Why not give him permission to market his eggs through the retail stores? And, Mr. Speaker, while we are on this subject, I would like to ask the minister one other question about an incident I came across a few days ago. I went into a Dominion Supermarket and I asked for Top of the Morning sausages.

MR. MORGAN: Top of the Morning?

MR. WARREN: Yes, it is a particular kind of sausage; in fact, one of the better sausages made in the Province. And I was told by the meat producers there that they are no longer allowed to carry them on the shelves. So I was disappointed and said, "Why?" She said, "Well, they have to be inspected." So I went into the Co-op, which indirectly comes under the minister's department, and you can pick up all of the Top of the Morning sausages that you can ask for. Now, Mr. Speaker, if it is a fact that Top of the Morning sausages or any other sausages are to be inspected by inspectors in his department, or some Health inspectors or whatever the case may be, why can there not be available

MR. WARREN:

in all the stores, or is it just another example of the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing? I say to my hon. Leader I have not said whether we will support the bill or not. We will support the stabilization programme if it is beneficial to all concerned, not just to half a dozen of those high and mighty guys who are pulling all the strings on the Egg Marketing Board, the Farm Products Board and so on. As for the Commodity Board, I would think the minister is only attempting here to put a few of his friends on a few more boards within his department.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): If the hon. the minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I just want to have a few words on this Natural Products Marketing Board. The impression was left with me, after listening to the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), that all of these boards are bad or not set up for the good of the consumers and producers. He probably did not wish to leave that impression. I have had some experience since I have been elected with two boards, one is the Milk Marketing Board, which has been set up recently, and the other is the Egg Marketing Board. The Milk Marketing Board, I found after studying the issue of the milk products within our Province, was necessary to be set up because we had producers on the West Coast of the Province who could not market their product, yet we had milk being trucked into this Province, at different prices, from provinces such as Nova Scotia and PEI. I believe at the time, we were producing between 40 and 50 per cent of our milk

MR. AYLWARD: products, yet we had farmers who wish to produce more milk and they could not do it because of the competition from other provinces. A lot of the milk that was coming in here was surplus to the other provinces and was being dumped on our market. So the boards themselves, particularly in this case, are very necessary to our producers and indirectly necessary to our consumers, because if we are going to have natural products dumped on our markets here in Newfoundland, for a while the consumer might benefit with advantageous prices, but when all our own producers are put out of business, which eventually would happen, be it eggs or poultry or milk, these people who are shipping in the milk will see the advantage to them and they could charge us the price that they saw fit rather than a price which would be regulated through the competition from our own farmers.

I did have some problems recently, and they have not yet been solved, in dealing with the Egg Marketing Board. There is a young man in my district who is very anxious to become a producer in eggs, has already become a producer in eggs, but he is not meeting the requirements of the Egg Marketing Board. Now my big problem with the board at the time was finding out the information to allow this young farmer to be able to produce eggs in this Province. I could not find out how many eggs were being brought into the Province, I could not find out the quotas which exist in the Province presently, and I found this very disturbing. I understand that this Natural Products Marketing Board Act which we are bringing in - some of the board is established now - will help to allow us to get the information so that we can make an objective assessment of whether we need more producers in the Province or not. This young man Williams has a market for his product

MR. AYLWARD: right now. There is some agreement between the Newfoundland Egg Marketing people and the National Egg Marketing Board, CEDA I believe it is called. Apparently if the producers in Newfoundland are found to be producing more than their quota we could be fined up to \$1,000 a day, I do not know who is fined, I guess the local board is. But I was upset more with the idea of not being able to get the required information

MR. AYLWARD:

so that I could judge whether we need more entrants into this egg marketing system. And this young man, Williams, is quite agreeable to having an investigation made into the quota system within the Province and, if it is determined that we are not importing more eggs than we need to, he would be satisfied to comply with the regulations. He believes personally, I know and he knows also, that we are importing quite a few eggs from Nova Scotia right now. I understand from the board that we are also exporting eggs from the Province to go to breaking houses, as they are called, to produce egg-nogs and whatever else they do. I cannot understand, if we are importing eggs, why we should be exporting them. I want to know how many eggs we can supply within our own market and I would like to see our total egg production in the hands of Newfoundland producers who would be protected by a board from unfair competition by producers in other provinces so that excess produce from other provinces would not be dumped here.

So I agree with the idea of marketing boards. I think the final decision should be left with our Department of Agriculture and the minister, if necessary, so that all the power will not be given to individuals who are operating the board and producing the products at the same time.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, it has been argued that these marketing boards and agencies create a monopoly, that they are in violation of Federal Combines Act.

MR. NEARY: That has been argued, and I believe there is an element of truth in it, Mr. Speaker, but I am not going to debate that aspect of this bill at the moment.

What I am going to talk about is a matter that has been brought to my attention on a number of occasions, and that is the sale of products from Newfoundland Farm Products.

