



Province of Newfoundland

THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XXXIX

Third Session

Number 64

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable James Russell

Tuesday

11 December 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.
Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I have received from Kruger Incorporated today a piece of correspondence addressed to me.

'Dear Mr. Premier: You have asked whether Kruger Incorporated would be prepared to complete its acquisition of the shares of Bowater Newfoundland Limited prior to the enactment of Bill 37.

'Our corporate decision to purchase Bowater Newfoundland Limited was based on the assumption that any significant labour standards liabilities will not become liabilities of this company. Given that the viability of our plan could be seriously jeopardized, Kruger Incorporated cannot proceed with the acquisition of the mill until Bill 37 has been enacted.

'Without such certainty, Kruger Incorporated will be forced to reconsider its present commitment. As you know, this is a major undertaking by Kruger to Newfoundland. We wish to proceed to make the Corner Brook operation competitive in the industry, which will provide job security for the people of Corner Brook and of Western Newfoundland, but no company can be expected to commit itself under such a cloud of uncertainty given that millions of dollars to be invested are at

stake for our company.

'I trust that this position is not one that you find unreasonable, and you surely realize that time is of the essence in order to finalize the acquisition.'

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, the Premier was kind enough to deliver a copy of this letter to me a short while ago and I just had the opportunity of reading it. It was of interest for us to note that in the first paragraph of the Kruger letter it was mentioned that it was the Premier who asked whether Kruger would be prepared to complete its acquisition of the shares of Bowater Newfoundland Limited prior to the enactment of Bill 37.

The Premier went to Kruger and asked for their assistance, Mr. Speaker. Now the Premier asked in forwarding this letter to us whether we would be prepared to have Bill 37, and the Kruger Bill complete passage today. I have a reply being typed now but I can summarize it for the Premier. While Kruger indicates that its concern is that significant labour standards liabilities not become liabilities of Kruger, we point out that this can be assured by government providing the necessary guarantee to Kruger that in the event claims are made and upheld by the courts, government will assume the liability and relieve Kruger from any obligation. It should be noted here it is still uncertain whether the courts will agree with the Labour Standards

Tribunal in its interpretation of the Labour Standards Act. It is also uncertain whether the employees of Kruger will pursue any claim.

Now we understand Kruger's concerns that it not be put in the position of assuming an indeterminate liability, but we believe that any legislative action to assist Kruger should relate specifically to that company. We do not believe that a foreign company should be permitted to dictate the labour laws of the Province. Now we intend to see that Bill 37 is fully debated in all its stages. We will agree to the immediate passage of the Kruger Bill. And we will also agree to permit passage in all its stages of the legislation, or possibly an amendment to the Kruger Bill should this be the decision, which would be necessary to guarantee for Kruger that that company would not become liable for any claims of Bowater employees with respect to temporary layoff.

MRS. NEWHOOK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. Minister of Communications.

MRS. NEWHOOK:
Mr. Speaker, this is not a statement as such. I just wish to advise this hon. House of my response to a petition from Williams Harbour presented by the hon. member from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock).

MR. NEARY:
On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister in her opening remarks said this is not a statement, yet she insists on plowing on and making a report on a petition. I do not believe that is in line with a Ministerial Statement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. minister certainly did indicate that statement she was making is not a ministerial statement as such.

MR. NEARY:
Do it in Answers to Questions.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
It appears to the Chair that indeed it might be a little bit more appropriate to make the statement in Answers to Questions.

Oral Questions

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Premier. The Prime Minister, Mr. Mulroney was in New York last night and confirmed to U.S. investors that his government will change the so-called back-in provision under which the Petro-Canada Corporation was entitled to 25 per cent of all oil found on federal lands. There was an indication, Mr. Speaker, that back-ins will apply only to oil discovered after the statement was made in 1980, and this would be the approach of government.

Now I would like to ask the Premier whether he can now tell us whether he has been informed or not by Mr. Mulroney that the back-in provision will not apply to the Hibernia development?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) is presently on his way to Ottawa for consultations with the federal government on the whole question of energy policy for Canada. Upon his return, having determined the position of the federal government on the whole issue as it relates to our offshore - as we understand it, it could vary from one region of Canada to another area of Canada depending upon the economics of a given field - that we will be in a better position to clearly identify how it will apply offshore here.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the Newfoundland Energy Minister (Mr. Marshall) has rushed off to Ottawa following an all-night sitting in light of this report from the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mulroney was very clear. He said that his government will eliminate the back-in provision in all cases before 1980. Mr. Speaker, if the Premier was not consulted beforehand and informed that this announcement was going to be made,

would the Premier agree that this strains the definition of consultation when the Prime Minister of Canada makes a decision, announces it publicly and only then meets with the Newfoundland Government representatives?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No, Mr. Speaker. We have been meeting regularly for the last three or four weeks with the federal government as it relates to energy policy for Canada.

MR. BARRY:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
A final supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Would the Premier indicate whether the Prime Minister of Canada informed him or the Newfoundland Energy Minister (Mr. Marshall) that the 25 per cent back-in for Hibernia would be removed.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, that is presently under discussion between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the hon. the Premier. Last night when the hon. gentleman participated in the debate here - and I know we cannot refer to previous debates, but the hon. gentleman is quoted in the media as painting a very bleak and gloomy outlook for the Newfoundland economy for the months and years ahead - would the hon. gentleman tell the House whether or not it was wise for him to say that Fishery Products International is bankrupt? Will it do any damage, will it do any good? Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman made a categorical statement here last night. We all realize they have financial problems, are insolvent, but was it correct for the hon. gentleman -

MR. BARRETT:

Insolvent is close to meaning the same as bankrupt.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman submitted a categorical statement that Fishery Products International was bankrupt. Now would the hon. gentleman care to elaborate or clarify that statement that he made last night?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, anybody who was within hearing distance last night while I spoke on Bill 37 realized that I was making the statements in the context of Bill 37. I said we have a serious situation in our iron ore industry, in just about all of our mineral industry except for the precious metals. I said we have a very difficult situation in the fishery, that the companies that make up the new company, Fishery Products International,

were bankrupt, that a receiver had been put in place there. I also talked about the forest industry, in that Abitibi-Price has not made any money at either Grand Falls or Stephenville for the last year or so, that as a matter of fact they have been losing money. It was in that context that I said Bill 37 is so important. Because if we were to burden these companies which are near bankrupt or losing money, or like Fishery Products International which has within it three bankrupt companies, this would even lead to a worsening of an already bad situation. It was in that context of Bill 37 that I said we should not at this point in time put additional financial burdens upon these companies, especially when it is all based upon an ambiguity in a law that was passed in 1977. It was in that context that I made these statements and I stand by them.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A supplementary the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, how could the hon. gentleman make these statements when only a week ago he told the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that they wanted to hear something positive, that they wanted to hear good news, bright news for a change? The hon. gentleman I believe indicated that Newfoundland had turned the corner. Now last night the hon. gentleman did a complete reversal, we turned the other corner last night and we are now headed up a blind alley. Now could the hon. gentleman tell the House why the about-face? If we are really in such serious trouble as the hon.

gentleman implied last night, are we going to become a wasteland? Is the economy of this Province about to collapse down around our ears as the hon. gentleman indicated last night? Mr. Speaker, why the change? The hon. gentleman told us last week that people are fed up with doom and gloom, bleak outlooks and so forth, they need something upbeat the hon. gentleman told us. Was he just trying to bully the Opposition into agreeing to pass this bill last night or was there any logic at all in what the hon. gentleman was saying?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Obviously the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) did not read the speech that I made a couple of weeks ago when I was saying that if government policy is followed, the policy that we have articulated as the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, then I believe we have seen the worst of the recession and that we are starting to come out of it. However, the opposite is true: If government policy is not followed I do not believe that we are going to see as optimistic a time in the next couple of years as we should see. Last night I was arguing that the Opposition are opposed to government policy as it reflects itself in Bill 37 and therefore it was going to put additional burdens on us coming out of the recession and getting into a recovery phase. We have signed a couple of hundred million dollars in agreements with Ottawa in the last six months, which money will start flowing through the Newfoundland economy in 1985. We will have, Mr. Speaker, a detailed, comprehensive agreement

on the offshore hopefully in February of this year, passed into law later in the Spring and into the constitution in the next seven or eight months or so when the other provinces see the agreement and agree to embed it into the Constitution. So there are signs on the horizon which say that we have the opportunity now to move out of the recession and into a recovery phase but the Opposition are the people who seem to want to prevent this from happening. They want to see more unemployment so that they can blame it on us in 1985, so they want to see more recession, they want to see more depression, Mr. Speaker. What I am saying is that if the government has its way, if government policy is followed we believe that we have a good opportunity but if you add to Fishery Products International problems another \$15 or \$20 million, if you add to the forest industry another \$10 or \$15 million, if you add to the mining industry another \$5 or \$6 or \$10 million that is a lot of money and it will retard the recovery. But if government policy is followed we believe we are on the upturn and we can look forward to better things in 1985 and 1986.

MR. NEARY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A final supplementary the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, that is a big if. That is not what the hon. gentleman said last week. He told us last week that the telephone workers strike was going to be settled, the trawler strike was going to be settled, everything was a bed of roses the hon.

gentleman told us. Because the fishery is our most basic industry - it is the mainstay still of the Newfoundland economy; has been for 500 years, will continue to be so as long as we protect the inshore fishery and not neglect it like hon. gentlemen are doing because they have no policy on the inshore fishery - would the hon. gentleman tell the House, in connection with the fishery - let us take that one item alone - is it the policy of the administration and the hon. gentleman to continue with a part-time Minister of Fisheries? It is the most important portfolio in the government, Mr. Speaker, and as good as the hon. gentleman is - he is probably very competent - is it right, are we not weakening the industry and weakening the position of Fishery Products International, the inshore fishery, the deep-sea fishery, the fish plants, are we weakening the position of all of these organizations by not having a full-time Minister of Fisheries? Can the hon. gentleman tell us if that is a part of his policy or does he intend ever to fill that vacancy? Or is he waiting to see what is going to happen to the previous minister before he appoints a full-time Minister of Fisheries?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, let me answer one part of the hon. member's question with a question. Did the hon. gentleman read the speech that I gave a week or two ago? Did the hon. member actually read it?

MR. NEARY:
It was given at a Tory convention. I do not attend Tory conventions.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It was a public speech. The hon. member therefore was asking questions based on not even reading the speech itself which was delivered to the press and everybody else. So the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is asking questions based upon ignorance of the facts. The hon. member has not read the speech and therefore tries to concoct a question based on something that he has not even read. Mr. Speaker, I mean, it is absolutely incredible. Now, number two, as it relates to the Minister of Fisheries, if tomorrow morning or this afternoon I appoint a Minister of Fisheries, full stop, who is not responsible for anything else, the Opposition and members of the media would say, 'Cabinet is too big, you are wasting money. One minister can do two or three portfolios. What is this business of wasting money by putting more of your buddies in Cabinet so that you will have more in Cabinet than on the backbench and they all owe allegiance to the Premier?' Mr. Speaker, let us face it now, that is what they would be saying, that is their standard story when somebody else is added to the Cabinet or additional positions are created. All I can say is this, Mr. Speaker, the present Minister for Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) is doing an excellent job as Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
He has had meetings. Nothing in the Fisheries portfolio is been overlooked. As a matter of fact, I think the minister is on his way again for more meetings today in

Ottawa as it relates to fishery matters on all fronts of the fishing industry. The hon. minister is a very competent man, he does an excellent job. He has done an excellent job in his portfolio of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development and he is doing an excellent job with his added responsibilities. When I deem it right, Mr. Speaker, I shall appoint a Minister of Fisheries, full stop. At the present moment the hon., the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development is acting Minister of Fisheries, he is doing an excellent job. Fisheries is a primary responsibility. The Minister of Fisheries, Acting, or the Minister of Fisheries is a member of the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet. The present minister, acting, is spending a lot of time on fisheries matters, he can handle it and he is doing an excellent job. When I deem it fit, Mr. Speaker, there will be a Minister of Fisheries, full stop.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. I would like to know if the Minister of Labour has received any information on any impending shutdowns or layoffs for the iron ore industry in Labrador West for the coming year?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, I think it is public knowledge by now. I understand the production schedule for Wabush Mines for next year has decreased somewhat from their capacity of

six million tons to something like 5.4 or 5.5 and as a result of that there will be a shutdown sometime this year, hopefully in the Summertime. They normally try to arrange it for vacation periods. So there will be a shutdown sometime in 1985 in Wabush Mines.

MR. FENWICK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary by the hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
My information is the shutdown will be on July 1 which is about six months from now.

MR. DINN:
That is sometime in the Summer, is it not, in 1985?

MR. FENWICK:
I would like to know from the minister if in this situation where we have seen approximately six and a half months given, whether he feels that six and a half months notice is now possible for a temporary layoff? Is that now a reasonable thing to be asking out of the one company that has managed to be disciplined by the Labour Standards Tribunal?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. Minister of Labour.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, I would think the hon. member would be more concerned about the iron ore industry in Western Labrador than to play antics in the House of Assembly and play his little political games. The fact of the matter is that he knows, as well as just about every member here, that the iron industry in Western Labrador is in a very serious

situation, and the fact of the matter is that the Iron Ore Company of Canada is not at full capacity, which we would like to see on this side of the House. Wabush Mines has indicated now that they will be cutting back on production in 1985, which nobody in this Province likes to see, but they have to do it. And the fact of the matter is, as the member knows, the company reassesses its position twice a year, once in December and once in May. And the fact of the matter is that in May their production requirement for the year could go up or could go down. To allow the employees down there to pick the best time for them to take downtime, which generally is conceded to be in the Summer so they can come out of Western Labrador and go on vacation, the company in May or June will decide whether that production level goes up or goes down more, and it may have to decide at that point in time that it has to go down more. As a result of that, in order to communicate that to their employees and have downtime when it is more beneficial to the employees, they may not be able to give the sixteen weeks notice to facilitate what the employees themselves want.

MR. FENWICK:

They got six months notice here.

MR. DINN:

They got six months notice, yes, but that is one of the reasons why it is necessary here to take the impediments that are currently existing in the Labour Standards Act and correct them. The hon. member should have seen this a long time ago and should have supported the legislation right from the outset.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. I wonder if the Premier could tell us now whether the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report will be tabled in the House before Christmas?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure. I will have check for the hon. member and get the answer before six o'clock. I do not know the answer off the top of my head. I know it was just about ready last week. That was the last I heard of it but I will get the information for the hon. member.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) what is happening in connection with the firefighting academy for Gander? I noticed the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities were hot to trot on that issue last week. There was a commitment made by the administration that they would open a firefighting academy in Gander to train firefighters throughout the Province, a good project. Could the hon. gentleman tell us what has happened to it? Has it gotten the axe? Is it the suffering from the government

restraint programme? What is happening concerning that firefighting academy?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to that particular subject we had a meeting last week, as a matter of fact, with the association of Fire Chiefs who expressed that concern as well. As the hon. member is aware, we have temporary facilities right now set up at Gander which are doing a fine job in offering some courses in training these firefighters. But with respect to the academy itself, that will have to be determined, Mr. Speaker, in the budgetary process as to whether or not that academy will receive full funding this year.

MR. NEARY:

Is it under active consideration by the minister?

