

C 3849 —



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 71

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

2 December 1985

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Menihek on a matter of privilege.

MR. FENWICK:
On November 27 in this House I received a tabled answer to a question that I had asked of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). It was a question I asked about some seedlings that had been damaged in the Wooddale Forest Nursery and asked for a list of those individuals who has been hired on. The answer the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands gave said that he did not indicate at any time last Spring that there was a temporary programme to replace damaged seedlings. Since that time I have managed to check on Hansard of June 10, 1985, on pages 1486 and 1487, and it clearly states in there that the minister, in replying to a question, indicated that indeed there were damaged seedlings, indeed there was a transplanting programme, and indeed there were temporary employees hired. My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that the minister was under no obligation to even answer the question, but having answered it, in my opinion, there was a deliberate attempt to mislead the House in this particular answer. I would like a motion, since I have to end this question of privilege with a motion, that the minister answer the question, which is very clearly specific to what information he gave before

and that a motion be brought before this House to condemn the minister for his attempt to mislead the House.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, there is no point of privilege. If the hon. gentleman is dissatisfied with any answer that he has gained from any minister in this House, there is a proceeding that is set forth for Thursday in the Late Show for him to debate it. I could say if there is any lack of order or breach of privilege, it is really the hon. gentleman saying that the minister has deliberately misled the House, which is out of order. Apart from that the hon. gentleman got up on a point of privilege that is not a point of privilege. As I say, if he is dissatisfied he has another avenue to debate it.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of privilege, I have had a chance of looking at this matter because the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) did come to me on Thursday and asked me how he should deal with the matter. I said I would have a look at it and get back to him, which I did just a short time ago. I suggested to him that he have a word with the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands. He said that he had done that and he did not appear to be satisfied with the reaction, if you like, from the minister. I said, well, naturally he was free to take it up or deal with what he figured was a problem in any way he felt was correct. As I said, I have had time to consider the matter and I have looked at the

reply that the minister gave, and the best that I can say about it is that there was not a programme to replant damaged seedlings but there did appear to be a programme, a necessity if you like, to replace seedlings that had been damaged. So, on that basis, I must rule there is no point of privilege.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Your Honour brought down a ruling on Wednesday when I was out of the House. This is my first opportunity since Your Honour brought down the ruling to ask Your Honour, at this time, if he would request that the Premier withdraw the remarks which Your Honour have found to be unparliamentary. I would ask the Premier himself, if he is a man, to present an apology.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Thank you for your ruling, but I am not sure you mentioned anywhere where the words mentioned were unparliamentary.

MR. BARRY:

Yes. Page 1.

MR. PECKFORD:

'Two recitals are unparliamentary,' and therefore you have ruled the motion out of

order and I do not know what else needs to be said about it. The motion was ruled out of order as far as I know.

MR. BARRY:

Further to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The procedure in this House, as Your Honour knows and as the Premier knows, is that when a matter of unparliamentary language is raised, first Your Honour makes a ruling with respect to the language and then, once Your Honour finds that the language is unparliamentary, Your Honour requests a withdrawal. In fact, if the member does not withdraw Your Honour directs that he withdraw; and if he then does not withdraw, the procedure is for Your Honour to name him. So that is the accepted procedure on unparliamentary language and either the system is going to work for everybody or there is going to be no system at all.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the motion has been withdrawn, so therefore, obviously, the comments have been withdrawn.

MR. TULK:

The motion was not withdrawn, it was ruled out of order.

MR. BARRY:

No, no. The language is there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I am going to refresh my memory on all the

events and I will rule on that matter tomorrow.

Statements by Ministers

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

On September 24, 1985, the government released its legislative programme along with copies of most of the legislation which was contemplated to be considered at the adjourned session this Fall. Mr. Speaker, it has been the policy of this government to deal effectively and more systematically with the legislative process over the past five or six years. Thus, we have adopted such proceedings as having no night sessions unless they are absolutely necessary, and we have broken the sessions generally into two sections, the first one being the Spring for the Throne Speech, budget and such urgent legislation as had to be dealt with; and the Fall for the remainder of the legislation. This year we opened earlier and the government advanced its legislative list in expectation that there will be ample time to deal with the legislative programme and we would not have to sit long into the Christmas season, recognizing that during this time all members of the House have extra duties and functions to perform, than they normally have at other times, in their own districts.

We set a target that the House should rise in the first week of December. We see no reason to

change this programme. Government will therefore propose - and I want to advise the House that government will be proposing - that the House rise on Friday of this week. I hope in the meantime that we can make substantial progress and that much of the legislation can be dealt with.

As to the Atlantic Accord, Mr. Speaker, I am sure hon. members are aware the Federal Government House Leader had indicated that the federal government would be introducing the legislation earlier in the New Year. I can report that the drafting of this legislation is going very smoothly indeed and there are really only minor technical details needed to be addressed before submitting them to both Houses.

Since the Accord, though, Mr. Speaker, and I think this should be understood, will incorporate some provisions of the new energy policy as set forth in the new Canadian Petroleum Resources Act and that certain elements of that act will be incorporated into the Accord legislation pursuant to the agreement, and this relates to land tenures and sales and what have you, The Canadian Petroleum Resources Act must logically be presented to Parliament before the Accord legislation can be presented.