Before I come to that, I want to go back over a matter that was raised in this House a couple of weeks ago in connection with the increase in the price of pork paid to pork producers in this Province. We still do not understand how the recommendation to increase the price of pork substantially in this Province got past the board that deals with the price of pork, how it got past Newfoundland Farm Products, how it got across the minister's desk without being detected, how it got into the Newfoundland Gazette without being spotted. It went through five or six different procedures before it was discovered that the increase that was being recommended was completely out of line. I believe the minister told us in the House that the price of pork is governed pretty well by the price of pork in Ontario and I believe the recommended increase was-what?-twenty cents a pound.

AN HON. MEMBER: Newfoundland Farm Products pays (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes.
And, Mr. Speaker, this went through five or six different channels, different procedures, was not spotted by anybody, was gazetted, became the law of the Province and then suddenly - I do not know if it was the Cabinet that had to reverse the decision - but suddenly the whole thing had to be wiped out. And, you know, I still

December 12, 1983

Tape 3924

EC - 3

MR. NEARY: fail to see how that could
happen. The minister obviously had to put his signature
on it . It did not go straight from

MR. NEARY:

the people who set up the price of pork, they did not sent it directly to The Newfoundland Gazette.

MR. CARTER:

Probably it was done by a Liberal.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about pork and pigs, the hon. gentleman comes to mind every time. But I would like to have an explanation as to how this happened because I cannot see for a moment the Hog Marketing - is it the Hog Marketing Board? Is that what it is called? - making a decision on their own -

MR. MORGAN:

You are hogging the time.

MR. NEARY:

- and then sending their recommendation to Newfoundland Farm Products to - is it Mr. Jackman? No, he is the Marketing Board, it had to go to Mr. Jackman and then it had to go to Farm Products, now Mr. O'Reilly, before that some other gentleman, then it had to go to the bureaucrats in the minister's office, then it had to come across the minister's desk.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And that is where it stopped.

MR. NEARY:

No, it did not stop, because it ended up in The Newfoundland Gazette, It did not stop there, that is the trouble. It was published in The Newfoundland Gazette and became the law of the land. And within a matter of days, in a matter of hours, there was chaos in the industry and the recommended increase had to be withdrawn. We would like to have an explanation for that, Mr. Speaker, we would like to find out how that happened.

Now the matter I want to raise is a matter of chicken, the sale of Newfoundland Farm Product's chicken to the big supermarket chains in this Province. I am told, Mr. Speaker, and I want the minister to listen to what I am going to say, that the sale of chicken to the

MR. NEARY: supermarket chains in this Province is the biggest rip-off in this Province today. The chicken are sold to the large mainland supermarket chains in this Province at a ridiculously low price. The chicken are sold to the mainland supermarket chains here in this Province for a ridiculously low price. As a matter of fact, the chicken are sold to supermarket chains below what it costs Newfoundland Farm Products to process them.

MR. SIMMS: Why are they doing that?

MR. NEARY: Well, this is the question: Why would they do it? I do not know. Because what I am saying in actual fact is that the taxpayers are subsidizing poultry that is sold to the big supermarket chains who make a tremendous profit off of it. The mark up, I am told, is astronomical on chicken.

MR. SIMMS: It cannot be.

MR. NEARY: It is. It can be and it is.

Mr. Speaker, here we have a product processed by Newfoundland Farm Products, heavily subsidized by the taxpayers, sold to the large mainland supermarket chains for ridiculously low prices and they end up - Sobeys and Dominion stores - making huge profits. Mr. Speaker, does Your Honour think that is good enough?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I am sure if Your Honour could give me an answer he would say, no, it is not good enough. But it is happening and it should be looked into. Mr. Speaker, I have the facts and figures - I did not know this bill was coming up today - I have the facts and figures to back it up. I was given the facts and figures by people who are knowledgeable in that industry who showed me the price that Newfoundland Farm Products pay for the poultry, how much it costs them to

MR. NEARY: process it, what they sell it to supermarkets for and the mark up in the supermarkets.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): A point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: We have what amounts to a very serious charge from the most irresponsible member of this House and he is naming the names of various companies but he is not willing to back it up with arithmetic. Let him name the prices and the actual mark up if he is so sure of his facts.

MR. NEARY: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order, that is a pile of boloney.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is six times this afternoon that the hon. gentleman got up and broke the rules of the House, the aristocrat,

MR. NEARY: the snob from Nagle's Hill, broke the rules now six times in this House today. And I believe it is time to crack the whip, Mr. Speaker, against the hon. gentleman. If he keeps breaking the rules and taking the House on his back he should be named.

But I believe, Mr. Speaker, getting back to this bill, I think it is high time that the minister and the administration took a good hard look at the way these products are being handled, especially the poultry, the chicken. Mr. Speaker, I am told the markup in our supermarkets is anywhere from 300 to 700 per cent markup on the chicken that comes from Newfoundland Farm Products. It would not be very much trouble for the hon. gentleman to trace that back through the system and find out if there is any validity to it, if there is any truth to it, any foundation. And if there is, Mr. Speaker, take the necessary steps to remedy the situation. We are pumping an awful lot of money into Newfoundland Farm Products. We are subsidizing that operation down there to the tune of - what? - \$3 million or \$4 million a year?