MR. DOYLE:

I would imagine it is under consideration, yes.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier whether he has given any consideration, in light of the approach now taken by the Prime Minister of Canada, of tabling the salaries of the various officers of Crown corporations?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I think last year or the year before it was tabled, but we have no problem in tabling it in the House, none whatsoever. There was a question came up, I think a couple of years ago, and we produced a booklet with all of the salaries in there. That is no problem at all. We will do it immediately.

MR. BARRY:

Were they broken down?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They were broken down.

MR. BARRY:

They were broken down into individual salaries?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Right. I think it was when the hon. member, as a matter of fact, was over here that it was done. But there is no problem, we will do it again as soon as we can.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile on a supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

On that subject, would the hon. the Premier indicate to the House if it is the intention of the administration there opposite to allow the Auditor General to audit the books, the accounts of Crown corporations?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is the policy of the government right now that the Auditor General's Act applies to departmental estimates and for the

Auditor General to ensure that if a given amount of money was voted for A, B and C that it was spent on A, B and C. There has not been any new consideration of whether the Auditor General's duties should be expanded to Crown corporations at this point in time.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile on a supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman knows, of course, there is no Auditor General's Act. But what I am asking the hon. gentleman is if he will give the Auditor General access -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There is an Auditor General's Act.

MR. NEARY:

There is no Auditor General's Act but we need one badly in the Province.

DR. COLLINS:

There is the Financial Administration Act.

MR. NEARY:

The Financial Administration Act is not the Auditor General's Act. The government of Canada and the other provinces have an Auditor General's Act but we do not have one in this Province. We should have one. Now will the hon. gentleman agree to give the Auditor General access to the accounts, to the books of Crown corporations for the purpose of auditing Crown corporations?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the present policy seems to be working very well; the Crown corporations are audited by firms and the minister responsible tables the annual report in the House. If the hon. member has a problem with any of the corporations, any of their annual reports, if there is something there that is inconsistent or whatever, well, then, the hon. member can raise it. Does the hon. member have a specific example of where this is not working -

MR. NEARY:

Yes, and I will be bringing it up later on.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- the annual reports, and that there is a discrepancy in the accounts of these Crown corporations? If so, I would ask the hon. member to bring it forward.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee I will have all sorts of recommendations to make along these lines. I think the policy followed in other provinces, and by the Government of Canada should be brought into effect here. The Minister of Health's (Dr. Twomey) predecessor claimed that the Canada Health Act that was passed some time ago was an unrealistic document, the Canada Health Act that does away with user fees in the provinces and so forth. Does the hon. gentleman feel the same way about that act? Does the present minister feel that it is an unrealistic document? And does the present minister feel that we

should have user-pay fees in this Province, or is the hon. gentleman opposed to user-pay fees? Where does the hon. gentleman stand on the Canada Health Act?

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

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to give a very definite philosophy on the Canada Health Act. We have no problem at all in Newfoundland opting out or charging extra fees for any procedures. But, I must say, I have become aware of a few problems since I have moved into the Department of Health during the last few weeks. One of them is when people from this Province are requiring very specialized care that is unavailable in this Province and have to go to a large centre in Canada and some of these physicians charge these people more than the stated rate of payment in Ontario or Newfoundland. These people have written to me and we are in a bit of a quandry as to how we can handle it. Am I concerned about it? Yes, very definitely concerned. But to give you an overall philosophy, I think I can say I am quite happy with the way it is working in Newfoundland; I think it would be improper for me to make any comment on what is happening in the rest of Canada.

MR. NEARY:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MRE. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:
It is unclear from the answer given by the hon. gentleman whether he is for or against user-pay fees. Now, Mr. Speaker,

the hon. gentleman did some -

MR. SIMMS:
An excellent answer.

MR. NEARY:
Yes, he did some pretty fancy stick handling, and it all sounded so wonderful, but can the hon. gentleman give me a simple yes or no answer? Is the hon. gentleman opposed to extra billing, opposed to user-pay fees? Yes or no!

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

DR. TWOMEY:
It is quite obvious, Sir, that I cannot have an opinion on it since it is not a problem here, so it is a hypothetical question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Communications. It is widely expected today that they will be announcing some reductions in manpower, or even in stations among the CBC operations in this Province. My question to the Minister of Communications is has there been any consultation between the provincial government and the federal government or the CBC on having any input into what is proposed? Can you hear the question? May I repeat the question, Mr. Speaker? I do not think the hon. minister understood it. The question I would like to ask, in the anticipated layoffs in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, I would like to know whether the provincial government has consulted with either the

federal government or the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation with respect to having input into what kind of cuts will occur?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Communications.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I telexed the hon. the Minister of Communications (Mr. Masse) expressing to him my concerns over the social and economic impacts of closing down CBC stations anywhere in Newfoundland, or of downgrading any of these stations, and I suggested that maybe they not consider any cutbacks at all in Newfoundland, and if these are necessary, that there are other ways of realizing savings, and that if there are cutbacks to be made, it should be done in such a way that the impact would be spread of the entire system. I understand that the minister will be meeting his counterparts in all of the Provinces of Canada, and very soon will be talking about a new mandate and new policies for CBC. I have also sent a similar message off to the President of CBC, but I have had no response.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I will direct a question to the Premier, but I do not mind if he refers it to whichever minister has responsibility. It is a question involving the Newfoundland Library Service. It may seem like a minor matter, but I think there is a matter of principle here. I would like to ask the Premier whether there is any policy for the disposal of redundant books within

the Newfoundland Library Service, or within offshoot agencies such as Newfoundland Books By Mail, which I believe is one offshoot of that? Is there any policy with respect to the disposal of redundant books by those services?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know off the top of my head what happens to old books, but I will find out for the hon. member and see. The minister responsible is not in his seat at the present moment.

MR. BARRY:

Who is the minister responsible?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Rideout).

MR. ANDREWS:

Old books go in the Archives.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They go in the Archives, do they?

MR. ANDREWS:

Yes, old ones, real old ones.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, the real old books, but how about the books that are still good?

MR. SIMMS:

The provincial Public Libraries Board make those decisions and develop their own policy.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, we will have to find out for the hon. member just what the policy is of the Library Board as it relates to that.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

If I could be a little specific, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) is expressing a particular interest in this question, and I believe he may know why. A couple of weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, I was informed that there was a sale of excess books by the Newfoundland Books by Mail Service that was carried out in Grand Falls. That sale ran from Friday to Monday and realized, I think, \$900 or \$1,000. Then, on Monday, Mr. Speaker, over the protest of certain employees, they took the remaining books, hundreds of books, and brought them out to the Grand Falls dump and dumped them.

MR. ANDREWS:

Who did?

MR. BARRY:

Whoever was responsible for the books.

MR. SIMMS:

The Libraries Board.

MR. BARRY:

The Library Board or whoever. Now, I would like to ask the Premier whether he would have this investigated. Because it is abhorant to me to see books being destroyed when, if you look around this Province, if you look at the schools, you will see inadequate libraries in the schools, if you look at senior citizens homes, or nursing homes and so forth, you see a need for books there. And, Mr. Speaker, I am informed that it is a regular policy of certain libraries within the Province to destroy books rather than make them available to nursing homes, schools and so forth. If that is what is happening, it should be

stopped and it should be stopped immediately.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The time for Question Period has expired.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 50 I give notice that I shall on tomorrow move that further consideration of any resolution or resolutions, clause or clauses, section or sections, preamble or preambles, title or titles relating to Bill No. 37 entitled, "An Act To Amend The Labour Standards Act", shall be the first business of the Committee of the Whole when next resolved by this hon. House and shall not be further postponed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

Answers to Questions

for which Notice has been Given

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question from the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), seeing he has

not read my speech of a couple of weeks ago and he is asking questions without having the facts, I now table a copy of that speech for his edification and enlightenment.

Presenting Petitions

MR. STEWART:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STEWART:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of 479 residents throughout the Province but mostly from the district of Fortune - Hermitage.

The petition is requesting big game moose hunting in Area 26, known as Jubilee Lake, formerly Long Harbour, be prohibited for non-residents.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition is as follows:

"Whereas the number of big game moose licences in Area 26, Jubilee Lake, have decreased by 69.4 per cent since 1979" - there were 425 issued in 1979 and 130 in 1984 - "and, whereas non-residents are guaranteed first choice for twenty of these licences per year" - twenty-three were awarded in 1981 - "and, whereas this represented 4.7 per cent in 1979, it represents 15.4 per cent in 1984 of the total licences available for this area; and, whereas these twenty licences prevent each year a minimum of forty residents, two

per party licence, and up to eighty where there were three to four shares in one licence; and whereas residents' demand is extremely high with 810 applications in 1981, 791 applications in 1982 and 798 applications in 1983 being unsuccessful; and, whereas we, the undersigned big game hunters are opposed to non-residents having priority over residents; therefore be it resolved that we beg the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to take immediate action to prohibit big game moose hunting for non-residents in Area 26, Jubilee Lake, commencing in the 1985 season."

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say that the majority of the signatures on the petition are from the district of Fortune - Hermitage. This was the main area of concern, since the majority of moose hunters in my district from St. Bernard's to English Harbour East hunt the Jubilee Lake area, formerly known as Long Harbour area. The petition also contains names from St. John's, Clarendville, Grand Bank, Fortune, Random Island and many other communities throughout the Province. The majority of the hunters who have signed this petition have hunted at some time or still hunt the Long Harbour area.

This petition, Mr. Speaker, with 479 signatures, is, I think, definitely indicative of the mass opposition to non-residents being given priority over residents in the Province.

The area of greatest concern to the petitioners is Area 26, where we have seen a decrease of 69.4 per cent in big game licences since 1979. The petition stated

there were 425 issued in 1979 and only 130 in 1984.

Mr. Speaker, on and around the Burin Peninsula, for instance in Area 30, known I guess to local hunters as the Knee area, there were 150 licences issued in this area in 1981, and in 1984 there were only 30 licences. In Area 38, known as the Foot area of the peninsula, there were 85 licences in 1981, down to 10 in 1984. Mr. Speaker, in the Black River Area, Area 28, there were 230 licences in 1981, down to 180 in 1984.

Looking at these three adjacent management areas to Area 26, we have also seen a drop by 52.7 per cent in just four years, from 465 licences in 1981 to 220 in 1984.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to moose hunters and moose hunting generally in the Province, most of the hunters with whom I have talked who go into these areas around the Burin Peninsula have noticed many changes over the last several years. The use, I guess, of all-terrain vehicles has had a serious effect on the moose population in this particular area. Moose hunters seem to be travelling much farther into the country.

Mr. Speaker, hunters have also noticed the tremendous increase in the bear population in this area. Maybe this is why over the last couple of years, which is indeed strange as moose hunters who hunt the Long Harbour area will tell you, we see very few calves now.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

I have to inform the hon. member that except by leave, of course, his time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
Does the hon. member have leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:
Agreed.

MR. STEWART:
Thank you. I will try to make it as short as I can.

I was stating, Mr. Speaker, that the bear population in the Long Harbour area has been on the increase lately and many hunters will tell you that it is very seldom that you will see a calf now with its mother. Maybe the Wildlife branch should take a serious look at this. Perhaps one of the reasons why moose is on the decline in that particular area is because of overpopulation by bears.

MR. SIMMS:
It could be, yes.

MR. STEWART:
Hunters, I think, Mr. Speaker, also feel that there are too few wardens, especially on the Burin Peninsula. I stand to be corrected, Mr. Speaker, but I think, to the best of my knowledge, there are two wardens serving that area. I believe there is one in Grand Bank and one in Clarendville serving the whole peninsula.

MR. SIMMS:
That is right.

MR. STEWART:
I think the true hunters in Newfoundland and Labrador would like to see the number increased.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to say that it is government's policy that should there be a drastic decline in the moose population in any particular area where non-resident hunting licences are issued, the number of non-resident licences available will be reduced accordingly.

The hunters, I think, Mr. Speaker, signing this petition, feel that this practice was not followed and feel that non-residents should not be given priority over residents in obtaining moose licences:

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to supporting this petition, and I ask that it be placed on the Table of the House and referred to the appropriate department.

Thank you.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker, in fact I also have a copy of the petition just presented by the hon. member. In fact, the originator of this petition came to me some time ago concerning an injustice that he presumes to have been done in this Province.

Now, about two weeks ago we saw this government bring in a sports hunt in Labrador and I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe 95 per cent of all big game hunters in this Province would prefer that licences for big game be available only to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. I believe all hunters in this

Province would prefer to have priority in obtaining licences.

This petition specifically refers to Area 26. Mr. Speaker, I think there are other areas in the Province where non-resident hunters should not be allowed. Why should it be just Area 26? I would like to go on record as saying if we are going to eliminate non-resident hunters from Area 26, which I understand is providing a livelihood for a particular group of people, why restrict the measure to Area 26, why not look at the rest of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador? If we are going to get rid of non-resident hunters, I think we should get rid of them all over the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and not just specifically in area 26, although area 26 may have a unique problem in itself. Mr. Speaker, I think this petition was well thought out, it was well investigated. It has, as the hon. member said, 479 names, of people throughout the Province, in particular of people on the Southwest Coast and on the Burin Peninsula. Now I think the lesson that the Premier and the minister responsible for Wildlife should gather from this petition is that resident big game hunters are not given a fair share of moose licences because x number of licences are allotted each year for non-resident hunters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe from conversations with the present Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Rideout) that he will have the fortitude, moreso than the former minister responsible for Wildlife (Mr. Simms), to bring in changes and that it is quite possible you may see three and four member hunting

parties this year. Mr. Speaker, I have been after the former minister for a number of years to see that more Newfoundlanders and Labradorians can obtain a moose licence, and the only way that can be done is instead of having a two party licence as a maximum there, should be a three party licence, or a four party licence. By doing that some of these hunters will be satisfied.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Rideout) is somewhere in the confines of the Legislature and I cannot speak in his behalf but I know that I want to say a few words to the petition.

MR. TOBIN:
He did not support it.

MR. SIMMS:
I noted with some interest that the member did not actually say whether he was supporting the petition or whether he was not.

MR. WARREN:
I am.

MR. SIMMS:
He is supporting the petition.

Mr. Speaker, the more you delve into this particular petition, by the way, the more interesting it gets. First of all there is a bit of confusion as to whether or not the people who have sent forth this petition are actually talking about non-residents as being people from outside their area or

whether they are talking about non-residents from outside the Province. And in fact the member who presented the petition now thinks that the impression is they wanted the licences for people in their own area, but he is not absolutely certain. In any event it needs a little more investigation.

The hon. member knows, Mr. Speaker, that the number of licences allocated in the big game licencing system is based on accurate census work that is done accurately and the amount of overharvesting by whatever methods, particularly poaching or whatever illegal methods, has some influence and Area 26 I guess is no different than any other area in the Province.

On the couple of points that the member for Fortune Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) mentioned with respect to wardens, I would say that my recollection is out of the 40 or so management areas throughout the Province a dozen or 15 of those have about two wardens per region, the rest of them only have one warden per region. So there is a difficulty, there is no questions about it, with respect to the number of wardens, but to increase the number of wardens requires an awful lot more funding for salaries and equipment and transportation costs and so on and I think that that is a problem that the department has been struggling with for a number of years. But one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the member for Torngat Mountains, the number of non-resident licences in the area was not decreased is because there are two outfitters who service that particular area and cater to non-resident hunting, and each of

them employs half a dozen people or so. So on the one hand members opposite frequently will talk to us about increasing employment, but now the hon. member supporting this petition, in essence and in fact went further in his comments and suggested that we should perhaps think about eliminating non-resident hunting throughout the whole Province. To do so would wipe out the outfitting industry, lay off several hundreds of people who are working in the outfitting industry and create more unemployment. That just does not make any sense at all, Mr. Speaker. It is obviously a ludicrous statement by the member for Torngat Mountains who did not put any thought into it whatsoever. I am sure the minister responsible for Wildlife will give serious consideration to the prayer of the petition as ably presented by the member for Fortune-Hermitage and I understand in fact that the minister will be responding to the people concerned.