Now we want to introduce legislation simultaneously, at the same time, on the same day, and for these reasons we will not present the Accord legislation before Christmas. But the House will rise on Friday until the end of January or the first week of February, when we will reconvene solely to consider the Accord legislation, which will be brought in, of course, within the

framework of Section 57, which means that it has to be brought in, introduced - not as the Energy Critic (Mr. Flight) said the other day, passed - on or before February 11, the first anniversary date of the signing of the Accord.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we are very disappointed to hear what the minister has just said with respect to the Atlantic Accord. If Your Honour recalls, the Premier stated to this House that that Accord would be presented to the House the second week of November, I think that was the Premier's statement. Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting to have that legislation presented. We are ready at any time to adjourn other business and move on to deal with that. What we see now, Mr. Speaker, is again, a sad lack of planning, a sad inability to meet deadlines and meet schedules, and a sad lack of planning to bring to completion the detail, Mr. Speaker. Now I would hope that any delay is being caused by members opposite fighting harder than they have been to date to see an improvement to Clause 54, to see the Come By Chance refinery protected so that we can have that resource processed on land. With respect to the other points, Mr. Speaker, really what has happened is that this past week has seen so many bills go through the House, Mr. Speaker, so quickly that the Government House Leader (Mr.

Marshall) is now faced, since the Atlantic Accord is not coming forward, with the prospect of not having any business, Mr. Speaker, to lead before the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:
The hon. gentleman is debating a ministerial statement. If the hon. gentleman wants to address what has happened in this House, we spent twenty-one days in Supplementary Supply, two days on a routine bill whose counterpart was passed in five minutes last year, and on Friday, in Committee stage, we were redebating, again, bills that had already been passed.

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

MR. BARRY:
Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Government House Leader that we are prepared to expedite the business of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The Leader of the Opposition's time has now elapsed.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, what we have just seen from the Government House

Leader is closure by another name. We would ask Your Honour to consider whether it is proper for the Government House Leader to get up and threaten the Opposition and say that we must sit by and just rubber stamp legislation as it comes up.

We are prepared to expedite the business of this House. We are prepared to see that legislation moves forward expeditiously. But also, Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility to point out when the matters that are raised by members opposite have flaws, errors, deficiencies or otherwise, constitute bad legislation. That is our responsibility and our duty. That is what we are going to see carried out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear! Hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker. All I did initially in this House was rise and advise the House as to when we are going to rise and advise them as to the course of business and try to approach it in a co-operative fashion. The hon. gentlemen need not get paranoid with me about every single issue I raise. It is one thing to spread it into the energy area where the government's success is a reflection of his failure, but it is another on simple matters where I am trying to accord common courtesy and civility to the House.

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

Statements by Ministers

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased today to inform hon. members that there has been a dramatic increase in the sale of crafts in this Province since the removal of the twelve per cent sales tax which was announced in Dr. Collins' budget of May 16, 1985.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
My department is presently conducting a survey of crafts stores in the Province and preliminary figures indicate an increase in sales of \$300,000 this year.

Several craft businesses have indicated a significant increase in sales since the removal of the sales tax. The following is a quote from a letter received from a well known, long established craft store in St. John's: "Pleased to inform you that we have shown a remarkable increase in sales at our Water Street retail store during the summer tourist season and we attribute this mainly to the removal of sales tax on all handcrafted

goods."

A spokesperson for the Newfoundland and Labrador Craft Development Association said the sale of crafts at the Association's annual show was up over twenty per cent over last year. She said she does hesitate to give full credit to the Provincial tax exemption for the increased sales.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Dr. Collins, Minister of Finance should be complimented for his foresight in taking this stimulative fiscal measure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I again thank the minister for providing me with a copy of the statement and I will tell the House anything that stimulates the economy in this Province, with our desperate straits at the moment, is certainly welcome. I am glad and very pleased to see that kind of an increase.

Another report, for the minister's information, if he may not have it already, is that the Labrador contingent at the annual Christmas Craft Fair, even though weather kept the numbers who visited down, experienced a significant increase in their sales.

However, before the minister claims full credit for these vastly increased sales, I would

like to see a few figures on the type of quality control now in place, which is responsible to the minister I believe, and also it might be interesting to see some figures on quantities produced this year as opposed to previous years. But, if all of the statement could be taken at its face value, and indeed the elimination of the 12 per cent sales tax is what caused the increase in sales, then that certainly would be a good indicator for government to get another plank out of the Liberal platform and electoral stand and realize that a reduction in the retail sales tax in this Province would generally tend to stimulate the economy to a great level, as has been indicated here. I think that is what we should see, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Treasury Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the tentative agreement reached earlier with the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees on behalf of approximately 3,500 employees of hospitals, nursing homes and other institutions across the Province has now been ratified by the membership and a new three year agreement will be signed shortly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

In addition to improving the terms and conditions of employment in areas relating to lay-off, union security, and certain fringe benefits, the three-year agreement includes a two year wage freeze with the third year providing a salary increase of 4 per cent.

Members of the House will note that this will be the eleventh collective agreement signed since the introduction of a two-year wage freeze. Agreements were previously signed with the Newfoundland and Labrador Nurses Union, the Public Libraries Board, hospital support staff, Waterford Hospital support staff, ferry workers, the teachers' association, the teachers of Labrador West, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation, the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation and that includes something in the order of 16,000 persons, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for giving me a copy of his statement beforehand. We are happy to see, Mr. Speaker, that this tentative agreement, which was reached with NAPE, has now been ratified. We note the numbers of agreements that have been signed since the wage freeze was brought in. But, Mr. Speaker, let nobody feel that this has been done without great hardship to the employees of government in this Province and, Mr. Speaker, without great damage to labour relations

between government and the workers of this Province. The fact that the workers have had their backs to the wall and have had no choice, Mr. Speaker, but to succumb to these Draconian measures, which were brought in without proper consultation, does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that they entered into these willingly or that they feel very good about the position they now find themselves in.