MR. GOUDIE: Two million dollars a year.

MR. NEARY: Two million dollars a year, over two million a year.

MR. STAGG: The government are subsidizing that and are subsidizing the farmers.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what we are doing, we are not subsidizing the farmers, we are subsidizing Sobey's and Dominion Stores and that is the point.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, we are selling it to them at a loss.

MR. NEARY: We are selling at a loss, a ridiculously low price. We are subsidizing the moneybags from Ontario and from the Mainland.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do you have the figures with you?

MR. NEARY:

No, I do not have them with me.

That is what we are doing, Mr. Speaker. We are protecting - the hon. gentleman if he wants to talk about the principle of these agencies and so forth- egg farmers and the poultry farmers and the hog breeders, we are protecting them, but the price we are paying is a pretty high one for protecting a handful of producers in this Province. I am not saying that we should not do it, but it is a pretty high price we are paying.

MR. STAGG:

What are you saying?

MR. NEARY:

What I am saying is that we should not be subsidizing Sobey's and Dominion Stores with these products. They are the ones who are benefitting by it and it is high time to put it to a stop, Mr. Speaker. I use the example of chicken because that is the one that was documented for me. And I believe if the hon. gentleman will check it out, Mr. Speaker, he will find that what I am saying is true.

MR. CARTER:

Table the information.

MR. SIMMS:

That is sensible stuff for a change.

MR. NEARY:

Pardon?

MR. SIMMS:

That is sensible stuff.
for a change.

MR. MORGAN:

Yes, very , very sensible.

MR. NEARY:

Of course it is, and it is something that should be looked into. I am not talking about savoury, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is quite capable of maketing his own product and what he cannot market he gives away. He must have had an excellent year because we ended up this year with a huge bag of savoury with a big piece of red ribbon tied around it.

MR. ROBERTS: Have you had it tested for broken glass?

MR. NEARY: I have not had mine tested, as my hon. colleague reminds me, I have not had mine tested for ground glass. It is very difficult to detect ground glass in savoury. But I do appreciate the hon. gentleman's gesture, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman has been associating with turkey so often he even knows how to stuff it.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am dead serious about this matter. And I hope that the minister will undertake to have a very thorough examination and investigation made into the matter that I just raised, because I think that if he does he is going to get an awful shock.

MR. SIMMS: Not a royal commission.

MR. NEARY: No, not a royal commission, you do not need a royal commission to trace it back through the system and find out what is happening regarding the price.

MR. ROBERTS: They cannot afford any more royal commissions.

MR. NEARY: No. My hon. colleague got me motivated and then when I heard the member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) over there up talking, then I hesitated because I do not have the facts here with me, they are down in my office, in my files there somewhere. I did not know the bill was coming up today, if I did I tell you that I would put some facts and figures on the table that would knock the eyeballs of the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) out.

MR. SIMMS: You could table it tomorrow.

MR. NEARY: No, I will not. I will leave it to the minister. And the minister is quite able, quite capable of checking it out to see if there is any foundation to it.

December 12, 1983

Tape No. 3926

PK - 4

MR. SIMMS:
tomorrow morning, 'Joe'.

Let us know the first thing

MR. NEARY:
bit too quick.

No, maybe that will be a little

MR. WARREN:
Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) say? Did he have anything to say about
the Egg Marketing Board?

What did the hon. member for

MR. NEARY:
member for Kilbride did say something about the

Yes, the hon. gentleman, the

MR. NEARY: Egg Marketing Board and made some very valid points, by the way. I was listening very carefully to what the hon. gentleman said, He was on the same trend that my hon. colleague was on here about people wanting to expand, wanting to get into the industry and were being barred and blocked -

MR. WARREN: By a couple of individuals.

MR. NEARY: - by a couple of individuals, and yet we are importing these products into this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say on the bill. I look forward to hearing what the hon. the minister has to say on the points that have been raised, which I think are very valid points indeed.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): If the hon. the minister speaks now, he will close the debate.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GOUDIE: I want to thank all three hon. speakers for their comments, including you, Mr. Speaker, and your very positive comments towards -

MR. ROBERTS: That will not get you anywhere, he is in the Chair now.

MR. GOUDIE: - certain things and your concerns about others. Perhaps I can try and deal with some of the comments of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) first before I deal comments by the gentleman representing Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). We should, I suppose, one of these days have a full scale debate on the agricultural industry. It would certainly do me good to hear comments.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition was very concerned about the increase in the price of pork, and we all are, I have to say that. The incident to which he

MR. GOUDIE: refers regarding a price recommended by the Hog Marketing Board, and the following exchange between the Natural Products Marketing Board and Newfoundland Farm Products I will explain as quickly as I can. The price that Newfoundland Farm Products pays for pork is based on a Toronto price, not an Ontario price, which at the time was fifty-eight cents on the Toronto market and then two cents added on to help cover the cost of freight.

MR. ROBERTS: So it is not based on Newfoundland costs or on Farm Products cost?