Orders of the Day

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, just to explain to hon. members, I plan to call Orders 27, 14, 15 and 16. Obviously, depending on time, there may be others after these, but we will be calling those. So we will be calling those bills on which debate on second reading has been adjourned. They are the Human Rights one, the one with respect to the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology, and the one with respect to Acquisition of Goods and Services by public tender.

MR. NEARY:

In that order?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Yes. I call Order 27.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order 27 is the continuation of second reading on Bill 59, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Human Rights Code."

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

The debate was adjourned by a member who is not in the House right now. I am not sure what the procedure is at this point.

MR. SPEAKER:

He loses his opportunity.

MR. FENWICK:

I would like to speak on it, Mr. Speaker. Bill 59, which is the "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Human Rights Code," probably could be called the Amherst Heights Act if I guess we were looking for a reason for it being here since it obviously refers to that particular incident. The reason I want to get up and talk about it, and I do not want to spend too much time on it, is I feel it is important, being the only representative of the New Democratic Party in the House and not having had a chance to speak on it in the past, that the comments of our party and myself be entered into the record on it.

I think, in common with most of the members in the House, if not all the members in the House, I was quite taken aback by the circumstances that led up to the necessity to enter this particular piece of legislation, when it became apparent that there were some great difficulties on the part of the Transition House people in getting a suitable place to set up shop, so to speak. At

the time I got in touch with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), thinking maybe there was something we could have done with the Municipalities Act or with the City of St. John's Act in order to make it much more difficult to obstruct this kind of thing in the future.

I am not sure if this particular piece of legislation is exactly the way to go, but it obviously is something that can be used in order to make sure that that kind of discrimination does not occur in the future and obviously both myself and my party support it.

One of the things I would like to do, though, is deal with some of the argument put forward by the City of St. John's and its council with respect to the decision they made, because obviously that is the reason we are dealing with this at this time. The arguments that were put forward when the debate was hot and heavy was that the residence concerned, or the house concerned, or the building concerned, was not suitable for an institution of that size. I believe they were talking at that time about something like ten clients - I guess that is probably the best way to classify them - and perhaps six staff members would be involved with it. And on the surface there is a small amount of validity to the kind of comment they were making. They were looking at a residential area and in a residential area it is sometimes exceptional to see as many as sixteen people occupying one particular residence. There is a temptation to put some credence into that kind of argument. The question that sprung to my mind was that obviously if sixteen people can live in a residence of this size,

somehow this particular residence got built there and somebody must have been in charge of the building code when it was built there.

MR. WARREN:

I am going to call a quorum.

MR. FENWICK:

You are not going to do it again, are you? Do not do that to me again, please. Wait a little while. I do not mind if there are no guys over there listening.

MR. WARREN:

Do you want them in?.

MR. FENWICK:

No, I do not care if they come in or not. They can hear me on the speaker in the lounge, I understand.

The fact of the matter is the house was built in that area and, judging from the appearance of it on television - I must admit I have not seen it in person - it seems to me it is quite a large residence. Nevertheless, somehow it conformed with the zoning by-laws and with whatever amendments were made to it to build it. So it seems to me the question of a residence that could take that many people had already been determined in the past by previous councils or by zoning by-laws or whatever the case might be.

So I find it difficult to deal with the objections and the stated excuses by the City Council for basically refusing to allow it to be used as it was currently zoned.

There is a question there that if sixteen people were too many, would fourteen people be too many, or twelve? It seemed to me that

there was room for compromise there, if indeed that was the major concern there. And I feel that is not perhaps the major concern, that there were probably other things working at the time.

The other thing I think that we have to address, that we have to question is where is the most appropriate place for former patients of hospitals for nervous diseases and so on to be? The Council came back and proposed areas, on LeMarchant Road and so on, which they said were more commercial, and they proposed this as the kind of place that they should be. I have been around there because the place I am staying at while I am in St. John's is in that vicinity, and quite frankly I find it alarming that they would think that that is the most appropriate place for any kind of people. It seems to me the area is quite commercial, there is a lot of traffic in the area. It is true there are some commercial facilities which might be convenient, but I am not sure for individuals who have undergone the kind of stress that these people have we would want to put them in such an overstimulating environment, and it seems to me that perhaps a residential environment was probably more appropriate. Looking at the two locations, it would seem to me that I would probably prefer to see them on a quite cul-de-sac since it might provide more of a home atmosphere for these individuals concerned.

Having seen that these seem to be the major arguments put forward by the City Council, and in my opinion these arguments are at least open to refutation or to the argument that these are perhaps not valid arguments, then it seems

to me that it is a good idea to have this particular piece of legislation, so that the individuals who are trying to get this residence established could at least allege discrimination against the individuals involved.

As I said before, I do not have a huge amount of comments to make on it, but I do feel that the City Council made a wrong decision. I think they made a wrong decision based on the arguments that they put forward. I am not going to try to impugn their motives, since I understand it is not very parliamentary, and I think we do owe respect to them, but I think they made a wrong decision. If this amendment to The Newfoundland Human Rights Code were in effect at the time, the individuals concerned would have been able to appeal it and, hopefully their appeal would have been successful, and they would have been able to go ahead with some reasonable facilities in that area.

Mr. Speaker, these are about the only short comments I wish to make on this particular piece of legislation, because I feel to say any more than I really feel about it is to actually delay the legislation. As all hon. members on the other side know, we have never any intention of delaying legislation that is to the benefit of Newfoundlanders as a whole.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):
Order, please.

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

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, very briefly opinion has been canvassed quite widely on this Bill and all hon. members are in support of it. As hon. members will recall, the principle of the bill is to proscribe discrimination based on mental disability as the Human Rights Code already proscribes with respect to physical disability, religion, race, colour, political belief, ethnic background, etc.

So as all hon. members who have spoken on the bill have pointed out, it is progressive legislation, it is beneficial legislation. It will bring within its ambit of protection people who suffer mental handicap and henceforth it will be illegal to practice discrimination with respect to that group of citizens. And I am very pleased to move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Human Rights Code", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 59).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Calling Of Tenders For The Execution Of Public Works And The Acquisition Of Good And Services By Government Funded Bodies". (Bill No. 40).

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Did I adjourn it the last time?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes.

MR. FENWICK:

I am not sure actually at this point what I said at that time

since it was so long ago. Unfortunately, with the order of business, it is very difficult to anticipate what is going to come up next. If I recall correctly, the only caveats I had about the bill at the time were that it now including the large number of institutions and these institutions did not seem to have been consulted about the entire process. I suggested delaying it for six months, a procedure which embroiled us in a procedural wrangle, so I am going to stay away from that having learned my lesson about that particular piece of business.

However, I would like to say that it is unfortunate that evidently some of these institutions have not really had a close look at this particular piece of legislation, have not had a lot of input into it, or at least have not thought through the kinds of problems they may have with it. Because I think that it is appropriate that they do be covered by it, that is not an objection I have. I hope that the minister in wrapping up his comments would somehow, before the act is promulgated, at least get in touch with these institutions involved so they would then have some feeling for how they are to comply with it, and determine whether or not it would interfere with some areas of activity. The specific one that was brought up to me was from the Faculty Association of Memorial University which was concerned that in the expenditure of research money the public tendering process may cause a number of problems. Am I correct in assuming that there is a proposed amendment to this in Committee stage?

MR. YOUNG:

A proposed amendment, yes.

MR. FENWICK:

There is. Actually that amendment in Committee stage may address that particular problem, as I understand it is supposed to address the problems of some of the hospitals that are looking for specific pieces of equipment.

Having brought those concerns up, I am finished.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

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

The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I just have a few points and a few remarks to make on it. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) asked some questions wondering if this applied to Hydro. As outlined in the schedule, it does apply to Hydro. Also, Mr. Speaker, he asked whether the 15 per cent still applies when the 1.5 applies. Mr. Speaker, there are quite a few changes in this new act. Mr. Speaker, for the first time municipalities will come under it, and all agencies of government. For the first time, Mr. Speaker, we will be going to public tender for services, although some will be excluded that cannot come under the act. There has been consultation, Mr. Speaker. I have had some requests from the hospital association and some letters from the city. And if there are any amendments to be made, they will be made in third reading.

Mr. Speaker, the Public Tendering Act covered goods and services and public works, but now, for the

first time, Mr. Speaker, it will apply to the rental of office space. Mr. Speaker, this bill was brought in more or less following to a T what was requested by the Mahoney report. Mr. Speaker, what it all amounts to is that all government purchasing will be open and aboveboard, no more patronage, no more skulduggery. Mr. Speaker, this will cure all of this, and Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro will have to come under it.

MR. NEARY:

There will be more pork barrelling and patronage than ever before.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. YOUNG:

That is what the hon. member thinks, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I say there will be no more payoffs, no more wrongdoings, everything fair and just and aboveboard and I have much pleasure in moving second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Calling Of Tenders For The Execution Of Public Works And The Acquisition Of Goods And Services By Government Funded Bodies," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 40).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Establishment And Operation Of The Institute Of Fisheries And Marine Technology." (Bill No. 39).

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I believe I adjourned the debate and I have nine minutes left. I only wish I had nine hours so I could heap great praise, so I could compliment the Liberal administration of the day that they built the College of Fisheries in this Province, so that I could heap great credit on the Liberal Government of Canada for contributing \$27.5 million to this great project, \$14.3 million by the Province, \$27.5 million from the previous Liberal Government in Ottawa.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said in my earlier remarks the day the bill came up for second reading, this Marine Fisheries Institute is a great Liberal concept and all the administration there opposite is doing is just transferring it from the old Memorial College buildings over to the Ridge Road. The Marine Institute was one of the dreams of former Premier Joey Smallwood and I believe I made the point the last day we debated this bill that that man was the twenty-third premier of Newfoundland and he did more than all the other twenty-two put together. I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that he is improving almost daily from his recent health setback. Every night he is in St. John's I go to see him - last night I could only see him for half an hour - and I can report to hon. gentlemen that he is improving tremendously but he still has a considerable ways to go before he is back to normal.

MR. PEACH:

Is he going to come back and take over the leadership?

MR. NEARY:

That is very unkind and unfair, that is unbecoming. The hon. gentleman should go over and look after the horses over in Victoria.

Mr. Speaker, that man did more for this Province than all the other twenty-two premiers put together. That Fisheries Institute, that Marine Institute is his baby. He was the one who thought it up, he is the one who searched and found Dr. Ray Barrett to become the first President of that college, and I paid tribute to Dr. Barrett last week. Now, Dr. Barrett has retired. He provided yeoman service to this Province and to the Fishery College. What we need now, Mr. Speaker, is a replacement and I would hope that the hon. gentleman responsible, the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power), will search and soon find an individual as good as Dr. Barrett who will be free from political interference, who will see to it that institute, that magnificent Liberal institute will have academic freedom. That was one of the big problems, if hon. gentleman will recall, that I mentioned last day when we discussed this bill. When we were setting up the College of Fisheries and Marine Technology, one of the things that we were concerned about was whether or not the college would have academic freedom the same as Memorial University. I happen to think, Mr. Speaker, that the College of Trades and Technology and the Marine Institute should be the equivalent of Memorial University, they should have academic freedom and so, Mr. Speaker, we are going to support this bill. Why would we not support this bill when it is our baby, it is our project, it is a Liberal project? Why would we not support the bill? Let me again repeat that the only thing

that is happening here is that the physical assets are being moved from the old buildings which are now obsolete over on Merrymeeting Road the old Memorial University College - to to a new building on Ridge Road, but the concept is not changing. That is a good thing because the buildings are old and obsolete and they needed to be replaced and the College needs new quarters, Mr. Speaker. An awful lot of students have passed through the doors of that institute since we created it first back in 1963. The Marine Institute is now, Mr. Speaker, over 21 years old. Twenty-one years ago this was the great Liberal dream. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I could find words to describe the contribution that this institute has made to Newfoundland and especially to our fishing industry. We have people coming there from all over the world. That is the way it was meant to be, but it was designed and developed primarily to deal with our offshore resources, to deal with the oil, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. gentleman should not forget that the first oil rig sailed into Newfoundland waters and drilled off our coast under a Liberal administration, the SEDCO 1 I believe it was.

MR. STEWART:

How many Newfoundlanders had jobs on her?

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman was still in diapers, Mr. Speaker, he was still on the tit and bottle when the Liberal administration brought the first oil rig into this Province to drill offshore. He was still on the nipple when that happened, Mr. Speaker, and probably still is as far as we know. We know some people over there who suck their

thumbs and sulk when they cannot get their own way. This is a great Liberal concept which has provided magnificent service to the people of this Province, especially to our fishermen. Do hon. members know how many engineers and how many skippers and how many mates have graduated from that college? Every opportunity I have I attend the graduation of that Fishery College. I was there one day and I was so proud, Mr. Speaker, that I supported that project in Cabinet when I saw the youngest skipper to every get his papers, to get his certificate graduate from that college. I do not remember his name but he was in this early twenties.

MR. CALLAN:

Was that a captain?

MR. NEARY:

A captain.

MR. SIMMS:

He was still on the tit and bottle too was he?

MR. NEARY:

No, he certainly was not. He wrung more water out of his socks than the hon. gentleman ever sailed over.

MR. CALLAN:

It is probably Captain Hillier in Whitbourne. He is the youngest captain in Newfoundland.

MR. STEWART:

No. He was from Harbour Breton, Sid Hynes.

MR. NEARY:

How old was he?

MR. STEWART:

His early twenties.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, he was. I was proud. I was down to the last graduation they had there.

MR. SIMMS:

You were Leader of the Opposition in those days?

MR. NEARY:

No, I have even gone when I was just an ordinary backbencher, Mr. Speaker, the lowest form of life in this House.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to support the bill because all this is is an enlargement of a great Liberal project. We are proud of it and we should be proud of it. Hon. gentlemen should get up and crow about it, should get down on their hands and knees tonight and thank Almighty God that we had liberalism and Mr. Smallwood in this Province, and not get up and try to take the credit for this themselves. There is no credit for hon. gentlemen. The only credit they could take is the fact that they are moving it from one building to another, or one group of buildings to another group of buildings, that is the only credit they can take. It would not be possible only the Liberal Administration in Ottawa contributed \$27.5 million. So we will support the bill, Mr. Speaker, and we hope that hon. gentlemen there opposite will join us in saying, "Thank you, Mr. Smallwood, and thank you, Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador."