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask the Premier a question concerning the First Ministers' Conference. I would like to ask him whether the infliction of prosperity was extensive as a result of his consultations, Mr. Speaker, and whether phase two of the Prosperity Crusade has brought about considerable improvements to the resources of this Province, and whether, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's comments with respect to reduction of the deficit is now an adoption of the policy put forth by the Liberal Party during the last election, where we recommended just that, less attention, Mr. Speaker, or going slower with correcting the deficit and making a greater effort to stimulate the economy by such things such as I just noticed by the minister who has indicated -

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is making a speech. This is Question Period and he is obviously making a speech.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I was just going to draw that fact to the hon. member's attention.

MR. BARRY:

I will bring it directly to the point. The Minister for Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) just indicated the removal of the sales tax, Mr. Speaker, has meant a significant increase in craft sales. This is the very point that we were making during the election, that a reduction in the sales tax generally would mean a great increase in business expansion around the Province.

Has the Premier now decided to adopt the policies of the Liberal Party and are these the policies that he was putting forward to the Prime Minister in Halifax in order to have prosperity inflicted on this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the first thing I had to do when I went to Halifax was explain to the First Ministers that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland did not favour factory freezer trawlers being outlawed in Newfoundland. That is the first thing I had to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I had to explain to the Premiers across Canada why the Liberal Party of Newfoundland wanted factory freezer trawlers coming in and raping the Northern cod resource, and that was difficult to explain. Mr. Speaker, they could not understand why there was not unanimity in Newfoundland, especially after I explained to them what was at stake here as it related to the Northern cod stocks. That was the first thing.

The second phase of the Prosperity Crusade will come when we sign the Hibernia development early in 1986, for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition. I know the Leader of the Opposition is jealous because he is not the one who is going to see that Hibernia development get underway. He has taken credit for just about everything that happened in Energy since about the year 1900, even though, when I became Minister of Energy, there were no oil and gas regulations. All I can say to the Leader of the Opposition is that I am sorry if he is jealous but the second phase of the Prosperity Crusade will occur when the Hibernia development gets underway and the green light is given in 1986. As it relates to the deficit reduction, in dealing with the national debt, I am saying that has to be done over time, gradually, and cannot be done overnight or in two or three years.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would indicate whether he was able to have the Prime Minister change his position with respect to factory freezer trawlers or whether he was merely engaging in the same little bit of play acting, Mr. Speaker, that he was engaging in in the House of Assembly? Did the Premier indicate to the First Minister that we pointed out in this House that we were against factory freezer trawlers, but we were even more against the Premier of this Province trying to deceive the people by play acting in this House? Did the Premier indicate that to the Prime Minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know about the Leader of the Opposition, but I am sure anybody who watched the First Ministers' Conference, not only in Newfoundland but in Canada, knows that I was not play acting, that I was trying to defend the interests of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If the Leader of the Opposition wants to call it play acting when I am trying to defend the interests of Newfoundlanders, let him come right out and tell all Newfoundlanders that all I am interested in is play acting. I am trying to ensure that we gain the majority of fish, if not all the fish, off our shores, and if the Leader of the Opposition is against that, that is too bad.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the Premier dropped his opposition and agreed to start negotiating the amount of cod that will be available for factory freezer trawlers. He totally caved in at the First Ministers' meeting in Halifax and stopped the fight against factory freezer trawlers and decided to negotiate the amount of cod. Would the Premier confirm whether that was in fact the case? Would the Premier indicate if he has been successful in obtaining a provincial veto, a Newfoundland veto on matters relating to free trade? I noticed the Premier is saying that the Premier will give a mandate to the federal government, to Mr. Rheisman who will be the federal negotiator? Does this mean that there will be no control once negotiations start on the part of the Province or will the Province have a provincial veto?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

On the first part of the question, because there were two questions there, Mr. Speaker, rather than one, no, I have not given up the fight on factory freezer trawlers. Everybody in Newfoundland knows that, and if the Leader of the Opposition does not I cannot help it. On the second part on the question, of free trade, there is a ninety day period in which the Premiers are going to be negotiating with the federal government on that.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I have a question for the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward). Notwithstanding anything that has been said in the House, through the media or otherwise to date, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if he would clearly state the government's position on the expanded use of Goose Airport and advise the House, other than the health study recently announced by the minister responsible, what steps are being taken or contemplated to address the concerns of the Native peoples which will be affected by expanded use?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, this government has made it quite clear that we are very interested in expanding and improving the Air Force Base at Goose Bay. We would like to see and are promoting this being base used as a NATO training centre. We have addressed all the concerns that the Native peoples have brought to our attention. We have instituted a health study by the Canadian Medical Health Association - I believe that is the name of it. We are presently studying the affects of low-level flying on the wildlife population, caribou in particular. These are the two main concerns that we have heard from the Native peoples. It is our intention to promote the

Goose Bay Air Base and see if it cannot be used as a NATO training centre.

MR. KELLAND:

On a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Again to the minister, in the event that we do see expanded use of the airport by our NATO allies, has the minister given any consideration to perhaps some specialized form of training if it does become a fait accompli, so that the aboriginal people can be incorporated, those that wish to be incorporated, into the workforce and take advantage of the spinoff effects of increased use of the base?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural Agriculture and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, sometime this Fall several of my colleagues visited the Cold Lake area in Alberta, which has a similar operation to what we plan for Goose Bay. We visited it for several different reasons. We had the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), who had some discussions with people there concerning the wildlife affects. The Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) was with me to have a look at what possible affects there might be on the environment. That area has an even more intense NATO training centre, or North American training centre, where

they have what they refer to as live bombing, which is not approved in our plans at all.