MR. GOUDIE: That is correct. It is based on the Toronto price, which was fifty-eight cents, plus two cents a pound to try and offset -

MR. ROBERTS: It is not based on the actual cost of hogs here, is it?

MR. GOUDIE: No, that was the problem. The Hog Marketing Board, as they do now have the authority to recommend prices, what they were doing was recommending eighty cents a pound I believe, or 80-point something a pound, which would cover their cost of production. Now Farm Products, being a business, felt it could only pay the sixty cents a pound, did not agree with the recommended eighty cents a pound and the conflict then began. However, the matter is being dealt with, right now as a matter of fact, and I should point out that one of the reasons that the cost of pork is eighty cents a pound today, or it was two or three weeks ago, is determined not only by the cost of production here in this Province, but it also relates to the production of food in North America. One of the problems we have is that the hog and broiler industries are very cyclic, you talk about rabbits being cyclic in their abilities to reproduce, they have nothing on hogs and broilers when it gets right down to the crunch. The President of the United States paid feed

December 12, 1983

Tape No. 3927

MJ - 3

MR. GOUDIE: growers in the United States not to produce feed, they have an oversupply, at the same time there was an oversupply on the market of hogs and broilers, and that carries right on down the line so we end up in a situation where you have more product available to the market and very little feed becoming available, so the price of feed has gone up and the price of the produce is going down because there is so much available and that

MR. GOUDIE: was another factor involved in this as well. However, government did agree to provide a \$600,000 subsidy, if you will, or assistance programme to the hog producers to try and get them through, the twenty-two of them I believe, through this difficult period of time -

MR. ROBERTS: \$600,000?

MR. GOUDIE: \$600,000 as a short term interim measure to try and deal with this problem, and the proposed amendment dealing with a stabilization fund relates to the other part. There are five provinces in Canada already who have agreed to a red meat marketing plan, possibly other provinces will agree with that, and if they do there is then the possibility of setting up a stabilization fund or programme whereby the federal government, the provincial governments and the producers themselves would have financial input into this fund during the higher points in the cycle of the industry upon which the producers can draw at the lower point in that whole cycle. So these two items are both related.

Now regarding the ridiculously low prices -

MR. NEARY: How did it get into the Newfoundland Gazette?

MR. GOUDIE: Oh, sorry. Right.

By the way, I think the hon. gentleman used the word "investigate" or "investigation" or something to that effect. Certainly the matter should be looked into, I believe was his recommendation, and I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that the suggestion is well made in that that looking into began about three weeks ago. And we are also looking at

MR. GOUDIE:

marketing boards generally, how they work, how effective they are, what effect they have upon the market, the prices, etc., it is all being reviewed right now and hopefully before too much longer, early in the New Year, we will have some firm recommendations upon which we can act. How it got into the Gazette was simply a matter of someone, I cannot use the term "fooling up" let me put it that way, I will not use the other one, but when it did finally get to my desk, Mr. Speaker, it was stopped there and it is being dealt with now.

Regarding 'ridiculously low prices,' I think was the term that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) used in relation to the price of the chickens being sold for to the chain stores and the market is high, all I can suggest to the hon. gentleman is that we are not self sufficient in chickens or hogs or whatever the product might be, As a result there is a great deal of importing of certain produce, and as a result of that a great deal of dumping, especially when the conditions that I just mentioned, the supply of feed and the prices being paid, etc., etc., is all involved, so some of the produce which the gentleman might see on the shelf may not be from this Province. I only point that out.

MR. NEARY: I am talking about stuff from this Province.

MR. GOUDIE: Okay. Fine. Well, if that is the case, then that is something that I can obviously look into and will look into, but in relation to the produce from Newfoundland Farm Products, we, down in that particular corporation, are wholesalers, we are also the processors of pork and broilers that go onto the market.

MR. WARREN: What about retailing?

MR. GOUDIE: Well, we have considered that but we have not really addressed it in any great depth yet. It is difficult enough now dealing with the processing and the wholesaling, never mind the retailing as well.

AN HON. MEMBER: That will be done automatically.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, exactly. So the concerns put forth by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) I think were all valid concerns and they are being addressed right now and have been for some period of time. The question raised by the gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) relating to how many boards are we talking about here - or how many boards, I think he said, may be established somewhere down the road - he was concerned that we could end up with a dozen or so and so would I. I can only tell the gentleman that.

MR. GOUDIE: The only boards we are concerned about now when we talk about membership and people in the hog industry electing three of their own representatives to sit on that board, we are only dealing with the boards that are in existence now, not about any future boards. I do not foresee any future marketing boards under the agricultural industry, at least, being established at all. We have enough now and the only thing we are concerned about and the members on the board are concerned about is whether or not they would have the right to recommend certain members from their group to sit on the board rather than all being appointed by the minister, which would automatically do away with the concern of the hon. gentleman of my appointing only my friends or political friends or whatever. If they are elected by people from the industry, then obviously I have no control over it and that fear is already taken care of by this proposed amendment.