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

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

The hon. Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it certainly is a pleasure to find such unanimous agreement for this bill. There has not always been unanimity in this House in the last few days but certainly it is a pleasure to see it as it relates to this bill. It is good legislation, Mr. Speaker, designed to improve the educational opportunities for many persons in this Province. It is also designed besides improving the educational opportunities for some persons who want to get involved in highly technical nature of the offshore, the oil and gas and petroleum development, to provide an opportunity for many of our fishermen in the most undeveloped area of our fishery, inshore fishermen in the smallest boat, to learn things about fishing technology, to learn things about fishing harvesting procedures, to learn new methods of making traps, to learn new methods of catching, to learn new uses for navigational and other kinds of gear. So it is very important, Mr. Speaker, that it be realized, even though this new institute is going to operate in a highly technical, technologically advanced kind of field with a flume tank, with all kinds of advanced three-year programmes in navigation and petroleum development, it is also going to be a fundamental institution in this Province to help the persons who are involved in our most important and significant primary resource, our fishery.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a pleasure to be involved with this bill. It is something which is going to make a significant improvement in Newfoundland. I know the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) loves to give all the credit in all the world to all the Liberals who used to be in

Newfoundland, who used to run the government, and they certainly deserve a fair amount of credit for having some foresight in setting up a fisheries college to emphasize the fishery in Newfoundland. We have expanded on that and we are going to expand on the programmes that we are going to use in the new fisheries college, the new Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology. It is a programme whereby many persons in Newfoundland, through the programmes offered in our institute, programmes not offered any other place in Canada for some courses, can make themselves world class leaders in their field, to give them job opportunities not only within Newfoundland but within Canada and within many other parts of North America and the world in general, in the North Sea, whether it is Norway or Scotland. There are going to be job opportunities for the persons who are going to be graduating from our new Fisheries and Marine Institute.

It is a pleasure, Mr. Speaker, as I did the other day, to go up and look at the new facility, albeit it in the throes of construction. But the building itself, with over 200,000 square feet of space, is going to be used to educate the people of this Province to give them the job opportunities that exist.

It is also important that we reaffirm as a government, Mr. Speaker, the role that the rural aspects of life play in Newfoundland. Albeit the new Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology is centred in St. John's, our largest city, it is important to realize, Mr. Speaker, that it is really a rural institute. Albeit, Mr. Speaker,

we have this new institute in the largest city in the Province, it is primarily designed to emphasize the rural aspects of Newfoundland life. That is very important to us. I have difficulty sometimes dealing with the criticisms which the member for LaPoile levels at this government such as he did the other day when I and the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) went to Baie Verte in a helicopter to -

MR. NEARY:

To cut the ribbon for a beauty culture course.

MR. POWER:

- to discuss with the principal a five year plan and also to emphasize the fact that we intend to make government services and government ministers and government programmes just as available in Baie Verte and rural Newfoundland as they are up here on Ridge Road in the new institute, and as they are here on the parkway, and that we are going to make those programmes available and we are going to treat all Newfoundlanders equally when it comes to educational opportunity. We think, Mr. Speaker, that this new institute that we are opening in September, 1985, is going to be a significant improvement, a significant accomplishment and a significant opportunity for the persons of this Province who want to improve their educational abilities.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, before moving second reading, that as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned, Dr. Barrett has retired. The Premier and I just recently attended a function honouring Dr. Barrett for the valuable functions and the performance he gave to the Fisheries College over the years.

He was an exemplary gentleman who led the college, who improved it from a very fundamental sense to the very fine technological school that it is, and we wish Dr. Barrett all the luck in his retirement that he so justly deserves and we hope that Dr. Barrett will continue to contribute to the education of this Province as he has done for so so many years.

MR. NEARY:

He is a wonderful man.

MR. POWER:

Yes, he is, and he has done a very, very good job for the Fisheries College.

So, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government it gives me great pleasure to be able to move second reading of this bill for the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Establishment And Operation Of The Institute Of Fisheries And Marine Technology", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 39)

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Companies Act." (Bill No. 53)

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will be aware, a new companies act is due to be introduced in the Legislature quite soon. I make that point because this is not the major piece of legislation in the sense of company law which will be introduced. That has been under

review and under study for quite some period of time and my understanding is that it should be ready for presentation quite soon. This is an amendment to the present act which would provide that a company which is incorporated in another jurisdiction could apply to the Registrar of Companies in Newfoundland and be granted a certificate of continuance. It would also provide that a company incorporated in Newfoundland could, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, apply for continuance in another jurisdiction and if granted a certificate of continuance in that other jurisdiction be given a certificate of discontinuance by the Registrar of Companies in this Province.

So these are provisions which are found in the other provinces and in that sense it is a reciprocity arrangement to the mutual benefit of both provinces. It is also a provision which will be in the new Companies Act due to be presented in the House in the fairly near future, but what it does is provide that this reciprocity between provinces becomes operative as soon as this becomes law. As I say, a major piece of legislation, a new companies act is due to be introduced fairly soon and there have been a number of representations made and there are a few matters there on which there are differences of opinion, and the Law Society and various other people have made representations on it. But this particular bill here is not one which I would think is going to generate a great deal of debate or perhaps even interest, but it is something which will be useful and practical for a number of companies in the Province.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak very briefly on this act. As the hon. gentleman says it is the sort of procedure that we find in other provinces of Canada. It is an amendment to the Companies Act so that upon the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council companies may apply for continuance in another jurisdiction. Well that is sort of self-explanatory I suppose, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a few general questions if he does not mind. I notice today, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is rather subdued. Last night we could not shut him up. Last night he was racing back and forth across the House, he was more vocal than we have ever seen before, Mr. Speaker. He was loud and technical, sometimes humorous, Mr. Speaker, but today you can hardly hear the Minister of Justice on this side of the House. He is introducing a bill and he must have a sore throat or he must have laryngitis or something because he talked so much last night, Mr. Speaker. But, nevertheless, we enjoyed the hon. gentleman. But I want to ask the hon. gentleman a few questions. First I want to ask the hon. gentleman how the new companies act is coming along? I understand that matter has now been in the hands of a select committee of this hon. House for some considerable period of time. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. gentleman has a progress report from the chairman of the committee as to when we can expect a new companies act to be drafted

in this Province and become the law of this Province. It is long overdue, Mr. Speaker. I have said it before and I will say it again in this hon. House, that I am sick and tired of going to the Registry Office to search a company and find that the share list is overdue or find the names of the secretaries of some law firm on the share list. That practice has to cease, Mr. Speaker. I must say I want to commend the staff of the Registry office for the excellent co-operation they give us in the Opposition office when we are searching and investigating matters in relation to companies. They are very, very helpful and most co-operative with us, Mr. Speaker, and we appreciate that very much. But the problem lies not with the staff, the problem is with the Companies Act itself, the law of this Province. Let me give hon. gentlemen an indication of what I am talking about. I went down the other day - I did not go down, I sent my secretary down to get a share list on Trouty Seafoods. If hon. members have not heard the name before they may hear it in the future. A company called Trouty Seafoods was incorporated over a year and a half ago. Do you know what I discovered, Mr. Speaker? The shares are being held by Royal Trust and the share list is overdue. We have very good reason for searching that company. We happen to know that the owner received a couple of hundred thousand dollars from the administration there opposite recently, around about the same time a certain matter was going on in Long Harbour. We do not know if there is any connection but it looks awfully suspicious to us, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Innuendo.

MR. NEARY:

No, not innuendo, because one of the owners of that company, so we are told, was one of the gentlemen in the party. But we could not get to first base, Mr. Speaker. We ran right up against a dead end, a blank wall, because the individuals, the principals of these companies do not have to file a share list for a year after they are incorporated and then they can go overdue. The Registrar can send out his notification that they must file the share list or be stricken from the registry, but that takes a little time, may take four, five or six more months, and by that time they can close the company out, they can just let it be stricken from the record. That happens in a lot of cases. When the people that are researching, the investigators get hot on their trail, Mr. Speaker, they let the company then be stricken from the registry. I will bet you that I could give hon. gentlemen there opposite names now of companies, send them down to the Registry office to get the share lists of these companies and they will come back with a blank, with the names of lawyers or secretaries in lawyers' offices. Why is this practice allowed to continue, Mr. Speaker? I heard an explanation a year or so ago from a lawyer that struck me as being very flimsy, very flimsy indeed. This procedure gives the companies an opportunity to cover up the real owners, to cover up the principals. You go down and you find shares held in trust by Montreal Trust, held in trust by Royal Trust, held in trust by some law firm, some lawyer downtown. Held in trust for whom? There should be complete and full

disclosure in that Registry office and not an attempt by the principal of companies to cover up. Are they ashamed to admit that they are the owners or is there some skullduggery going on behind the scenes?

Mr. Speaker, another thing I would also recommend to the minister is that all the companies owned by individuals be put on one file, filed in one place. Right now when I want to find out, for instance, who owns Olympia Construction, who owns Viking-Sintra, who owns the company that is building the convention center, I have to get eight or ten share lists. It should all be filed under one head so that when I go in if I want to find out what companies the Tory bagman owns I should be able to find it quickly and not have to search all over the place. And half the time it is only by accident we find out the companies that are owned by the Tory bagmen, it is only an accident sometimes that we find out. We might see the name of a company in a newspaper and say, well, who owns that? That looks kind of suspicious, whoever the owner of that one is must be pretty close to the administration. He has got this contract or that contract or they have written a description that fits the product that he supplies. It is no trouble to detect it, Mr. Speaker, if you want to. Every time Newfoundland Information Services puts out a release or you pick up a newspaper, you see a different company. Metal Craft, Easteel, Olympia, Vicking-Sintra, the convention center, all owned by the Tory bagmen and all getting all kinds of patronage and all kinds of pork barreling and all kinds of favouritism from this

administration. And, Mr. Speaker, our job is very difficult. You have to have eyes in the back of your head to watch what is going on half the time. And when you get hot on their trail, then they change the name of the company, they form a new company and then you have to go through the same process again, for another year before they file their share list, another few months for the Registrar to get the notification out that they are in default, and then another few months for them to respond. And a year and a half or two years have gone by before you can get to the bottom of the situation. I thought it was only in Bermuda or in Nassau that they have offshore accounts and offshore companies, but we have it here in Newfoundland to a certain degree. You might say, Mr. Speaker, that in Newfoundland you can have an offshore company it takes you so long to find out who the principles are, who the owners are and it is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. If we had a computerized system, if we had new technology in the Registry Office for searching and the like, we would be able to get the information instantaneously. Now we have to go scrabbling around for days and weeks before we can get the information.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what improvements are planned. I commend the staff down there. They are working under very difficult conditions, they are very co-operative and helpful, I commend them, but I would like to see the system brought into the modern day world, Mr. Speaker, so that when we do go chasing after the scoundrels and the rogues who are fattening at the public trough, who are getting the government contracts, the fat

pigs.

MR. TULK:

Who squeals for them?

MR. NEARY:

Well, we have a fat pig in this House who can squeal for them, the demagogue, the cynic who brought in this closure resolution today in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker. A rotten stinker. Closure would only be brought in by a stinker, Mr. Speaker, or a pig that lost its squeal. So, Mr. Speaker, they had their spokesman in this House.

MR. TULK:

Who are you referring to?

MR. NEARY:

I am referring to the cynic, the demagogue who brought in the closure motion in this House. Demagogue may be unparliamentary, so I withdraw it. But certainly I think it is parliamentary to say that the pig has nothing left but a squeal. It is obscene what we saw happen here this afternoon. But they have their spokesman here in the House. If we are going to do our job as elected representatives of the people, then we should be able to do our homework, our research, Mr. Speaker, smoothly and accurately, and we should be able to come up with information instantaneously and it should be accurate information. But nobody should be allowed to hide behind the fact that a law firm can put secretaries names on a share list. What foolish nonsense! There is no justification for it. Lawyers can argue all they like, 'Well, they need a little time, you know, to sell the shares in the company or to get their terms of incorporation in.' Mr. Speaker, what a gigantic bluff. Lawyers are trained I think for

one purpose and one purpose only, with all due respect to my learned friends, and that is to figure out loopholes, ways to get around the law, and that is a way to get around the law, Mr. Speaker. So they flick in their secretaries' names. I have gone down there in the Registry Office and come up with the names of little innocent girls. If they only knew, Mr. Speaker, the companies that their names were put on the share list of, and if they only knew that they would be liable for any claims against that company. I presume they would be. Is that correct, my learned friend, that they would be responsible for the claims?

MR. BARRY:
No comment.

MR. NEARY:
I cannot even get a bit of free legal advice.

I see girls and fellows, I meet them every day, and then all of a sudden it clicks in my mind and I say, 'Her name is on a share list of So-and-So company. I wonder does she know it and does she realize the implications of it?' I have used this argument in this hon. House before, Mr. Speaker. I do not think my remarks fell on deaf ears because at least we do have a select committee of the House looking at drafting a new companies act. I do not know how far the work has progressed, I would like to find that out from the hon. gentleman. I would like to find out too from the hon. gentleman what they intend to do to improve the facilities on the ground floor and bring the Registry office up into the light of day. It is now shoved down in the basement of Confederation Building, bring it up into the

light of day so that any ordinary Newfoundland can go in and search and see who owns this and who owns that and search his deed if he wants to. If you are buying a piece of property you should be able to search it yourself and not go and have to pay a fortune to lawyers to do it for you. What are they, trained real estate agents, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Yes, but you can do that now.

MR. NEARY:
You can do it, but how many ordinary people know how to do it? Therein lies the problem. Most people are scared, are afraid, are nervous about going near the Registry office. Somehow or other they have this conception about the Registry office that it is a legal jungle. I am not afraid of it, I go in and out there all the time.

MR. REID:
That is the height of bull.

MR. NEARY:
What is the height of bull?

MR. REID:
That is.

MR. NEARY:
Now the hon. gentleman can afford a lawyer. The hon. gentleman does not go down and do his own searching, he would not know how.

MR. REID:
I am too choosey.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman's truck, overloaded, goes down through a wharf over in Trinity Bay, I am sure that he has to get a lawyer to bail him out, to come to his rescue.

MR. REID:

No way.

MR. NEARY:

He just says, 'Well, the federal government are responsible because they did not build a wharf strong enough to hold up my overloaded truck.' So down she goes through the wharf. I am sure the hon. gentleman now risks having a claim made against his company, should one of his bulldozers, Mr. Speaker, go bottom up or his sander skids off the road or hits a car, I am sure the hon. gentleman handles all the legal work himself. He is such a brain, Mr. Speaker. Do you know what the hon. gentleman should do? We should set up another department over here at Memorial University and we should call it the Conflict of Interest Department and we should make the hon. gentleman the chief instructor in that department. He should have a group of students from Tory firms doing business with the government, Tory firms that are feeding at the public trough, and he could take them in and explain how to avoid conflict of interest. The hon. gentleman could write a textbook on that himself, guaranteed.

Mr. Speaker, we are too kind to the hon. gentleman. Maybe in future we may not be so kind to the hon. gentleman.

MR. REID:

I will be more than kind to you too.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, there you go, another threat. If it was 4:00 o'clock this morning no doubt they would be in fighting for him, they would probably be over here now wrestling me to the floor. It

would not be the first time they wanted to do that. Mr. Speaker, the whole trouble is -

MR. REID:

I will go over now if you want me.

MR. NEARY:

Well, come on! Come on over!

MR. REID:

Come outside!

MR. NEARY:

'Outside', There you go! That is the only language they understand, Mr. Speaker, barroom talk. That is not House of Assembly talk.

MR. TULK:

That is what he understands, barroom talk.

MR. REID:

You invited me.