We also had Mr. Shouse, the Mayor of Happy Valley - Goose Bay - he may be the former Mayor now, I am not quite sure - and several of my staff, including the Assistant Deputy Minister for Northern Development, who, with the wildlife biologist for the area, stayed around for a couple of extra days to speak to the Native people and some of the wildlife people in the area. And if we can promote Goose Bay and develop it, as is Cold Lake developed now; the community of Cold Lake, which would be similar to Happy Valley - Goose Bay, is very involved with the base at Cold Lake. There are special affirmative action programmes for Native peoples. There is a reservation on the boundary of this training area; on the low-level flying reserved area, there is an Indian reservation, and these people work in co-operation with the armed forces. They do get training. I personally have made representation to Colonel David to ask what their feeling would be towards having affirmative action programmes for our Native peoples, and they are more than willing to co-operate with the Native peoples in Labrador for any of their concerns, and particularly if they wish to apply and be trained for jobs that might become available. They would be only too happy to look at it. And when the planning is finished and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Do you want an answer? I mean, it is up to you. I can give it to someone else later. But the hon.

the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) is genuinely interested in this.

Mr. Speaker, a bit further down the road, if the Native peoples are interested, I intend to make some representations to the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) and we can work out a plan. We have to get the Native peoples interested in our programme and the planning. They might wish to come to work on these jobs, which I am sure quite a few of them are.

If you still want to hear, there is another benefit for Native peoples. There will be a lot of new people moving into the Goose Bay area, particularly people from Norway and West Germany, with a lot of relatives, from fairly affluent countries, coming to Newfoundland to visit their relatives and using the services of the Native peoples as guides to take them into the country, which is a definite benefit. It is the sort of thing the Native peoples would like to be able to promote, to use their own skills to take these tourists into their area, to promote their skills as guides and fishermen.

MR. KELLAND:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Minister, for that information. I am pleased to see that you are taking some positive steps to ensure that the aboriginal people will be able to be incorporated into whatever training programmes might be available. My final supplementary

to the minister deals with the approach to promoting or letting all views be known to our NATO allies. I know the Cold Lake trip incorporated members of government, municipal leaders and so on. But I also believe that the minister and the House are pretty well aware of what the Opposition's position is on the expanded use of the base and our concerns that the Innu and the other aboriginal people get a chance to express their concerns in whatever form is available to them. Has the minister consider some form of a select group - I do not know if a Select Committee would be right which would represent both the government and the Opposition who have a similar position on the use of the airport, some sort of a group to either meet with the NATO countries which may be in a position to operate out of Goose Bay, and take an approach whereby both sides of this House, supplemented by people from the private sector and from the aboriginal people to mount a -

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is not asking a supplementary question, he is obviously making quite a long speech.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I think the hon. member is taking a long time to get to his question. Maybe he could ask a short question now.

MR. KELLAND:

I probably did, Mr. Speaker, but the minister was a long time getting through his second answer. Anyway, have you or would you consider a joint approach to information getting out to the European countries, our NATO allies, which would include the government, the Opposition, the private sector and perhaps some of the Aboriginal people as a joint committee to express all views?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member will recall that at one time this Fall there was an information group set up by the Armed Forces to visit the communities in Labrador, all the coastal communities, and they had opposition in one community. They provided a lot of information to the people of Labrador during these meetings. We have a delegation from the Province and from the federal Department of National Defense visiting the NATO countries right now, explaining the assets of Goose Bay area, selling that part of Canada so that the NATO allies can be aware of the facilities that we have to offer. I hope that we will convince them to come and use Goose Bay for increased activity.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to clarify that last point.

MR. SPEAKER:

There are a number of members been getting up regularly wanting to ask questions. A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Would the minister consider including a member or members of the Opposition in the delegation he speaks of because we have a similar position? That was my final question and he did not address it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I have informed my staff on this committee and residents of the area of the Opposition's view on this, that they are supportive of government's view. That position will be made known by the committee. I am not on this committee, nor is any member of this House it is a committee of officials.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell). It was brought to my attention just this weekend that on top of the high costs of electricity bills there is another problem consumers are facing. Newfoundland Light and Power is now imposing a \$120 advance charge on anybody who has had any problems with their light bills. In other words, if they had their lights cut off or they move into a new apartment, and have had problems in the past, they must pay \$120 in advance before they can use the electricity. I want to ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs is he aware of this? It has come about recently.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Newfoundland Light and Power is a private enterprise operation and they have no reason to advise me as to what their policies and procedures might be. I am not aware of what the hon. member just mentioned. I shall certainly look into it.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

I wonder is the minister aware that he is the Minister aware that he is the Minister of Consumer Affairs?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

My gracious, this must have had to go before the Public Utilities Board.

MR. RUSSELL:

Do you have a question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

The Department of Consumer Affairs has a representative on the Public Utilities Board. Is it possible that he has not notified the minister that this has been brought against the consumer? Is that what he is telling this House, that he has no knowledge of

this being brought to the consumer, the \$120 advanced charge charged by the Newfoundland Light and Power? Surely goodness, the minister is not going to stand here and tell this House that he does not know anything about it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the last number of days the Opposition have been asking a number of questions to me of the rate changes and the new structure for rates in this Province. I have contacted Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to get an explanation from them and I also, during the course of that conversation, asked them if anybody in the Opposition had made any representation to them? I certainly was not surprised, however, to hear that nobody in the Opposition has had interest enough to contact Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro about the new rate structure.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

The Minister of Consumer Affairs is well aware of the Opposition's stand on electricity rates, and the people in the Province are well aware of it. If the Minister of Consumer Affairs did half the job that the critic is doing, it would be a lot better situation.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Would the hon. member pose his question?