The gentleman representing Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) I think adequately covered the situation as it dealt with a Mr. Williams in Kilbride. The only comment I would want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that that particular gentleman was producing only brown eggs and what other comment can I make other than the one that Rosemary made in her campaign, 'Brown is Beautiful'.

Top of the Morning sausages, I am not familiar with them, Mr. Speaker, not familiar at all. I am sorry, I like sausages for breakfast myself but I do not know this particular brand. I do not know if it has to be inspected. I do not know where it comes from. I do not know, you know, if it is something that is produced - I am not familiar with Newfoundland Farm Products putting out a product called Top of the Morning. They may very well. If they do, then I am not aware of it. But all I can do is suggest to the hon. gentleman that I will have the matter

MR. GOUDIE: looked into. If it has to deal with inspections, this is the only Province in Canada which has a disease-free pork which goes on the market. That, I suppose, speaks for itself in that the meat coming out of Farm Products is fairly pure and certainly well accepted and of a good quality. But the Top of the Morning sausages, Mr. Speaker, I am just going to have to check into, I cannot say any more than that right now. I think I dealt with all of the questions raised and I move second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

ON Motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1973", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 23].

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Public Service Commission Act, 1973". (Bill No. 21].

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move this bill for second reading on behalf of the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young]. It is a simple amendment to the Newfoundland Public Service Commission Act. Under the act, at least one member of the commission, it is provided, must have served in the public service for at least ten years. What the amendment does is very simply say that the period of service as a member of the commission counts as service in the public service. Now the reason for this is that there may be, from time to time, employees in the Public Service Commission itself, or in any other commission of government, who may be qualified to accept the appointment as commissioner in the public service. I hasten to add there are no vacancies now and there are

MR. MARSHALL:

no appointments contemplated, so they want to be able to provide that there could be a succession from within the public service, as appointed from within the Public Service Commission.

The other amendment is one that is not of major import. Apparently, the Commission annually evaluates delegated authority, and presently they must evaluate delegations quarterly. It just provides, instead of quarterly, annually.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I tried to pay attention to what the hon. gentleman was attempting to say when he introduced this bill on behalf of his colleague, the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), who, incidentally, is right out in the back there. He should have been in to introduce his own bill and defend it. Mr. Speaker, they lack confidence in the hon. gentleman. They have no confidence in him.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman has gone out to his district.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman was just over there. I just saw him outside in the corridor.

MR. SIMMS:

I will go in and check.

MR. NEARY:

Well, just see if he is there. Maybe he just skipped out and went down in the private elevator and I did not see him. But, Mr. Speaker, he should be here to introduce his own bill and defend his own bill so that we could ask some questions of the hon. gentleman. But no, he runs out of the House. Every time something comes up concerning that department, the hon. minister runs

MR. NEARY: away! He cannot face the music, cannot face the House!

MR. CARTER: Who are you talking about?

MR. NEARY: He is good at sniping across the House, Mr. Speaker, but is not good at standing on his feet in this House and defending his department and the legislation and the bills that are brought before this House. And, therefore, he has to rely on the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to get up and introduce a bill that he does not know the slightest thing about. I listened to what the hon. gentleman had to say and paid attention. I said, 'Now, let me see.' I said, 'I read it and I do not understand what is behind it.'

MR. SIMMS: You saw that about everything, Sir.

MR. NEARY: I do not understand what is behind it. I read it carefully.

MR. SIMMS: You do not? The House Leader does.

MR. NEARY: The House Leader does?

MR. SIMMS: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Well, he certainly did not make it clear to me and to my colleagues what is behind this. He merely got up and said, 'It is a simple amendment' - made it look like it was just a piece of housekeeping business, very simple, nothing to it, hardly worth wasting the time of the House to talk about, very casual and non-chalant about it, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Like the Livestock bill.

MR. NEARY: Well, no, it is a little more important than the Livestock bill. So when he took his seat we were just as wise as when he started, Mr. Speaker. And I still do not know what is behind it, why the legislation had to be -

MR. WARREN: We have another twenty bills here too.

MR. NEARY: Yes, we have another twenty bills. Well, we have plenty of time, Mr. Speaker. We have plenty of time. We know now we are going to have disease-free turkeys, we have the savoury delivered to us, we have the savoury to go with them, so we are all set for Christmas; we do not have to worry about our turkeys.

MR. WARREN: No problem now.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, we will be here until about Christmas Eve.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are an awful lot of questions that we want to ask about the Public Service Commission. The hon. gentleman can start out by telling us who the present members of the Public Service Commission are, tell us how long they have been on the board, tell us if they are appointed for life - are they appointed for life or are they just appointed at the pleasure of the ministry? - and tell us how effective they are.

And, Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting also to hear the hon. gentleman tell us how many positions have .

MR. NEARY:

been created outside the public service in the past year?

MR. SIMMS:

Several thousand.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, the hon. gentleman is right because when it comes to political appointments and political patronage, Mr. Speaker, I tell you this that former administrations could certainly learn a lot from the present administration.

MR. MORGAN: They provided a book on the way you handled it.