MR. NEARY:

That is the kind of stuff you would hear on the Bowery down in New York, Mr. Speaker. The Bowery or down in the taverns is where you would hear that kind of talk, not here in the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!:

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Why does the hon. gentleman not go and take a course in public speaking and come into the House and enter into the debates, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BARRY:

Gerry, what is next?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Collection agencies.

MR. NEARY:
Collection Agencies. I am anxious to get on to that one, so we can dispose of this one quickly. I do not know if I can entice my hon. and learned friend to enter into this debate on the Companies Act.

MR. BARRY:
We have said it all in the draft act already.

MR. NEARY:
I have said it all?

MR. BARRY:
No, I have said it all in the draft act already.

MR. NEARY:
Is the hon. gentleman on that committee?

MR. BARRY:
I drafted it.

MR. NEARY:
The hon. gentleman drafted it? Well, if the hon. gentleman drafted it, now I am beginning to get faith in human nature again. I would submit if the hon. gentleman had a hand in drafting it, then it must be a good draft bill.

MR. BARRY:
Not this one now, but the one that is before the Committee.

MR. NEARY:
The one that is before the Committee, that is the one I am talking about. I look forward to getting that draft bill, Mr. Speaker, so that I can see if these loopholes are being plugged. I suppose the hon. gentleman would not be breaching a confidence if he told me whether these loopholes are going to be plugged, where principals, owners of companies, have to file their

share list, that we can find out the real owners of companies in a specified period of time?

MR. BARRY:
I pointed out the problem and I left the government to make their choice.

MR. NEARY:
Well, we know what conniving individuals they are and how they will skirt around it. They still want their buddies to remain anonymous. They want the principals of the companies to remain anonymous, they do not want us to find out who they are. Can you imagine? I was hot on the trail of the biggest group who receive patronage and favours from this administration; Olympia, Easteel, Metro, the Convention Centre, Viking-Sintra, Viking, and God only knows how many more tentacles they have, how many more companies they have that we do not know about that are getting favours from the administration there opposite. That is six I mentioned there, six companies owned by the same group of individuals or the same individual, and we have to go in six different directions, and sometimes it is only by sheer accident that we find out who they are. That is not good enough, Mr. Speaker, when we are trying to protect the public treasury!

MR. TOBIN:
It was never so good before.

MR. NEARY:
And we will eventually get to the bottom of Trouty Seafoods. We will eventually find out who owns Trouty Seafoods. Mr. Speaker, I tell you, something that really irritates me and annoys me to no end is the fact that - let us take Trouty Seafoods as an example:

Trouty Seafoods will come to the Newfoundland Government for a guarantee, and the ministry will sit around the table and they will give a guarantee to Trouty Seafoods, and when I go down to the Registry office to see who they are, I find their shares are held by Royal Trust. In other words, the ministry are giving loans and guarantees to companies and they do not know who the real owners are. No wonder we are accusing them of favouritism and patronage!

We had an example in this House only two weeks ago when I questioned the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) in connection with a company that got a contract on the Burin hospital. The reason we were given by the minister - the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) should listen to this - the Minister of Public Works told us that the reason they got the contract was because they were a local company. And I asked, "What about the other companies? Who owns the other companies?" - the hon. gentleman should remember - "Who owns the other companies?." He said, "I do not know and it is none of my business." After just telling me the procedure used by the Cabinet to funnel this contract to the Tory bagman, on local preference, we were told.

MR. TOBIN:
That is true.

MR. NEARY:
I asked the Minister of Public Works, "Who owns the company?" The hon. gentleman should have been here if he was not here.

MR. TOBIN:
I was here.

MR. NEARY:
He said, "It is none of my business. I do not care who owns the company."

MR. TOBIN:
He does not care about the names of the companies as long as they are Newfoundlanders.

MR. NEARY:
Oh, I see. Well, how do we know it was a Newfoundland company if he did not go and check the share list?

MR. TOBIN:
Probably he did.

MR. NEARY:
I asked him and he said no. Mr. Speaker, he said, it is none of my business. I do not want to know who owns these companies.

MR. RIDEOUT:
No more it was not, it was the Minister of Development's (Mr. Windsor) business.

MR. NEARY:
It was the Minister of Public Works who let the contract.

Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. gentleman, "Who owns the other companies?" He said, "I do not know and it is none of my business." Yet, he argued that the contract was let because of local involvement and local preference. What a heap of garbage that is! They can find a formula anytime they want. They have opened up the public tendering procedure and now there are enough holes in it that you can drive one of the hon. gentleman's bulldozers through it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

They have opened it up now, Mr. Speaker, so that they can use whatever formula they want, they can devise new ways and means and formulas to give the Tory bagman and supporters all the contracts they want.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. REID:

What about John C. Doyle and Valdmanis and that crowd? What happened to all that crowd? To stand up there and talk like that this afternoon, How ridiculous!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, where has the hon. gentleman been all his life? Has he been down under a truck or a bulldozer hid away somewhere, or has he been down trying to get his truck up out of the hole that he made in the wharf over in Trinity Bay?

MR. REID:

To what a waste of tongue!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman could only get up and make a speech like I can.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I need the protection of the Chair against the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope that the hon. the minister can provide the House with some information on the matters that I have raised. These are very serious matters, they are not just to be skimmed over and brushed aside. They are very serious matters indeed. There is

no justification for people not putting their names on the share list right from the time the company is formed. Now, the hon. gentleman will get up and use the age-old argument, the traditional argument; I can hear him now getting up and saying, 'Oh, well, we cannot do that. It is virtually impossible to do it.'

MR. TOBIN:

By the way, that is not the first contract for the Burin hospital.

MR. CALLAN:

No, Frank Moores let one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

I am not surprised, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the first contract. We had three sod-turning ceremonies down there.

MR. TOBIN:

That is right, your leader, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), called one.

MR. NEARY:

The biggest make-work project they had on the Burin Peninsula for three elections was building platforms and grandstands for the Premier to get up on to cut a ribbon or turn a sod to build the hospital on the Burin Peninsula.

MR. TOBIN:

Who was the member who built a platform to let a contract for (inaudible)?

MR. NEARY:

My hon. colleague is the father of the hospital on the Burin Peninsula.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anything that I have not

said. Can my hon. colleague think of anything that I have left out, that I meant to say about this bill? Did I leave anything out? Can my hon. colleague think of anything that he would like to add while we are debating this?

MR. BARRY:

I think you have done a pretty good job and you have covered everything.

MR. NEARY:

Thank you. I want to repeat the main point again, not for the benefit of hon. gentlemen on our side, Mr. Speaker, but for the benefit of hon. gentlemen there opposite, who sometimes are not listening; it may sound repetitious, but you have to keep repeating things. Mr. Smallwood used to keep repeating things for a purpose, and I keep repeating them for a purpose. I know the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook) understands and is listening to what I am saying, and the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) is hanging onto every word that I say. I know the member for Trinity/Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid) understands because he keeps interrupting me. He knows every detail. He understands exactly what I am talking about. He is an expert at searching in the Registry office. He is an expert on the Companies Act. So I am not worried about the hon. gentleman. But I am concerned about some of the hon. ministers and members directly opposite me that they may not get the message.

And what is the message? The message is that people are hiding behind the law. They are using the law to hide. They are hiding behind the Companies Act. They are too ashamed to come out and put their name on a share list.

Why not? They are hiding behind the law. The law needs to be changed, and the sooner it is changed, in my opinion, the better.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The last speaker, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) raised some questions about the Committee for the Companies Act established by this House. And rather than let the minister answer that, since he has not been directly involved with the Committee, I will reply.

I would just like to inform the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that the Committee is presently working on the new Companies Act. In November we had a public hearing in which we were presented with briefs by the St. John's Board of Trade, the Institute of Chartered Accountants, the Certified General Accountants, and we also had a written brief submitted by the Newfoundland Medical Association concerning different parts of the act.

A lot of the points that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) raised are reasonable, I guess, or some of them are reasonable when he was dealing with the Companies Act. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, a report on the new act was prepared by him. And at this time I would like to thank him for providing the Committee with some of his valuable time last November to sit down with us and give us an explanation of what he had in mind when he was preparing his report on this new act.

In the new act there will be very

stringent and direct obligations for directors. It will not be as easy and probably would be impossible for the situation that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned where secretaries names will go on a share list. For anyone to allow his name to go as a director of companies from now on, would probably leave him open to two weeks wages for employees on shutdowns. There are many things in our new act -

MR. STEWART:

Probably now, he never said it was.

MR. AYLWARD:

- which would improve the present situation. The present act is based on an English law that I believe was passed in 1899, so it is no wonder there can be trouble. Our act has been amended many times, but there is a complete change in philosophy for our new act to bring it more in line with the federal government act that exist now, the Canada Act, and the acts in different provinces. It will make it easier for companies to incorporate, particularly smaller businesses. They can incorporate on their own, one shareholder, one person can form a company under this new act.

As I said there are a lot of personal liabilities for the directors, so if you allow your name to stand as a director of a company you would want to study the act very carefully. There are very stringent audit obligations in this new act.

MR. NEARY:

Good. I am glad to hear it.

MR. AYLWARD:

There well be very strong protection for minority shareholders. All of these things

are in the new philosophy of the new act.

So far we have had one public meeting, as I said. We have had some briefs presented. The Committee now is studying those briefs. Early in January, I would say, the first week, if not the second week, we will be receiving briefs from the Newfoundland Law Society and the Canadian Bar Association. To the best of our knowledge, these will be the last briefs that will be sent to the Committee. And we will be sitting then in private to prepare the act and we hope to have it presented to the House very early in our Spring session. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, there is certainly very little for me to say after the very informative contribution of the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) who is Chairman of the Select Committee. And I am sure that under his leadership the Committee will come in with an excellent report which will be presented to the House. And, of course, the Committee is made up of members on both sides of the House, as is the custom with select committees here. I would assume that it will be an unanimous recommendation. I have no way of knowing that, but I assume that would be the case. So certainly I think that will be a major step forward.

To reply to just a few matters that the hon. member for LaPolie (Mr. Neary) referred to; with respect to the location of the

Registry, it is in the basement of the Confederation Building.

MR. NEARY:

Where will it be in the new building?.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I am not sure where its location will be in the new building. I can check on that. There is no doubt it is quite cramped now for space. The problem with these places is each year there are more and more documents and more and more files. However, I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman's reference to the co-operation he received from the staff of the Registry of Companies. I certainly concur. I think Mr. Gillies, the new registrar there, and all his staff are hard working and efficient and co-operative with everybody, all members of the general public.

With respect to searching for a title, to the best of my knowledge, and I am not quite sure of this, there is nothing now to prohibit people from doing their own search.

MR. NEARY:

They do not know how..

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Well, that is a complication of it, they may not know how to go about it. I would say that incidents where a property or a house is being bought and there is a mortgage or something like that, then you are going to have the mortgage company wanting to have total legal security and they will probably, therefore, do it through a law firm. Of course, there are a number of people now who are searchers, who do the title searching in some cases, I suppose, for firms, in some case

for individuals.

However, I do believe that many, hopefully all the problems which people are experiencing in that area will be resolved with the new Companies Act. I look forward to the report of that select committee, which I understand from the Chairman should be forthcoming fairly soon. I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Companies Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave. (Bill No. 53).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting Collection Agencies And Collectors". (Bill 38).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

It is my pleasure to introduce Bill 38 respecting collection agencies and collectors. This bill repeals and replaces the existing Collection Agencies Act. The main thrust of this bill is to licence collectors. The existing legislation licences collection agencies only and does not cover individual collectors.

This new bill will regulate their conduct and responsibility, and it will provide for annual registration of both collectors and collection agencies. It will provide for renewal of registration, and it will provide for amendments and regulations for greater consumer protection.

This new bill, Mr. Speaker, is the result of complaints referred to

our Department of Consumer Affairs and Communications which indicated that certain collectors were using intimidating and harrasing tactics in the collection of debts. The licencing of collectors would facilitate the removal and the cancellation or suspension of a collector's licence when the act or the regulations have been contravened, or where in the opinion of the registrar it would be in the public interest to do so. Mr. Speaker, historically when a number of complaints against an individual collector have been brought to the attention of our department, and subsequently, of course, to the attention of the employing collection agency, the collector has been dismissed from that particular job, only, of course, to obtain employment with another collection agency and so was able to continue his or her harrasing and intimidating tactics.

Our ability to control the tactics used by certain collectors have resulted in media comment, comment by the general public, and I think there has also been comments by the members of the House of Assembly as well. We find that provinces that presently require registration and licencing of collectors have noted distinct improvement in collection practices and a decrease in complaints and this of course has resulted from the awareness of collectors that a loss of licence means loss of a job.

This new act will not present problems for the majority of collectors or collection agencies operating in our Province at the present time, but it will control the behaviour of those who employ less than ethical practices. The

changes in the bill, Mr. Speaker, are as follows, and I will go into these in detail so that we will understand it better. Section 2 (IX): This new section is provided to accommodate collection agencies selling collection schemes in the form of letters or notices to creditors enabling creditors to collect their own debts. Section 2 (b) defines a collector. Section 13 covers responsibilities and conduct of collectors and states that he or she must be registered as a collector as should be the agency for which that person will be working. And section 14 (2), Mr. Speaker, governs registration of collectors and states that an application for registration must include with it a notice of consent for employment from the collection agency for whom that collector will be working. Section 15, Mr. Speaker, provides for annual registration of collectors as well as collection agencies, which is not in the existing act. Section 17 (a) requires collection agencies to notify the registrar of changes in address or telephone number. And section 17 (b) requires the collection agency to notify the registrar of the commencement or the termination of employment as a collector. Section 17 (3) requires collectors also to notify the registrar of change of address for service and commencement or termination of employment. Section 18 provides for renewal of registration, and this is not in the existing act. Section 19 (2) provides for the addition of collectors to the act. Section 21 requires a collection agency to maintain a permanent place of business in the Province which will be open to the general public during normal business hours. And other sections in the act provide

also for the addition of collectors. Section 21 (b) requires that trust accounts be maintained in a financial institution. The former requirement was merely a chartered bank. And this amendment will provide for other depository sources such as credit unions, etc. Section 31 (s) provides for fees on renewal of registration. And section 32 (2) covers existing registration as being valid until March 31 next, following the commencement of the new act.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the important changes in the new act and there will be regulations of course which this act authorizes. I seek the concurrence of the members of this hon. House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that was a very good presentation by the minister. We support the principle of having controls on the tactics that are employed in the process of collecting debts. We have to realize and recognize that the more difficult it becomes in any jurisdiction to collect a debt, the harder it becomes then for individuals to obtain credit in that jurisdiction, and the more reluctant are individuals or companies to invest money in the Province or in the area where those restrictions on the ability to collect are placed. But we also all subscribe to the principles, I believe, that there is a limit beyond which collection agents and collection agencies should not go. I have in the course of practicing law experienced on a number of occasions where individuals have

been harassed - that is the only word for it - have been subjected to harassment by individuals employed by agencies which had debts passed over to them for collection. There is no question that we have to have some means of controlling these tactics. The method employed by the act of requiring registration is, in my view, an appropriate one.

Now the extent to which the act can be enforced is another question. I think it is something that may be difficult to enforce. It will depend upon the efficiency of the minister's department as to whether this becomes an act with real teeth in it or whether it becomes just another statute that is on the books that is not being enforced.