MR. EFFORD:

I would ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs, seeing as how he cannot do anything about the high electricity cost, would he check into the fact that they are being charged \$120 in advance? We all know that they cannot afford to pay it. Will he check and report to this House on that situation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I said in response to the hon. member's question, first of all, that I was not aware of this, but I said then that I will look into it. I will do that and I will get back with some information to the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). It has to do with an article in Saturday's Evening Telegram about the new cauterization laboratory that is needed at the General Hospital. The article is quite extensive but basically it makes several points. One is that the cauterization laboratory is now six or seven years old and it is getting worn out. New procedures are being performed in it that require a lot of time, it has been down for several weeks over the last number of years, and it is holding up a lot of operations that should be performed. The article indicates also that the Corporation is being asked to raise \$500,000 on its own which would be matched by government. I have checked with the Corporation

and they have indicated this is the way it should go.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Would you please pose your question?

MR. FENWICK:
My question to the minister is this: Are we now looking at a new policy for the providing of capital equipment for our hospitals in which they are now asked to raise money which will be matched dollar for dollar by the provincial government?

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

DR. TWOMEY:
Many of the foundations and hospitals in Newfoundland have offered to contribute to the special technological advances in the health care fields. One of these technological advances was written up on the weekend, I believe in The Evening Telegram. I understand that we are partially funding that.

Last Spring I did tell you that the foundation of the Janeway had contributed a certain amount to a special X-ray machine and we were also adding our addition. We have not changed our plans or our policies in the meantime.

MR. FENWICK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
This raises a very interesting question now. If the \$1 million lab is going to be matched on a

dollar for dollar basis, my question to the minister is: What happens if they fall short? What happens if they only raise \$100,000 or \$200,000? They indicate this machinery is needed immediately. Will the provincial government pony up the money required for this essential piece of equipment if they fall short of their \$500,000 goal?

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

DR. TWOMEY:
At this present time that is a purely hypothetical question. If the matter does arise, I will be able to answer it.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services. It concerns the case of Harvey Hawkins, the fishermen from the Summerford, Twillingate district, who, as we all know, is now a patient in the hospital in Toronto following a kidney transplant. Can the minister tell the House, Mr. Speaker, if the promise that was made to Mr. Hawkins and his family by the federal Employment Minister, Flora MacDonald, to the effect that funds from the Canada Assistance Plan and from the welfare department of the provincial government of Newfoundland would equal the amount that he would normally have received from Unemployment Insurance benefits - the amount, by the way, I think that he would receive was \$620 - is the amount he is getting now from the Social

Services Department equal to that as promised?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have no first hand knowledge of what the minister, Miss MacDonald, advised the gentleman in question. I do know that our involvement with the case seems to have hit the national media. It seems that it was an opportunity for some politicians to make the media. Our involvement in the case was that we paid transportation for Mr. Hawkins' wife to travel to Toronto with him. All of his expenses were paid for by the Kidney Foundation, but we paid his wife's expenses to Toronto and we paid the board and lodgings for Mr. Hawkins and his wife. Also, the mother and father of the child who received the kidney, we paid their way to Toronto and that was a cost of \$1,100 - plus. And, by the way, Mr. Hawkins' wife, the cost of her transportation was \$500 or \$600.

So that was our involvement up to that point in time. The bill for board and lodging, I guess will all be sent back to us. As I indicated to the press on a couple of occasions when I was called, he is eligible for any services that may be available while he is in Toronto and once he returns to this Province, then he is available for all the services that we have here. If he is able to work, if there are programmes in that area that are bring sponsored by the department I represent, then I am sure he will be hired on one of these. Whether he would be hired on some Canada Works programme or whatever, I do

not know, I really do not know what Miss MacDonald told him. She has not been in touch with me.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

This is an extreme case, not a normal case of a person applying for assistance under the Social Services Department. In light of the commitment made to this man's family by a federal minister, can the minister tell the House if he has made any special representation to the Federal Employment Minister with respect to his rights to unemployment insurance benefits? Has he given some thought to giving special consideration or making a special allowance to the Hawkins family? Like I said, this is a special case and I think it deserves special attention.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I have not requested any special attention because it is my understanding that the federal minister has taken upon herself to consider this as a special case. I was advised secondhand - as I indicated, the minister has not contacted me - that the minister's staff or the minister herself has been in touch with the Canada Manpower Office here in St. John's, or Mount Pearl, wherever it is, and it appears that the case will be

treated as a special case, as, of course, it will be again by the department which I represent. If there are some special needs or whatever in cases like this, then the family will be considered for it.

Again I would like to say I think that this whole thing has been blown out of proportion, because actually everything that can be done for this gentleman has been and is being done and will be done. I would like to assure the House and every single, solidary soul in Newfoundland that that is the case.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). I have a copy of the case to table in the House indicating that the hon. minister's law firm is acting for the University. Now Section (34) of The Memorial University Act states that if any member of the board accepts any office or position, or performs any service for which remuneration is received, the person must vacate the appointment as a member of the Board of Regents. I would like to ask the minister is he aware that his firm is acting for the University? Is he accepting that he is a party, if that is the case, to a breach of Section (34) of the Memorial University Act?