MR. TULK:

Nobody can fool it up like the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). He messed it up.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, they found a new technique now for getting around the public service and the new technique is to put people on contract.

MR. SIMMS:

That has always been done.

MR. MORGAN:

That is quite legal.

MR. NEARY:

Oh, that is the idea.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

It may be legal, Mr. Speaker, but it is immoral and it is obscene the way that the administration are abusing that privilege. And the Minister of Fisheries, of course, is an expert on that as we saw from the Auditor General's report there a couple of years ago.

MR. TULK:

The Ombudsman's.

MR. NEARY:

The Ombudsman rather. Mr. Speaker, the first time I suppose in Canadian history that the Ombudsman had to make a special report, not in his annual report to this House, had to write a special report to this House on something that the Minister of Fisheries had done, on how the Minister of Fisheries had violated the Public Service Commission Act.

MR. SIMMS:

It is not the first time. Ombudsman frequently do that.

December 12, 1983

Tape 3931

PK - 2

MR. MORGAN: It was done on the advice of his buddy, Walter Carter. They were buddy-buddy, Ambrose Peddle and Walter Carter out to get Morgan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: He was wrong.

MR. WARREN: He was right, but you fellows wanted to say it was wrong.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I suppose I am the only member of the House - now there may be others - but I say this, that I am probably one of the few, I am probably the only one who makes an annual visit to the Ombudsman. I have made my annual visit this year about three weeks ago. We only have two servants of

this House, there is the Provincial Ombudsman and there is the Auditor General, and I make it a point once or twice a year to call on both gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): It is noted that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has adjourned the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising to adjourn until tomorrow Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M.

On motion that the House do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M.

Index

Answers to Questions

Tabled

12 December 1983

*of Municipal Affairs
Dec. 12th, 1983.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY - WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1983

QUESTION NO. 158

MR. HISCOCK (Eagle River) ---to ask the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

QUESTION:

A list of all water and sewer contracts tendered to date for the 1983-84 fiscal year.

ANSWER:

See Attached Schedule.

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

Community	Project Description	Tendered	Contract Amount	Contractor	Award
Appleton	Water/Sewer	Tendered	313,995.00	H. Wareham & Sons	Awarded
Badger's Quay	Sewer, Phase V	Tendered	280,000.00	Town Forces	Awarded
		Tendered	19,416.48	Atlantic Concrete	Awarded
		Tendered	40,885.15	Waterworks	Awarded
		Tendered	50,000.00	Town Forces	Awarded
Bale Verte	Phase I, Water Supply	Tendered	62,600.00	Penny Paving	Awarded
Bay de Verde	Water & Sewer, Ph. IV	Tendered	246,814.00	Saunders & Howell	Awarded
Bay Roberts	Water & Sewer	Tendered	A. 57,590.26	Westburne Ltd.	Awarded
		Tendered	B. 13,947.36	Atlantic Concrete	Awarded
		Tendered	C. 26,258.73	Flygt	Awarded
		Tendered	20,000.00	BAE Group	

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

Community	Project Description	Tendered	Contract Amount	Contractor	Award
Bayview	Water & Sewer	Tendered	30,072.12	Waterworks	Awarded
Belleoram	Water System, Ph. II		35,000.00 22,000.00	Town Forces Extension	Awarded
Birchy Bay	Water & Sewer, Ph. I	Tendered	194,264.00	Southern Constr.	Awarded
Bonavista	Water & Sewer	Tendered	A. 15,294.72 B. 7,276.42 C. 15,705.88	Canron Inc. Crane Supply Westburne	Awarded
		Tendered	159,056.00 10,000.00	M & M Eng. Extension	Awarded Awarded
Botwood	Sewer	Tendered	258,343.00	Penny Underground	Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
Brigus	Water & Sewer, Ph. IV	Tendered	47,525.00 237,815.00	A & J Ent. Penny Underground	Awarded Awarded
Burin	Water & Sewer	Tendered	11,587.00 4,917.74 15,083.29	Canron Waterworks Heap Noseworthy	Awarded
Burnt Islands	Water & Sewer, Ph. II	Tendered	69,900.00 80,000.00	Penney Paving Ltd. Penny Ext.	Awarded Awarded
Buchans	Water		50,000.00	Town Forces	
Burlington	Water Line Replacement	Tendered	18,625.00 3,594 + S.S.A.	Trico Ltd. Main Plumbing	Awarded Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
Campbellton	Water & Partial Sewer	Tendered	144,700.00 6,000.00	Jalcon Study	Awarded
Carbonear	Water & Sewer		54,378.55		
Carmanville	Water System				
Carmanville	Water System				
Cartwright	Water & Sewer, Ph. III	Tendered	1,161,658.00	Hewlett	Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
Catalina	Sewer	Tendered	13,309.61 53,381.15 30,953.00 70,000.00 9,500.00	Westburne Flygt Leshaw Town Forces Equip. Rental	Awarded
Centerville	Water Supply Pumphouse		12,500.00		
Channel-Port Aux Basques	Water System	Tendered	53,338.30 20,586.00	CWC Ent. Nortec SGS	Awarded
Clareville	Dam	Tendered	133,000.00	Avalon Const.	Awarded
Comfort Cove- Newstead	Water & Sewer	Tendered	449,282.00	P.A.B. Ltd.	Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
Conception Bay South	Water & Sewer	Tendered	2,295,934.00	Suburban	Awarded
Corner Brook	Dam	"	200,000.00	Avalon	
Corner Brook	Water & Sewer				
Cottlesville	Water, Phase II	Tendered	248,350.00	Penny Underground	Awarded
Cow Head	Water Supply				