I would just like to briefly mention something else that perhaps the minister and her department might consider with respect to collections. We have seen various provinces out West at differing times and again quite recently - I believe it was the Province of Alberta but I do not remember for sure - bring in legislation to protect people from losing their farms by creating a moratorium through legislation. Because of this time of recession, there is serious concern about the number of farmers who are losing their family farms in many cases. There is a procedure set up where someone who has loaned money to a farmer can still collect but he has to take certain steps beforehand; he has to make application to a court and he has to satisfy the court that no reasonable arrangement can be made with the debtor to permit a payment over a period of time. You see, if a debt is owing, a bank or another financial

institution or an individual is entitled to claim the full amount of the money in one fell swoop, and in law, as things stand, without that type of legislation they are entitled to all of their money. Now there have been many occasions where individuals have gotten into a cash flow problem; they have had sufficient assets, but because of a decline in the real estate market or a decline in the market for whatever they are selling, they have what might be considered a temporary cash flow problem and a financial institution decides to go in and pull the plug and demand the full amount of the loan immediately. Now perhaps the minister might give some consideration, in a time of unemployment - maybe only in particular areas of the Province where unemployment - is higher than other parts - tying the ability of institutions to come in and immediately collect upon a particular debt to the level of unemployment in a particular area when it comes to the loss of the family home. I do not think it can apply to commercial type operations, but when it comes to the loss of the family home perhaps it is time that we consider a provision whereby there is some protection so that the individual does not have the home pulled out from underneath him. This could apply where it is the matter of the full amount of the loan being demanded, where if he had the opportunity to go before court he could show that he could make reasonable provision for payment, and where any reasonable lender should be prepared to, at minimal risk, continue the extension of the line of credit on the understanding that the full payment could not be made but a reasonable payment over a period of time could be made. Now I say

that with the qualification and with the very clear concern raised that if carried too far this type of legislation can discourage lenders from loaning money to individuals for the purchase of a home. We do not want to get the type of legislation that is going to do that. What we are looking for is a reasonable balance. What we are looking is something to cover the situation where individuals are caught, through no fault of their own, in a situation such as took place in Labrador West where you had large-scale layoffs and you had individuals, who had their money invested in their homes, left with no prospect of employment. I believe in many cases arrangements were made for these individuals. I am not saying that they were tossed out in street overnight but the employees of the companies were treated one way and I believe other individuals were treated another way. So I would make a suggestion to the minister that she give some consideration to taking a look at what is being done in the case of the farms out West and taking a look at whether that would have any impact upon the amount of capital that would be invested for loaning in the Province and provided that it does not limit the amount of credit that men and women in this Province would have access to then it maybe that some such form of legislation might be a worthwhile step and that we might be able to see families maintain a home who under current laws, under the current hard economic situation often end up on the street having to rent apartments, and often having to raise more money in order to provide accommodations for themselves than they would if the mortgage were renewed - but the mortgage is often not renewed

because they are no longer employed. Often the result is that government ends up, whether through subsidized housing programmes or sometimes just straight social assistance, having to meet the accommodation needs of families. We all know the horrendous stories about the cost of people who end up being put up at hotels because they are out on the street with children. What can government do? They have to be accommodated, you cannot turn your back on people in a crisis situation. Maybe if we had some sort of legislation such as I mentioned it might be that we could reduce the amount of expenditure and cost to government, reduce the dislocation of families from family homes without impairing the amount of credit that might be available to individuals in this Province.

So I would ask the minister to give some serious thought to this type of arrangement. Other than those few comments, I indicate that we will be supporting this legislation.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

My colleague made some very valid points and he made them well, Mr. Speaker, and I do not wish to detract from anything that my colleague said. I am sure the hon. the minister will reply to my hon. learned friend when she stands to close second reading of this bill.

I do want to have my little annual dart at the collection agencies, Mr. Speaker. I am glad, by the

way, that the minister is tightening up the laws of this land. Collecting money can be a pretty dirty business and some of the tactics and the strategy used by collection agencies and by collectors, Mr. Speaker, sometimes leaves an awful lot to be desired. They use some dirty tricks to collect money and I hope that this bill, the changes that are now being made, will help remedy some of that situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are living in an age where we are using plastic money. We have almost reached that stage now, Mr. Speaker, when the old greenbacks are not acceptable any more. That is true. If you have not got a credit card, if you do not have a Visa or a Mastercard they think you are the lowest form of life. They think you are from outer space somewhere. You go in and they say, 'How are you paying your bill?' 'I would like to pay my bill in cash.' They say, 'What? Cash? What is that? Have you not got a credit card?' Up to about four or five months ago I resisted credit cards. I finally had to succumb and get a credit card.

MR. SIMMS:

What did you do run out of money?

MR. NEARY:

No, it was not a matter of running out of money, it was a matter of sometimes being embarrassed. You find yourself standing at a hotel desk registering and they say to you, 'How are you paying your bill?' You say, 'I am paying by cash.' 'Well, have you got a credit card?' 'No, I do not have a credit card, if I had a credit card I would not be paying by cash.' 'Well, I am sorry, Sir, we have to have some form of identification.' 'Well,' I said,

'I will give you a driver's licence or I will give you a birth certificate.' 'No, Sir, I am sorry, we need a credit card.'

In one situation I was with a colleague of mine and he had to give his credit card number so that I could get registered at the hotel.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, by the way, before I go any further, in connection with the memorandum that I have here in front of me that hon. gentlemen there opposite were good enough to pass on to me from John McLennon, MHA. He says, 'If the provincial Cabinet does not travel to Corner Brook on Wednesday, December 12, 1984 as scheduled for the signing of the Kruger agreement our regular caucus meeting will be going ahead. The meeting will be tomorrow, December 12, 1984, in the Cabinet Room on the eight floor.'

'I would also like to remind all members that the Premier's get together is tonight at 8:00 p.m. in the Princess Room at Elizabeth Towers.'

MR. SIMMS:

I do not think that was meant for you..

MR. NEARY:

I do not know. It says, 'Sincerely, John McLennon.' I finally found out his name, Mr. Speaker. I would like to lay this on the table of the House and tell the hon. gentleman while I appreciate it very much I have to decline the offer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. the member who introduced this bill if the minister is aware that Gander Radio is to be closed by Mr. Wilson's restraint programme? Five will be laid off in St. John's, five in Corner Brook, five in Labrador City and Gander radio station to be closed.

MR. SIMMS:

Have you heard of any in Grand Falls?

MR. NEARY:

I do not think there are any in Grand Falls. Five are to be laid off in St. John's, five in Corner Brook, five in Labrador City and the Gander radio station to be closed. Now, Mr. Speaker, do we hear any protests from hon. gentlemen there opposite? Do we hear any demands now of Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! I wish to remind the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that we are discussing Bill No. 38 and I believe that he is straying rather far from the particular issue.

MR. NEARY:

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, of what we are discussing and I thank Your Honour for drawing it to my attention. But these people, these twenty or twenty-five individuals will now become a part of the unemployed in this Province. They will join the other eighty or ninety thousand Newfoundlanders who are unemployed. And then, Mr. Speaker, what happens when they become unemployed? In a year or so when they cannot meet their mortgage payments, they cannot pay

the bills that were incurred with the plastic money, they will have somebody coming around all hours of the night knocking on their doors, dropping letters in the hands of infants and teenagers, give them a letter and then scoot because they would not have the courage to stand their ground themselves, and they will be calling up saying, 'Do you realize that your mother or your father owes a bill down here?' Half the time they do not know who they are talking to, it could be a stranger answering the phone in the house. This is the sort of treatment that we are getting from these collection agencies and from collectors, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

You are delaying things.

MR. NEARY:

No, I am not. I am going to be very brief on this because I am getting rather tired today. Even though I went home at four o'clock this morning, there comes a time in every man's life when you get drained of your energy and I feel this evening like I have been drained of my energy. I may have Winter in my hair but I have Summer in my heart. There is a lot of life left here yet.

MR. SIMMS:

We know that.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman is aware of that. I will not be taking in the party tonight. You can bring a doggie bag in for me tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, this matter of collection agencies is a pretty serious business and I am happy to see that some measures are being taken to put the clamps on these people who harass individuals the way they do. I suppose you can

pass all the legislation you want, you can pass all the laws that you want, but these shysters, these schemers, will find a way to get around it, they will find a way to harass people. You know, the temptation to get in debt today, Mr. Speaker, is awfully, awfully great. There is a great temptation. When you have that old plastic money, that credit card, you think you can have everything you want. Nobody ever looks forward to the day of reckoning but it does come. And then, Mr. Speaker, the human factors, the human elements are ignored. It is then a hard-nosed business: You have your television, you have your radio, you have your car, you have your washing machine, you have your skidoo, you have your all-terrain vehicle, you have your motor bike, and now you have to pay for it. And then you figure, well, let me see, how am I going to arrange my budget? How am I going to arrange my budget so that I can pay for it? Then all of a sudden somebody comes along and says, 'Listen, buddy, we are not concerned about how you arrange your budget. You owe this money and you had better pay it or else. You had better pay it or we are going to seize your property, we are going to seize your home.' They have threatened to take people's homes.

MR. SIMMS:

I do not think so.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, indeed they have, and poor, ordinary people do not know the difference.

MR. MORGAN::

Where is the MHA for Strait of Belle Isle today?

MR. NEARY:

He is out researching.

MR. BARRY:

Are they going to use collection agencies for the retail sales tax I wonder?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, they are completely without scruples. Now maybe that is the nature of the business, maybe you have to be tough, maybe you have to be hard in that business. You know, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), now that he has some time on his hands, I believe by nature he is naturally built to be a collector. If he wants to pick up a few extra dollars, if he wants to supplement his income I think he is a natural for the job. Maybe he is not, maybe down deep inside the hon. gentleman is soft and kind hearted. Maybe he is, Mr. Speaker, I do not know. He puts up a good front and on the surface it would appear that he would make a good collector.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

He is a very kind hearted person.

MR. NEARY:

I will tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, he should have continued his career in singing. Voices in the Wind - he can strum a guitar and he can sign country and western songs.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if we can ever plug all the loopholes. It is pretty hard to legislate moral principles, it is very hard to do it. You can take a horse to water but it is very difficult to make him drink.

MR. SIMMS:

I thought the member was going to conclude.

MR. NEARY:

I am. Now, to conclude and finish, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we could say that we have made some progress. But these people are pretty cute, you know. They harass people and they always make accusations and charges when there are no witnesses, and they make them to people who they know they will let them away with it. They can make their phone calls. You cannot see who is on the other end, you cannot drive your fist into the mouthpiece of the phone as you feel like doing. The day will come when we will have television on telephones. You will be able to pick up your phone, look at the screen and be able to see who is calling you. Mr. Speaker, it is a dirty, dirty business and I suppose somebody has to do it. But these people should not be shovelling out the credit they way they do. They push it at you, they tell you you can have anything you want. No wonder shoplifting is so prevalent in society today, because the goods are all put out in front of you and if you are unemployed, your cheque did not arrive, and you are walking along and see a tube of toothpaste or a razor or a loaf of bread or a roast of meat or something, what is your first inclination, Mr. Speaker, if your children are going to school half hungry and half cold and wet? What would you do? What would hon. gentlemen do if they were driven to desperation? The point I am making - there is no excuse for it - but the temptation is there. We have the ten commandments. I suppose the Old Testament was written to protect people and their property. We have the ten commandments, 'Thou shalt not steal.'

MR. BAIRD:

Do not waste the time of the House.

MR. NEARY:

If the hon. gentleman has a contribution to make to this debate, let him get up.

MR. BAIRD:

You were home in bed when I made mine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear the hon. gentleman's views on collection agencies and people who collect money.

MR. BAIRD:

I do not know anything about them. I pay my bills. You do the same and you will have less trouble.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I am almost tempted now to sit down after a vicious attack like that, I am almost tempted to take my seat. As a matter of fact, I think I will because I cannot take it any longer.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

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

The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

Mr. Speaker, I do thank the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) for the points he made. I have taken notes of thme and I am sure it is something that we will look at in the future to determine if there is a necessity for legislation of

that kind, a protection of that kind here in Newfoundland. But, of course, the bill that we are dealing with now covers the behaviour and the responsibility of collectors and collection agencies, and it does not have anything to do with what the hon. Leader was talking about. But I do appreciate what he said. Certainly it is something that I will discuss with my staff and probably we can do something about it in the future.

My hon. colleague, with the news that he has just given me, made me feel so heartsick that I do not really feel like responding to this bill right now, but I would like to say to him that I have been fighting for the retention of the Gander Station, CBG. I will continue to do so. I have not given up yet and I hope that we will be able to resolve that problem.

MR. NEARY:

We will do everything we can to help you.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

Mr. Speaker, in replying to the way creditors or debtors are being treated in the courts, I know that in our department we do have legislation controlling how much money can be attached from a debtor's wages when his accounts are taken to court. They cannot take all of this money.

I am really pleased, too, with the Small Claims Court because it seems that the judges give very reasonable attention to the ability of a debtor to pay. And we also have here in the City of St. John's, and I wish we had them in other centres in Newfoundland, a credit counselling service. They are doing an absolutely

wonderful job. I met with them just this morning. When a person goes to them with his problems - he has nowhere else to go, he is absolutely overburdened and cannot see any way out - then this credit counselling service will talk with his creditors and will explain to him how to manage his money and get all of the creditors together and agree to accept so much on account. Then the debtor is advised how he or she must put aside a certain amount of money, make out the cheques and take them to the counselling service and the counselling service makes sure that the creditor gets this money. As a matter of fact, just a few days ago I received a letter from a very, very grateful lady in St. John's, and she said, 'For heaven's sake do not ever, ever stop funding your Credit Counselling Service.' She said, it saved her life, and without it she may have committed suicide. So we do have ways and means of helping people. We do it the best way we can. I do not think there is very much else I can say about the bill. I have explained the changes and amendments. Mr. Speaker, I recommend second reading. Thank you.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting Collection Agencies and Collectors", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 38).

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now adjourn until 3:00 P.M. tomorrow afternoon.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 12, at 3:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

December 11, 1984

*Table 1 by the Hon. The
Premier in reply to
Question, 11 Dec. '84*

ADDRESS

BY THE

HONOURABLE A. BRIAN PECKFORD,

PREMIER OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

AT A LUNCHEON

SPONSORED BY THE

P.C. ASSOCIATION OF ST. JOHN'S WEST

LESTER HOTEL

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 28TH, 1984

I AM VERY GRATEFUL TO THE P.C. ASSOCIATION OF ST. JOHN'S WEST FOR ASKING ME TO ADDRESS YOU. IT IS APPROPRIATE THAT THE P.C. ASSOCIATION SHOULD ORGANIZE AN EVENT SUCH AS THIS. I KNOW OF NO OTHER PARTY AT THIS TIME IN CANADIAN HISTORY THAT BETTER REFLECTS THE ASPIRATIONS AND HOPES OF CANADIANS AS DOES THE P.C. PARTY. THE FACT THAT WE HAVE SEVEN P.C. PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS, CALL IT EIGHT IF YOU INCLUDE B.C.'S SOCIAL CREDIT GOVERNMENT AND A NEWLY ELECTED P.C. GOVERNMENT AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL, IS AMPLE EVIDENCE OF THE WAY PEOPLE ARE THINKING IN CANADA TODAY AND THE DIRECTION THEY WANT THEIR RESPECTIVE PROVINCES AND THE NATION AS A WHOLE TO GO FORWARD IN THE FUTURE.