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

MR. MARSHALL:
I am not getting into a debate with the hon. gentleman. This hon. gentleman does not act for the University, never has acted for the University. I would suggest if he has any question as to who acts for the University he can direct it to the University officials who select whoever acts for the University.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
I would like to direct a supplementary to the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) since the minister responsible for the University has left for a moment. Would the Minister of Justice indicate whether she would investigate whether there has been a breach of Section (34) of Memorial University Act?

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, I do not see this matter as being within my jurisdiction.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
What we are talking about here is a Statute of the Province. We are asking the Minister of Justice as to whether or not there has been a breach of one of the laws of the Province. Mr. Speaker, would the

Minister of Justice indicate to us what laws of the Province must be breached in order for her department to investigate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition originally indicated that he was going to direct his question to the minister responsible for the University, which I would have thought proper. If the Leader of the Opposition, the same as any other citizen in the Province, has reason to believe that there has been a violation of any of our statutes, then as a lawyer he knows the proper course of action. It would be incumbent upon him to direct a formal complaint to the proper officials in the Department of Justice.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I cannot believe what I am hearing here, that a member of this House, Mr. Speaker, raising a matter with the Minister of Justice is not sufficient. Well, we will follow that up later.

I would like to ask the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) would he indicate whether he would look into whether or not there has been a breach of Section (34) of the Memorial University Act by virtue of the fact the Government House Leader's firm is acting for the University in a legal case?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, in all these cases where conflict of interest has been alleged, when the Premier and the House Leader have checked into them there has been no substance. If the Leader of the Opposition has some information which he wants to make known to me, I will be glad to look at the evidence, glad to assess it, but I just hope it has more substance than the other allegations the Leader of the Opposition has made.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

I would like at this stage to welcome to the galleries Mayor Winsor, Deputy Mayor Woodward and Councillors Fudge, Budgell and Williams from the town of Triton, Green Bay district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Section 26 (1) of the Financial Administration Act I want to table a Minute of Council relating to pre-commitment of funds. The Minute of Council having been issued on November 27.

Notices of Motion

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following resolution.

WHEREAS the attached letter is a copy of a letter from the member for Mount Scio to a relative of an Ocean Ranger disaster victim; and

WHEREAS this letter in addition to expressing sympathy makes certain statements on liability and compensation; and

WHEREAS the letter invites the recipient to contact the member for Mount Scio; and

WHEREAS the head of the letter in question, reads, "House of Assembly;" and

WHEREAS the telephone number given on the letter is that of the member for Mount Scio's law office; and

WHEREAS the April 1984 edition of the Canadian Lawyer attributes legal fees of \$750,000 to the member for Mount Scio's law firm as a result of his acting for the families of the Ocean Ranger victims;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House go on record as condemning the member for Mount Scio for his inappropriate conduct as a member of this House of Assembly.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon the Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that what we have here is the Premier trying to salvage the public rebuke that he received from Your Honour for his underhanded attempt last Tuesday. I would submit to Your Honour that the same thing is involved as was involved previously, namely that the Premier has had knowledge of this matter for some three years.

The Premier, by the way, has misled this House, as did the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) mislead the people of the Province on television, when they both indicated that the Premier only the day before had become aware of and received knowledge of the letter because the Premier, by his own words in this House of Assembly several weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, hurled the reference to the letter across the floor. I challenged him to stand up, Mr. Speaker, and he would not do it at that time. It was only when he saw he had no choice. His only choice was to answer the questions that we are raising, and when he saw that he did not have the answers, Mr. Speaker, to the questions we are raising, then he has tried to intimidate members on this side of the House. Let him know that this Leader of the Opposition and Member's of the Opposition will not be intimidated by these tactics by the Premier. Mr. Speaker, the questions will continue until we get answers. Mr. Speaker, we know why they are trying to close the House so quickly!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that there is no point of order whatsoever. I am just hitting a sensitive nerve about the behavior of the hon. member for Mount Scio-Bell Island. What I am trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is abide by your ruling of last week. I have a copy of Hansard in which your ruling says, "However, in my view of the resolution, I have concerns with two of the recitals," the two recitals I have removed from the resolution. It is only those two recitals that Your Honour found were unparliamentary. I can only, therefore, conclude that the other parts of the resolution were in order. Otherwise Your Honour, would have obviously referred to those as well.

What I am trying to do here, Mr. Speaker, is not intimidate the Leader or members of the Opposition. I am trying to determine whether an action by a member of this House, like the action that was taken by the member for Mount Scio-Bell Island a number of years ago, is going to be condoned or whether we are going to live by certain rules as members of this House whereby we perform our functions as a member as one thing, and perform our functions in a private business as another and that the two cannot be mixed. Unless we establish that here then, of course, members in the House of Assembly in the future can do what they like in trying to intertwine their business with their politics.

MR. TULK:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, what we see the Premier doing is again, trying to, as the Leader of the Opposition said, stop the Opposition from doing its job by doing through the back door what he could not do through the front. The other day he came into this House and tried to throw a bit of slime and dirt across this House and to impute motives where they were none. Your Honour consequently ruled that out of order.

I am not so sure - and I would ask Your Honour to look at this - that in suggesting, even in his resolution, that the member for Mount Scio's actions, as he calls them, were "inappropriate conduct," whether that is in order. Is that not, at the same time, imputing some sort of motive, some sort of inappropriateness? Should he not have said "his conduct" rather than his "inappropriate conduct"? Is he not already bringing down a judgement on the member for Mount Scio by saying it was inappropriate rather than just saying conduct?