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
Durrell	Completion of Phase I W/S		66,155.00	H. Cooper Extension	Awarded
Durrell	W/S Phase II	Tendered	259,881.50	Harry Cooper Co. Ltd.	Awarded
Durrell	Water Supply	Tendered	215,990.00	Penney Underground	Awarded
Frenchman's Cove	Water Supply Improvements				
Freshwater	Water & Sewer	Tendered	11,616.64	Canron	Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

Community	Project Description	Tendered	Contract Amount	Contractor	Award
Gambo	W & S, Contract 5	Tendered Tendered	\$ 534,539.35 101,840.00	Avalon Construction Hynes Construction (Extension)	Awarded Awarded
Gaskiers-Point La Haye 2A	Water 530-83	Tendered	27,990.00 47,671.39	Dinn & Kendell Water Works	Awarded Awarded
Gaultois	Industrial Fresh Water System Repairs	Tendered	16,390.00	K. Hackett Painting & Decorating	Awarded
Gillams I	Well System 495-83		4,339.86	Town Forces	
Glenwood	Pumphouse	Tendered	6,594.00	A & J Electrical	Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

Community	Project Description	Tendered	Contract Amount	Contractor	Award
Glovertown	Temporary Water Supply		\$ 30,000	Town Forces	Awarded
Goulds 2A	Water & Sewer, Phase V 531-83	Tendered	1,687,315	Eco Zone	Awarded
Grand Bank	Replace W/S re bridge	Tendered	89,780	A & J Enterprises	Awarded
Greenspond	Water Treatment		40,000 3,000	Town Forces Cecon Study	Awarded Awarded
Greenspond	Water Temporary Shamblers Cove		41,675.61 3,250.20	Westbourne Limited Flygt	Awarded Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
Happy Adventure 2A	Water & Sewer, Phase III 532-83	Tendered	\$ 332,893	Torngat Construction	Awarded
Heart's Delight- Islington, 2A	Water & Sewer, 533-83	Tendered	24,800	(Extension)	Awarded
			51,509.59	Heap Noseworthy	Awarded
		Tendered	76,000.00	Town Forces	Awarded
		Tendered	54,000.00	James Reid & Sons	Awarded
Heart's Delight- Islington, I	Water & Sewer, 496-83		25,000.00		
Hermitage/Sandyville	Water & Sewer System Ext., Phase 3	Tendered	145,983.00	Cadillac	Awarded
			28,000.00	(Extension)	Awarded
			- 2,000.00	Change Order	
Holyrood, 1A	Water, 534-83				

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
Hopedale	Phase 1, Design				
Irishtown, 3A	Water & Sewer, Phase I 574-83	Tendered	\$244,910.00	Lundrigan Group	Awarded
King's Point	Water & Sewer		40,500.00	Extension, Midland Construction	Awarded
Lawn, 2A	Sewer System, 535-83	Tendered	175,725.00 18,063.37 - 2,404.86	Town Forces Westburne Heap Noseworthy	Awarded
L'Anse au Clair	Water & Sewer, Phase 2	Tendered	649,841.00	Pinsent Construction	Awarded
	Phase 3	Tendered	149,370.00	Bonne Bay Contractors	Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
L'Anse au Loup	Water & Sewer, Phase 2	Tendered	766,500.00 230,000.00	Rosedale Phase I complete	Awarded
LaScie	Water & Sewer	Tendered	57,240.70	Heap Noseworthy	
Leading Tickles, 2A	Water & Partial Sewer, Phase IV, 536-83		86,162.00 22,706.00	Extension Extension Penny	Awarded Awarded
Lewin's Cove, I	Water & Sewer, 597-83		10,000.00	Repay Loan	
Little Bay	2" Waterline		2,474.27	Main Plumbing	Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
Little Bay Islands, 2A	Water & Sewer, Phase III 537-83	Tendered	514,725.00	Hewlett Services	Awarded
Little Catalina, 2A	Water & Sewer, Ph. IV, 538-83	Tendered	171,039.00	Jalcon	Awarded
Lushes Bight-Beaumont	Water & Sewer	Tendered	172,757.00	Pinsent Construction	Awarded
Main Brook, 2A	Water & Sewer, 539-83	Tendered	234,950.00	B & L Consultants	Awarded
Main Brook, I	Water & Sewer, 598-83	Tendered	15,000.00	Town Forces	Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