THE ELECTION OF THE MULRONEY P.C. GOVERNMENT PRESENTS AN AUSPICIOUS OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL CANADIANS. FROM MY VANTAGE POINT, ONE KEY RESULT IS THAT OUR PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS WILL NOW BE ABLE TO CARRY OUT THEIR MANDATES IN

A CLIMATE OF HARMONY AND CO-OPERATION. I CAN TELL YOU TODAY THAT BEING ABLE TO WORK IN THIS KIND OF ATMOSPHERE, BEING ABLE TO WORK OUT PROBLEMS THROUGH CONSULTATION AND WITH MUTUAL RESPECT IS SOMETHING WHICH ONLY SOMEONE WHO HAS ENDURED THE CONFRONTATIONAL POLITICS OF THE PAST FIVE YEARS CAN TRULY APPRECIATE. THIS NEW SPIRIT OF CO-OPERATION BETWEEN GOVERNMENTS AT ALL LEVELS WILL PAY TREMENDOUS DIVIDENDS FOR GOVERNMENT AND FOR ALL CANADIANS.

AS PREMIER AND AS MINISTER OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, I KNOW WHAT A DEBILITATING EXPERIENCE IT IS WHEN IT BECOMES ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO OBTAIN PROGRESS ON VIRTUALLY ANYTHING AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL WITHOUT CONFRONTATION, WITHOUT A FIGHT. IT IS NOT A GOOD EXPERIENCE KNOWING THAT BECAUSE YOU'RE JUST A PROVINCIAL PREMIER, YOU ARE BLUNTLY REGARDED AS IRREVELANT AND AN OBSTACLE TO FEDERALLY PERCEIVED SUPERIOR NATIONAL OBJECTIVES.

CONFRONTATION AS A STRATEGY FOR SOLVING CANADA'S POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC WILLS HAS BEEN PUT TO THE TEST AND IT HAS BEEN A FAILURE. CANADIANS KNOW THIS BETTER THAN ANYONE. ALL THEY HAVE TO DO IS LOOK AT THE FEDERAL DEFICIT, THE STATE OF THE CANADIAN ECONOMY AND THE LEVEL OF UNEMPLOYMENT. HENCEFORTH, I WOULD SUGGEST ISSUES OF PUBLIC DEBATE WILL HAVE TO BE RESOLVED IN A MANNER THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH CANADIAN TRADITION AND PRACTICE. I EXPRESS THE HOPE AND CONFIDENCE THAT OUR NEW NATIONAL GOVERNMENT'S COMMITMENT TO THIS PROCESS WILL BE MAINTAINED AND ENHANCED AS I'M SURE IT WILL.

MR. MULRONEY WILL HAVE MANY WILLING PARTNERS IN CANADA'S TEN PREMIERS. ALL EAGERLY WISH TO GET ON WITH THE JOB OF REBUILDING OUR RESPECTIVE ECONOMIES AND GETTING THIS COUNTRY MOVING AGAIN. UNDERSTANDABLY FOR CANADIANS, THE LEGACY OF SUSPICION AND BITTERNESS LEFT BY THE PREVIOUS GOVERNMENT WILL NOT DISSIPATE EASILY. FIVE YEARS OF INTENSE

POLITICAL STRIFE IN THE MIDST OF WHICH DISMAL ECONOMIC REALITIES WERE IGNORED, HAS SHATTERED THE HOPES AND THE CONFIDENCE OF MANY PEOPLE. IT WILL TAKE TIME AND A RENEWED SENSITIVITY AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL BEFORE CANADIANS' FAITH IN OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM IS RE-ESTABLISHED. FORTUNATELY, WE NOW HAVE A NEW NATIONAL GOVERNMENT THAT WE BELIEVE WILL SUCCEED IN RENEWING THAT FAITH AND CONFIDENCE, A GOVERNMENT THAT WILL BRING A NEW SENSE OF PURPOSE TO CANADA AND A NEW ERA OF CO-OPERATION NOT ONLY WITH THE PROVINCES, BUT ALSO WITH BUSINESS AND LABOUR AND WITH THE MANY OTHER GROUPS WHO HAVE AN ESSENTIAL ROLE IN OUR ECONOMY AND SOCIETY. INDEED, I BELIEVE WE HAVE A CHANCE TO REBUILD NOT ONLY THE FOUNDATION OF POLITICAL HARMONY, BUT ALSO THE PROSPERITY OF WHICH THIS NATION IS CAPABLE AND WHICH UNEMPLOYED CANADIANS EVERYWHERE ESPECIALLY IN NEWFOUNDLAND CRY OUT FOR.

NO WHERE IS THE NEW SPIRIT OF CO-OPERATION MORE EVIDENT THAN IN THE OFFSHORE ACCORD SET FORTH IN THE JUNE 14TH, 1984 LETTER FROM PRIME MINISTER MULRONEY TO MYSELF. THIS ACCORD, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, SIGNIFIES FOR ALL NEWFOUNDLANDERS THE END OF NEARLY FIFTEEN YEARS OF CONFLICT AND INABILITY TO RESOLVE A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE TO A PEOPLE CONCERNED WITH THEIR FUTURE AND THEIR RIGHT AS A PROVINCE TO PARTICIPATE EQUALLY WITHIN THE CANADIAN FEDERATION. THE OFFSHORE ACCORD IN MR. MULRONEY'S LETTER SYMBOLIZES THE GREAT CANADIAN CONCEPTS OF SHARING, FAIRNESS AND EQUITY AND A MUTUAL REGARD FOR THE RESPONSIBILITIES WHICH NOT JUST ONE, BUT BOTH LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT HAVE TO THEIR CONSTITUENTS.

LET ME GIVE YOU A FEW SPECIFIC EXAMPLES IN THE ACCORD WHICH ACCOMMODATE THESE LONG SOUGHT OBJECTIVES. THE OFFSHORE WILL NOT NOW BE MANAGED SOLELY BY ONE GOVERNMENT.

IT WILL BE DONE JOINTLY BY BOTH GOVERNMENTS. THE MANAGEMENT BOARD WON'T BE CONTROLLED SOLELY BY OTTAWA. NEWFOUNDLAND AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL BE REPRESENTED EQUALLY ON THE BOARD WITH AN INDEPENDENT CHAIRMAN. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WON'T TAKE THE LION'S SHARE OF THE REVENUES AND NEITHER WILL THERE BE A CAP PLACED ON THE PROVINCE'S SHARE. NOW THERE WILL BE A REVENUE SHARING FORMULA WHICH TREATS THE OFFSHORE AS IF IT WERE ON LAND AND WHICH PERMITS THE PROVINCE A SHARE OF THE REVENUES FOR AS LONG AS THE OIL FLOWS. THIS OFFSHORE ACCORD, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, REPRESENTS IN BOTH PITH AND SUBSTANCE, NATURAL JUSTICE AND THE CANADIAN WAY OF SHARING AND LIVING TOGETHER. FOR NEWFOUNDLAND, THE TRUDEAU ERA IS OVER.

NOW WE CAN GET ON WITH THE JOB OF TRANSLATING THE ACCORD AND GIVING EFFECT TO ALL ITS PROVISIONS WITHIN A NEW AGREEMENT BETWEEN OUR TWO LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT.

THIS PROCESS IS ALREADY UNDERWAY, A FACT HIGHLIGHTED BY THE RECENT VISIT OF THE FEDERAL MINISTER OF ENERGY, MISS CARNEY, TO THE PROVINCE. TAKING THE ACCORD FROM "LETTER" STATUS TO THE STATUS OF "FORMAL" AGREEMENT WILL REQUIRE A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF WORK AND NEGOTIATION, BUT I AM CONFIDENT THAT THE AGREEMENT FOR WHICH NEWFOUNDLANDERS AND LABRADORIANS HAVE BEEN WAITING FOR 15 YEARS, WILL SOON BECOME A REALITY HOPEFULLY FAIRLY EARLY IN THE NEW YEAR. IMMEDIATELY THEREAFTER OUR TWO GOVERNMENTS ARE COMMITTED TO TAKING THE FINAL LEGAL STEPS OF MAKING THE AGREEMENT A PERMANENT ONE FOR ALL TIME. THEN WE WILL HAVE THE OFFSHORE AGREEMENT ENSHRINED IN AN ACT OF THE CANADIAN PARLIAMENT AND THE NEWFOUNDLAND LEGISLATURE AS WELL AS IN THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION. ONCE THESE STEPS HAVE BEEN COMPLETED, THE OFFSHORE AGREEMENT CAN NEVER BE CHANGED WITHOUT OUR CONSENT.

TO SAY THAT THIS OFFSHORE ACCORD IS AN HISTORIC ONE IS TRULY AN UNDERSTATEMENT. IT IS THAT AND MORE. NEWFOUNDLANDERS PRESENT AND FUTURE WILL HERALD THIS AGREEMENT AS THE MOST IMPORTANT ADVANCE EVER UNDERTAKEN TO FOSTER ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROGRESS IN THIS PROVINCE. WE CAN BE VERY GRATEFUL FOR THE NEW GOVERNMENT AND FOR THE NEW ATMOSPHERE IN OTTAWA. WE CAN BE EXCEEDINGLY GRATEFUL TO THE PEOPLE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR FOR STANDING FIRM WITH THIS GOVERNMENT WHEN, DESPITE THE LEGITIMACY OF OUR ACTIONS IT WASN'T EASY TO OPPOSE AN ARROGANT AND INSENSITIVE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT. WE CAN BE PROUD OF WHAT WE HAVE ACHIEVED AND ARE CONFIDENT OF WHAT WE WILL ACHIEVE IN THE COMING MONTHS AND THROUGHOUT THE FUTURE.

IN THE SPIRIT OF WHICH I AM SPEAKING, WE SUCCEEDED TWO WEEKS AGO IN HAVING THE HIBERNIA DEVELOPMENT PLAN DELAYED. THIS DELAY WILL ENABLE THE PROVINCE TO REVIEW THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN PROCESS CONSISTENT WITH OUR NEW ROLE AS

EQUAL PLAYERS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS RESOURCE.
NEWFOUNDLANDERS WILL NOTE THAT OUR NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH THE
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WITH RESPECT TO THE OFFSHORE IS ALREADY
WORKING EVEN THOUGH THE FINAL AGREEMENT IS NOT YET
COMPLETED. BY BEING DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE PROCESS NOW, WE
HOPE TO MAXIMIZE THE JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND THE ECONOMIC
BENEFITS ASSOCIATED WITH THE OFFSHORE AS DEVELOPMENT
PROCEEDS.

THERE ARE THOSE WHO HAVE CHARGED THAT THE DELAY IN THE
DEVELOPMENT PLAN WILL RESULT IN A DELAY OF JOBS AND ECONOMIC
ACTIVITY. THESE ARE, HOWEVER, THE SAME DOOMSAYERS WHO IN
THE PAST SUGGESTED THAT WE WOULD NEVER WIN A BETTER DEAL AND
THAT WE SHOULD SIGN A NOVA SCOTIA TYPE AGREEMENT. THEY WERE

WRONG THEN AND THEY ARE WRONG NOW AND IF I MUST I WILL I SAY TO THEM AGAIN AND AGAIN; THE GOVERNMENT WHICH I LEAD WILL NEVER GIVE UP AN OPPORTUNITY TO INFLUENCE ECONOMIC AND JOB DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN THIS PROVINCE. THAT IS OUR RESPONSIBILITY AS A GOVERNMENT. WE TAKE IT SERIOUSLY AND WE INTEND TO LIVE UP TO OUR OBLIGATIONS TO THE FULLEST.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THE NEW OFFSHORE ACCORD AUGURS WELL FOR THE FUTURE. DESPITE THE FACT THAT WE ARE STILL STRUGGLING THROUGH A SLOW PERIOD OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT, WE NOW HAVE GOOD REASON TO LOOK FORWARD OPTIMISTICALLY TO A REVERSAL OF THE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS WHICH AFFECT US. OFFSHORE DEVELOPMENT WILL INAUGURATE A NEW ERA OF ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN WHICH WE BELIEVE A GREAT MANY NEWFOUNDLANDERS WILL BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE; THE PERSON WHO IS CURRENTLY UNEMPLOYED, THE STUDENT GRADUATING FROM THE UNIVERSITY OR THE TRADES

COLLEGE, THE BUSINESSMEN SEEKING NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR INVESTMENT AND ENTERPRISE.

INDEED, IF I WERE A BUSINESSMAN IN NEWFOUNDLAND TODAY, I WOULD NOT BE SITTING ON MY HANDS WAITING FOR ECONOMIC ACTIVITY TO ARRIVE. OUR BUSINESS COMMUNITY IN THIS PROVINCE HAS THE LUXURY OF SIMPLY BEING HERE AND THUS IN A PRIME POSITION TO GET AN EARLY START ON MANY OF THE BUSINESS ENTERPRISES THAT WILL BE REQUIRED AS A RESULT OF OFFSHORE DEVELOPMENT. I BELIEVE THE TIME IS RIPE NOW FOR ENTREPRENEURS TO TAKE A SERIOUS LOOK AT THE OPPORTUNITIES THAT NOW EXIST IN THIS PROVINCE. MANY OF THEM RELATE TO OFFSHORE DEVELOPMENT. BUT THERE ARE OTHER AREAS, TOO, WHERE INVESTMENT IS NEEDED AND OPPORTUNITIES EXIST, ESPECIALLY IN THE SMALL MANUFACTURING AND PROCESSING SECTOR.

I MIGHT SUGGEST THAT OPPORTUNITIES IN THIS AREA HAVE BEEN GREATLY ENHANCED AS A RESULT OF GOVERNMENT'S PROVINCIAL PREFERENCE POLICY. MANY BUSINESSES HAVE ALREADY

BENEFITTED FROM THIS POLICY AND THERE IS ROOM FOR OTHER ENTREPRENEURS IN THE MANUFACTURING AND PROCESSING FIELD; A FIELD WHICH I BELIEVE IS ONE OF THE MOST CHALLENGING AND EXCITING AREAS FOR INVESTMENT IN NEWFOUNDLAND TODAY.

WHETHER YOU PURSUE BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT IN THE OFFSHORE AREA OR IN SOME OTHER RESOURCE SECTOR, IS, OF COURSE, UP TO YOU. BUT IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, IT IS THE PRIVATE SECTOR WHO WILL CREATE THE ECONOMIC RENAISSANCE THAT WE ARE SEEKING AND IN ANY EVENT WE IN THIS PROVINCE ARE ON THE VERGE OF EXPERIENCING. THIS WE BELIEVE WILL HAPPEN ANYWAY WHETHER THROUGH INVESTMENT BY OUR OWN ENTREPRENEURS OR BY THOSE WHO WILL COME IN FROM OUTSIDE. NO DOUBT MANY ENTREPRENEURS WILL COME HERE FROM OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD AND WE WILL WELCOME THEM, BUT I WANT TO EMPHASIZE THAT OUR OWN BUSINESS COMMUNITY SHOULD NOT SQUANDER THE OPPORTUNITY TO GET IN ON THE GROUND FLOOR. THE ADVANTAGE OF BEING HERE AND THE ADVANTAGE OF KNOWING BEST THE LOCAL ECONOMY SHOULD NOT BE

OVERLOOKED. THE CHALLENGE, NOW, THEREFORE, IS TO COMBINE THESE ADVANTAGES WITH A KNOWLEDGE OF THE NEEDS OF AN EMERGING OIL INDUSTRY AND WITH GREATER KNOWLEDGE OF THE ENHANCED OPPORTUNITIES NOW AVAILABLE IN OTHER AREAS.