Let me make one other point, Mr. Speaker. The Premier in his second "WHEREAS" refers to liability. Do you notice the squirmy way that he trying to get in something that has to do with a court case involving the Ocean Ranger? As a matter of fact, the letter from the member for Mount Scio refers to compensation which has to do with Worker's Compensation which the member for

Mount Scio did free of cost as a member of this House and for his constituency, which he was perfectly free to do and which he did do for no fee. Now, Mr. Speaker, keep the Premier down there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

We know he is smarting. We know he is behaving in as unparliamentary a fashion last week as ever we have seen but, keep him down, keep him in his place. Let me make one other point, and I made this point last week to Your Honour when he made the ruling, that is the Premier puts in that that the member for Mount Scio and his law firm "attributes legal fees of \$750,000." Mr. Speaker, that is misleading information. The Premier is misleading this House again. He is trying to get down, Mr. Speaker, into the dirt and slime and to save his neck at any cost. His real problem is that he has a set of Conflict of Interest Guidelines in this Province which are of no use. He wrote them and tore them up for the Government House Leader so that he could hold his political power base in St. John's. Mr. Speaker, the Premier should apologize to this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. TOBIN:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West, to that

point of order.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I feel that I should respond to this. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) the other day challenged us all to get up and respond to it and I would like to have the opportunity, particularly after what the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) said. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, democracy must not only be seen to be done, it must be done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, we, as members of this Legislature -

MR. TULK:

Speak about the conflict of interest rights.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, and I am going to deal with you in a few days.

Mr. Speaker, we as members of the House of Assembly, are elected here to represent the constituents who sent us here. Mr. Speaker, I work as hard as any other member, probably no harder than most, but as hard as anyone, to represent the constituents of Burin-Placentia West, the same as everybody else, the same I am sure the Leader of the Opposition represents the constituents of Mount Scio-Bell Island. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the day that I use this position as a member of the House of Assembly for Burin-Placentia West, to represent those constituents and charge them for that action, that is the day, Mr. Speaker, that I believe I am

misusing the privileges and rights of the people who have sent me here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

We are on a point of order at the moment.

MR. BARRY:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is making the allegation that I charged for services which I performed as a member of the House of Assembly. That is incorrect. I have stated in this House that it is incorrect. The member knows that it is incorrect and I ask that that be withdrawn because it is a very serious accusation to make. It is a contravention of my privileges as a member and I ask him to withdraw it without qualification.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, on the matter of privilege brought up by the hon. the gentleman opposite, obviously the hon. gentleman says that the allegation of the \$750,000 is wrong. I mean, if the amount is

incorrect then it is a difference of opinion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

If the amount is incorrect, then the hon. gentleman can correct the amount and say what it is. Was there any remuneration or no remuneration at all? If there was no remuneration at all, that is a different matter. But if the amount is inaccurate, then that is not a matter of privilege. Let the hon. member set the record straight and say what the amount is. If there is a difference of opinion with respect to the amount, then there is a difference of opinion with respect to the amount. Let somebody clarify what the amount is. If there was no remuneration, if this was performed as a service by a member of th House of Assembly, having written the people on House of Assembly stationery, then that is a different matter. Let the hon. gentleman say, "No, it was a service that I performed as a member of the House of Assembly. There was no charge." That way we will get the thing clarified. Or if there was inadvertently a charge, maybe somebody inadvertently took in money or sent out bills or made deposits in the bank account, inadvertently, then perhaps there was a secretary or an office manager looking after the accounts who inadvertently took this money and put it in a bank account and they are now going to return it. These are the ways for handling it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
It is rare in this House, as I said last week, that you will see the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, former Minister of Justice, and a former Speaker of this House (Mr. Ottenheimer) stoop so low. What the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) said, and what was the point of privilege raised by the member for Mount Scio is that the member for Burin-Placentia West is stating that the member for Mount Scio received fees as a result of being a member of the House and received remuneration as a member of the House.

Now that is incorrect. That is false. We know why he is smarting. He is Executive Assistant to the Premier and he passed it up and now he is still trying to weasel his way out from under it as well, the biggest piece of dirt that ever came into this House last week. That is the real reason the member for Burin-Placentia West is so upset.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! To that point of privilege, I am going to check in Hansard and see exactly what the hon. member did say and I will have more to say about that tomorrow.

On the point of order, from listening to the resolution as it was read out, I did not hear anything that was incorrect in it. But again I am going to study that. And if I feel that is correct it will be on the paper tomorrow. If I feel it is not, it

will not be.

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRETT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have the answer to Question No. 30 appearing on the Order Paper, November 28, from the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward). 1. Does the Harmon Corporation presently receive any funding from the Department of Development? 2. Has the Corporation received funding in either of the last five years and, if so, what amounts has the Corporation received?

The answer to part 1 is, the Harmon Corporation does not receive any funding from the Department of Development for tourism, and 2, the Corporation has not received funding in either of the last five years.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to Questions Nos. 25 and 26, asked by the hon. the member for Stephenville. What are the percentage increases at other Newfoundland and Labrador Housing apartment units across

Newfoundland? The part with respect to Stephenville was answered in a previous question; Marystown 10 per cent; Goose Bay 14 per cent; St. John's various rate increases, ranging from 5 per cent to 14 per cent.

And No. 26, Why are three employees being transferred? They are being transferred, Mr. Speaker, because of restructuring with respect to regional offices out on the West Coast. In that the majority of calls for rural and remote housing etc. are now from Baie Verte and North of Gallants Hill, we have now restructured it so that North of Gallants Hill would be handled by Corner Brook and South of Gallants Hill would be handled by Stephenville. That is why the three people are being transferred.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to a question asked by the hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) on November 19.