Community	Project Description	Tendered	Contract Amount	Contractor	Award
Mary's Harbour	Water & Sewer, Phase I				
Marystown, 2A	Water & Sewer, 540-83	Tendered	289,870.00	A & J Enterprises	Awarded
Marysvale	Water System	Tendered	2,323.44	Main Plumbing & Heating	Awarded
		Tendered	10,250.00	R. Conway & Sons Ltd.	Awarded
		Tendered	2,950.00	R. Conway & Sons Ltd.	Awarded
Middle Arm, 3A	Water & Sewer, Phase I 571-83	Tendered	28,905.21 29,132.14 140,000.00	Flygt Heap Noseworthy Town Forces	
Ming's Bight, 2A	Water & Sewer, 542-83	Tendered	68,535.00	Barkers Construction	Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
Nain	Phase 3, Design		\$100,000.00	Bae Group	
Nipper's Harbour	Sewer, Phase 2	Tendered	383,220.00	Wells & Park	
North West River, 2A	Water & Sewer, Ph. VI 543-83	Tendered	313,767.00	Headland Construction	Awarded
Pacquet, 2A	Water & Sewer, Phase III 544-83	Tendered	13,200.00 196,400.00	Town Forces Bay Developers	Awarded Awarded
Paradise	Water & Sewer	Tendered	168,533.45	Sun Construction	Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
Parsons Pond	Water	Tendered	\$ 24,868.70	Westburne extension Town Forces.	Awarded
			9,667.32		Awarded
			55,000.00		
Petty Harbour-Maddox Cove, 2B	Water & Sewer #9 579-83				
Placentia, 2A	Sewer, 546-83	Tendered	78,000.00	Ed Collins Construction	Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
Plate Cove East	Water, Phase III	Tendered	144,030.00	Penny Underground	Awarded
Point Leamington	Water & Sewer	Tendered	142,600.00	Penny Underground	Awarded
Pool's Cove	Water System	Tendered	24,124.00	Dawes Mechanical	Awarded
Port Aux Choix	Water System	Tendered	36,535.00	Pius Sullivan	Awarded
Port Kirwin	Water System	Tendered	61,220.00	Boat Construction	Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

Community	Project Description	Tendered	Contract Amount	Contractor	Award
Portugal Cove	Water & Sewer, Ph. III	Tendered	822,312.00	Viking Corp.	Awarded
Pouch Cove	Water & Sewer	Tendered	246,410.00	Const. Manag.	Awarded
		Tendered	118,310	Const. Manag.	Awarded
Red Bay	Water & Sewer				
Red Harbour	Lift Station				
Reidville	Water Supply				

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

Community	Project Description	Tendered	Contract Amount	Contractor	Award
Rigolet	Water Supply				
St. Bernard's	Water System, Ph. I (Domestic)	Tendered	58,811.00 Extended to 80,000.00	Max Osbourne	Awarded
St. George's	Water & Sewer			Town Forces	Awarded
St. John's	Regional System	Tendered Tendered Tendered	2,903,240.00 47,099.70 1,209,796.00	Suburban Sun Const. Viking Corp.	Awarded Awarded Awarded
St. Paul's	Water		30,000.00		

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
Sandy Cove	Water	Tendered	41,700.00	Cross Roads Const. Ltd.	Awarded
Spaniard's Bay	Water & Sewer		40,022.00	Tors Cove	Awarded
Spaniard's Bay	W/S re CCDF	Tendered	13,343.75 10,787.08 <u>6,022.86</u> 30,353.69	Heap Noseworthy Heap Noseworthy Main Plumbing	Awarded
Summerford	Water & Sewer, Ph. III	Tendered	344,577.00	Awarded	
Tickle Cove	Installation of Watermain	Tendered	15,970.00	Fennell Co. Ltd.	Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
Torbay	Water & Sewer	Tendered	208,596.19	Clarkes Trucking & Excavating	Awarded
Torbay	Sewer Outfall	Tendered	306,800.00	Avalon	Awarded
Trinity, B.B.	Water & Sewer, Ph. VII	Tendered	269,662.00	Babb	Awarded
Triton	Water & Sewer, Ph. VI	Tendered	345,000.00	Rosedale Constr.	Awarded
Twillingate	Water Supply	Tendered			Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

Community	Project Description	Tendered	Contract Amount	Contractor	Award
Twillingate	Water	Tendered	Alt. A 24,950.00	Central Constr. & Decorating Ltd.	Awarded
			Alt. B 24,150.00		
Twillingate	Water & Sewer		141,288.25	H. Cooper Extension to (1982)	Awarded
Upper Island Cove	Water & Sewer	Tendered	409,019.00	Time Constr.	Awarded
Victoria	Water & Sewer	Tendered	207,245.00	Saunders & Howell	Awarded
Wabush	Storm Sewer	Tendered	84,900.00	G.P. Construction	Awarded

CONTRACTS AWARDED AND/OR TENDERED ON IN 1983/84 FISCAL YEAR

<u>Community</u>	<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Tendered</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Award</u>
------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	------------------------	-------------------	--------------

West St. Modeste	Water				
------------------	-------	--	--	--	--

Woody Point	Water				
-------------	-------	--	--	--	--