I WOULD EMPHASIZE THAT GOVERNMENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IS AVAILABLE TO HELP BUSINESSES GET STARTED OR EXPAND. THE OCEAN INDUSTRIES CAPITAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IS ONE EXCELLENT EXAMPLE OF THE PROGRAMS THAT PROVIDE FINANCIAL IMPETUS TO COMPANIES INTERESTED IN MARINE RELATED FIELDS. THERE ARE A MYRIAD OF OTHER PROGRAMS WHICH PROVIDE ASSISTANCE FOR MARKET AND PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT AND TOURISM, TO NAME A FEW WHICH ENTREPRENEURS CAN TAKE ADVANTAGE OF.

THE PRIVATE SECTOR, OF COURSE, WILL ALWAYS BE THE ENGINE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THIS PROVINCE. AS A GOVERNMENT, WE WILL BE DOING EVERYTHING POSSIBLE TO ENSURE THAT THE CLIMATE IS RIGHT FOR INVESTMENT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH. DURING THE PAST FEW YEARS, OUR PRE-OCCUPATION ON

THE ECONOMIC FRONT HAS BEEN WITH MINIMIZING THE EFFECTS OF A DEEP RECESSION. IN THIS REGARD, WE HAVE DONE EVERYTHING WE COULD TO SUPPORT BUSINESS AND MAINTAIN JOBS BY ENSURING THAT AS MUCH MONEY AS POSSIBLE WAS BEING CIRCULATED THROUGHOUT THE ECONOMY, THEREBY SUSTAINING AT LEAST A REASONABLE MEASURE OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE TIMES.

DURING THIS YEAR, FOR EXAMPLE, IN THE DYING DAYS OF THE TRUDEAU ADMINISTRATION, WE WERE SUCCESSFUL IN NEGOTIATING SEVEN FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL AGREEMENTS REPRESENTING FOUR HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS FOR JOBS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - NOT BAD FOR A GOVERNMENT THAT MANY SAID COULDN'T NEGOTIATE. THIS INCLUDED A FOUR MILLION DOLLAR PLANNING AGREEMENT, A TWENTY-TWO MILLION DOLLAR MINERALS AGREEMENT, A TWENTY-EIGHT MILLION DOLLAR BURIN PENINSULA DEVELOPMENT FUND AGREEMENT, WHICH HAS MADE POSSIBLE THE ST. LAWRENCE MINES REACTIVATION AND THE ELEVEN MILLION DOLLAR

COW HEAD FACILITY. WE ALSO NEGOTIATED AN 18.2 MILLION DOLLAR RURAL DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, A TWENTY-EIGHT MILLION DOLLAR OCEAN INDUSTRIES AGREEMENT, A TWENTY-ONE MILLION DOLLAR TOURISM AGREEMENT AND FINALLY AN AGREEMENT INVOLVING BOTH GOVERNMENTS AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR FOR A FIFTY MILLION DOLLAR HOTEL CONVENTION CENTRE OFFICE COMPLEX FOR ST. JOHN'S.

AND OUR EFFORTS DID NOT STOP THERE. RESIDENTS OF THIS CITY COULD HARDLY HELP BUT NOTICE PROGRESS BEING MADE ON THE THIRTY-FIVE MILLION DOLLAR CONFEDERATION BUILDING COMPLEX EXTENSION, THE FORTY-TWO MILLION DOLLAR FISHERIES COLLEGE, AS WELL AS THE FIFTY-SIX MILLION DOLLAR ICE TANK FACILITY AT MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY. THE CONSTRUCTION OF THESE FACILITIES HAS PROVIDED CONSIDERABLE SUPPORT TO THE CONSTRUCTION SECTOR AT A TIME WHEN PRIVATE SECTOR FINANCED CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY WAS IN GREAT DELINE. WE HAVE ALSO TRIED TO ASSIST IN OTHER AREAS TOO, DESPITE OUR TIGHT MONEY

SITUATION. FOR EXAMPLE, WE REMOVED THE SALES TAX ON CAPITAL EQUIPMENT SO AS TO SPUR MANUFACTURING AND PROCESSING ACTIVITY, AND AT THE SAME TIME ASSIST ABITIBI PRICE QUALIFY UNDER THE PULP AND PAPER MODERNIZATION AGREEMENT WHICH IN ITSELF REPRESENTS A CAPITAL EXPENDITURE OF SOME 33 MILLION DOLLARS.

IF I MIGHT BE SO IMMODEST, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THIS HAS BEEN A BUSY GOVERNMENT; A GOVERNMENT THAT IS TRYING UNDER VERY DIFFICULT CIRCUMSTANCES TO LOOK OUT FOR THE LONG TERM WHILE AT THE SAME TIME TAKING CARE OF OUR SHORT TERM DIFFICULTIES.

AND TO BE PERFECTLY FRANK, OUR SHORT TERM DIFFICULTIES ARE A MATTER ABOUT WHICH THIS GOVERNMENT MUST BE VIGILANT. NEWFOUNDLAND AS A RESOURCE BASED PROVINCE WAS HIT SEVERELY HARD DURING THE RECESSION AND WE ARE STILL COMING TO GRIPS WITH MANY OF ITS EFFECTS. WHEN YOU CONSIDER WHAT WE HAVE COME THROUGH DURING THE PAST COUPLE OF YEARS,

IT SHOULD NOT BE TERRIBLY SURPRISING THAT THE MINISTER OF FINANCE IN HIS RECENT MID-YEAR FINANCIAL REPORT ESTIMATED THAT THE DEFICIT ON CURRENT ACCOUNT WILL INCREASE BY 16.8 MILLION DOLLARS. SEVEN MILLION OF THIS AMOUNT IS RELATED TO A REDUCTION IN PROJECTED PROVINCIAL REVENUES, WHILE THE OTHER 9.8 MILLION DOLLARS IS THE RESULT OF A DROP IN ORIGINALLY FORECASTED FEDERAL TRANSFER PAYMENTS, WHICH BY THE WAY, ARE TIED TO THE PERFORMANCE OF THE CANADIAN ECONOMY.

OUR DEFICIT ON CURRENT ACCOUNT IS, THEREFORE, AS MUCH A PROBLEM OF THE CONTINUING SLUGGISHNESS OF THE OVERALL CANADIAN ECONOMY AS IT IS THE RESULT OF OUR OWN SLOW RATE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH.

DESPITE THE FACT THAT WE ARE STILL GOING THROUGH DIFFICULT TIMES, I BELIEVE THAT NEWFOUNDLANDERS APPRECIATE WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO DO AND THE OBSTACLES WE MUST OVERCOME. AS A GOVERNMENT, WE HAVE EXERCISED TREMENDOUS RESTRAINT IN

THE GROWTH OF GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES. INDEED, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THIS IS ONE OF THE LEANEST GOVERNMENTS TO BE FOUND ANYWHERE IN CANADA. THIS MAY SOUND LIKE PROUD BOASTING ESPECIALLY TO A LARGELY PRIVATE SECTOR AUDIENCE, BUT I KNOW THAT THE NEWFOUNDLAND PEOPLE AS A WHOLE WANT TO BE ASSURED THAT THEY ARE GETTING GOOD VALUE FOR THEIR TAX DOLLAR.

ONE OF THE BEST EXAMPLES OF HOW GOVERNMENT IS TRYING TO KEEP EXPENDITURES IN LINE IS IN THE RATE GROWTH OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE. IT IS A COMMON COMPLAINT OF MANY, ESPECIALLY THOSE IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR, WHO I MIGHT ADD ARE NOTORIOUS FOR BOASTING OF THEIR EFFICIENCY, THEIR LEANNESS AND THEIR PRODUCTIVITY, THAT GOVERNMENT FALLS SHORT OF ALL THESE THINGS. I SUSPECT YOU WILL BE VERY SURPRISED THAT DURING THE PAST FOUR YEARS OF MY ADMINISTRATION, THE PUBLIC SERVICE HAS INCREASED BY A TOTAL OF ONLY 12 POSITIONS. YES 12 POSITIONS IN A BUREAUCRACY OF OVER 9000. THIS REPRESENTS

A MERE 13/100THS OF A PERCENTAGE POINT INCREASE IN FOUR YEARS. I CAN TELL YOU, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THAT'S LEANNESS, THAT'S PERFORMANCE.

AND SPEAKING OF PERFORMANCE, YOU REALLY DON'T HEAR ANY MORE COMPLAINTS BY BUSINESS OF GOVERNMENT'S SLOWNESS IN PROVIDING PAYMENT FOR GOODS AND SERVICES. WHERE IN THE PAST LESS THAN 40% OF CLEARED GOVERNMENT IN A REASONABLE PERIOD OF TIME, NOW BECAUSE NEW SYSTEMS HAVE BEEN PUT IN PLACE BY THIS ADMINISTRATION, OVER 90% OF VOUCHERS ARE PAID WITHIN 25 TO 30 WORKING DAYS. THIS ACHIEVEMENT HAS HAD A TREMENDOUS POSITIVE EFFECT ON THE CASH FLOW OF BUSINESSES DEALING WITH GOVERNMENT AND IT IS ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF HOW EFFICIENCIES ARE BEING ACHIEVED.

EFFICIENCY AND RESTRAINT HAS BEEN ONE OF GOVERNMENT'S CHIEF PRE-OCCUPATIONS. RESTRAINT HAS BEEN REFLECTED, IN PARTICULAR, IN THE LEVEL OF PAY INCREASES TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE. THIS IS NOT A POPULAR INITIATIVE, BUT

WHEN LEADERSHIP AND TOUGH DECISIONS ARE REQUIRED, IT IS GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY TO SHOW THE WAY.

NEWFOUNDLAND PUBLIC SERVANTS, FOR THE MOST PART, HAVE BEEN PREPARED TO TIGHTEN THEIR BELTS AND ACCEPT THESE RESTRAINTS WITH THE KNOWLEDGE THAT FINANCIALLY WE WERE IN A VERY DIFFICULT POSITION. I CAN TELL YOU TODAY, I AM VERY PROUD OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE AND PROUD TOO OF HOW THEY HAVE HELPED GOVERNMENT COME THROUGH THIS DIFFICULT TIME. UNFORTUNATELY, BECAUSE OF GOVERNMENT'S BUDGETARY SITUATION, THESE RESTRAINT MEASURES MAY HAVE TO CONTINUE FOR ANOTHER WHILE. INDEED THE PROPOSED TWO YEAR ZERO/ZERO WAGE RESTRAINT PROGRAM TO BE FAIR WILL HAVE TO APPLY TO ALL PUBLIC SECTOR GROUPS FOR THE FULL TWO YEAR PERIOD UNLESS, OF COURSE, THE ECONOMY IMPROVES SUFFICIENTLY TO JUSTIFY A SHORTER RESTRAINT PERIOD AND WE CERTAINLY HOPE IT WILL.

NEVERTHELESS, THESE MEASURES REFLECT THE SIMPLE REALITIES OF THE TIMES AND WHILE NONE OF US PARTICULARLY ENJOY HAVING OUR WAGES FROZEN, THE ALTERNATIVES ARE CERTAINLY LESS PALLITABLE.

AS A GOVERNMENT, OUR FIRST OBJECTIVE IS TO ENSURE THAT THE EMPLOYED RETAIN THE JOBS THEY HAVE AND TO ASSIST IN THE CREATION OF NEW JOBS FOR THOSE THOUSANDS OF NEWFOUNDLANDERS WHO ARE NOT EMPLOYED. THE UNEMPLOYED ARE THE REAL VICTIMS IN OUR SOCIETY AND IT IS THEY WHO NEED TO BE HEARD AND RESPONDED TO FIRST. AS A GOVERNMENT, WE WERE ABLE TO HELP IN A VERY SUBSTANTIAL WAY WHEN JOBS WERE THREATENED DURING THE PAST FEW YEARS. I CAN MENTION OUR SUCCESS IN CORNER BROOK, IN BAIE VERTE, ON THE BURIN PENINSULA AND IN DOZENS OF FISHING COMMUNITIES THROUGHOUT THE PROVINCE.

AS FOR THE CREATION OF NEW JOBS, I AM OPTIMISTIC ABOUT WHAT WE CAN ACHIEVE AND I BELIEVE THAT THE ECONOMIC REALITIES OF THE PRESENT WILL SOON BE OVERCOME. I AM CONFIDENT GIVEN THE OFFSHORE ACCORD AND THE INCREASING OFFSHORE ACTIVITY THAT IS NOW BEING GENERATED HERE IN ST. JOHN'S AND AT THE MARYSTOWN SHIPYARD, GIVEN THE FACT WE ARE MAKING PROGRESS IN OUR EFFORTS TO PUT FPI ON A VIABLE FOOTING, GIVEN COWHEAD, GIVE ST. LAWRENCE FLUOSPAR MINE REACTIVATION, GIVEN THE SEVEN PROVINCIAL AGREEMENTS WHICH TOGETHER REFLECT AN INJECTION OF SOME \$400 MILLION OF CAPITAL INTO THIS PROVINCE OVER THE NEXT FEW YEARS, GIVEN THE MANY OTHER TANGIBLE THINGS THAT ARE GOING ON NOW, AND WHICH WILL BE GETTING UNDERWAY, WE WILL SUCCEED IN CREATING A BETTER CLIMATE FOR JOBS AND INVESTMENT.

INDEED, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, I BELIEVE THAT WE ARE AT THE VERY END OF A LONG PERIOD OF ECONOMIC STAGNATION AND I CAN SEE GREAT THINGS ON THE HORIZON, DURING THE COMING

MONTHS, WE WILL BE TAKING A SERIOUS LOOK AT MAXIMIZING THE JOB OPPORTUNITIES AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY ASSOCIATED WITH MOBIL'S DEVELOPMENT PLAN, WE WILL BE CONTINUING THE PROCESS OF ENCOURAGING INVESTMENT BOTH BY NEWFOUNDLANDERS AND FROM ENTREPRENEURS OUTSIDE. IT IS MY HOPE THAT YOU AND, INDEED, A LARGE PART OF THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY OF THIS PROVINCE WILL PARTICIPATE IN THIS ENDEAVOUR. OUR CURRENT ACCOUNT DIFFICULTIES AND OUR PRESENT LEVEL OF ECONOMIC GROWTH SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED TO CLOUD THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INVESTMENT WHICH EXIST AND WHICH WILL CONTINUE TO GROW IN THE FUTURE. NEWFOUNDLAND, AS WE HAVE SAID SO MANY TIMES, HAS THE POTENTIAL FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT AND THUS FOR A HIGH LEVEL OF ECONOMIC GROWTH. THAT IS WHAT THIS GOVERNMENT IS STRIVING TOWARDS AND WE WILL NOT RELENT UNTIL PROSPERITY IS AN EVER PRESENT REALITY IN THIS PROVINCE.

I HOPE THAT YOU WILL TAKE UP THE CHALLENGE THAT I
HAVE PRESENTED TO YOU TODAY AND THAT YOU WILL BE BIGGER
PARTICIPANTS IN A VIBRANT ECONOMY, AND THAT YOU WILL SHARE
IN THE BRIGHT FUTURE THAT WILL BE OURS IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND
LABRADOR.