MR. YOUNG:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. YOUNG:
Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 22 asked by the member for Port de Grave, and the answer to an Oral Question asked on November 27 by the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick).

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, this is the appropriate place to do it, before we come to Orders of the Day. I have a great deal of pleasure in moving that the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) take the Chair of this House as Deputy Chairman of Committees and Assistant Deputy Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
On motion, the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern was made Deputy Chairman of Committees and Assistant Deputy Speaker.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I might say that it is sad that the member for St. John's East Extern is not receiving a position where he can more fully make the contribution that we have seen him make before. But if that is all he is going to get from the Premier, we will gladly support that.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of the

Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The only thing I will say is that the people of Newfoundland will not be sad to see that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) does not get the position that he had before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

A bill, "An Act To The Department Of Finance Act", (Bill No. 56).

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I was fully prepared to speak to this bill for a considerable length of time, but I am now going to make my comments very brief, indeed. I clearly cannot support this bill because it is an attack upon democracy. When you see a concentration of power given to one person, to me it is very dangerous. We have seen the same thing happen in U.S.S.R many times, where Premier Khrushcev held so many positions. This is indeed a very dangerous thing to see happening, Mr. Speaker. With bills such as Bill No. 56, where the concentration of power is made moreso, we are attacking democracy. It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that at the same time as this bill is before us, the government side decides to attack democracy in our hon. House of Assembly; they are using a measure whereby the Opposition is going to be stifled, is going to be muzzled, is going to be intimidated. Is it for that reason, Mr. Speaker, realizing there are other bills on this Order Paper, that I am unable to continue to the speech which I was

going to give on the attack on democracy.

There was an attack on democracy with Bill No. 56, Mr. Speaker, and it is a sad day in this Province when we see an attack on democracy in this hon. House where I, as a member of this hon. House, am not able to get up and speak as I would like, and as I thought I was entitled to do, to a bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, before I close debate and move second reading, I would like to say that the only points and the only questions of real substance which were raised were with respect to the nature of this bill and whether this bill was going too far in giving to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), of all people, unbridled power so that the hon. minister could sign anything he wished to at any give time.

I reiterate that the purpose of this bill is to accord to the Minister of Finance exactly the same powers as were accorded to other ministers under the Departmental Act that was passed last year. It would, in effect, only give the minister, under very particular, prescribed rules and regulations of the Cabinet, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the right to sign agreements of a routine nature so that we would not get, as has happened over a period of time, the agenda of Cabinet cluttered up with routine matters which do not need the

specific attention of Cabinet itself. With that, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Finance Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973". (Bill No. 55).

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I have notes here with me on the particular changes in this, but I do not propose to go through them at the present time because this is a bill which brings in amendments to clear up certain things in the Act which are essentially now out of date, they are no longer current practice. The amendments get rid of those things which are no longer appropriate for the Act and also bring in certain changes of no substantial nature which will just allow the operation of the Corporation to go ahead in an efficient manner.

Now, I will be only too glad to go into any particular points which hon. members opposite, having studied the bill in great detail, I am sure, wish to go into. But rather than anticipating that and reading out all these points here, some of which, as I say, are quite inconsequential and, I think, would not be taking the time of the House to good advantage, so I introduce the bill for second reading.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER
The hon. the member for Fogo.

Mr. Speaker, in his usual fashion, the minister tries to gloss things over. That is the way this minister acts, he glosses over budgets in the Spring and paints over the cracks on them in the Fall. He is like the weather forecaster with his budgets. He is in the same sort of mood this afternoon that you would find him in in the Spring of the year, about March or April. He is beaming! Spring has struck again. There is nothing to this bill, there is nothing to his budgets, there is nothing to his forecasts.

He tried to pull the best trick of all last Spring, Mr. Speaker, when, instead of making the kinds of predictions that he used to make before, which were based upon what he thought was a good forecast, \$28 million to \$30 million, he said, 'No, I am going to \$70 million or \$75 Million, I am going to double it up so that I do not have to come in in the Fall and tell the House and tell the people of Newfoundland that I goofed again.' He said, 'I will do it this way: I will up the ante, I will double it all up the amount of the deficit.' So what do we see? Even with doubling it up, he proved to us that he cannot manage the affairs of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest a couple of things to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) about this little amendment that he has here. What he has done is given himself the ability - 'Old Scrooge' - to say just before

Christmas that not only those things that have 3 per cent alcohol in them are to be considered alcoholic beverages but even anything with 1 per cent alcohol in them. Mr. Speaker, you will soon get to a point in this Province where you will not be able to drink a cup of tea without the minister having the ability to lay on a tax, as if it were an alcoholic beverage. Now, that is what he has done.

No more spruce beer for Mr. Speaker for Christmas. None of that mild stuff for you, Mr. Speaker. There will be no more of that for you. You will have to pay the same for that as you have to pay for the hard stuff, although I know Mr. Speaker does not want to see the hard stuff. Old Scrooge is at it again.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He does not even drink wine.

MR. EFFORD:

He does speak once in a while.

MR. TULK:

Not standing up, though.

Mr. Speaker, what we see here is an attempt by the Minister of Finance - of course, he is going to carry it with his large group of people over there - to try to get another few cents out of the people of Newfoundland. It has almost reached the point with him where it is like trying to get blood out of turnip.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Spruce beer.

MR. TULK:

Yes, spruce beer. I was just telling Mr. Speaker that even spruce beer and his cup of tea is likely to be taxed this Christmas

by the Minister of Finance just the same as if it were the hard stuff, the same thing. Old Scrooge is with us again.

There is a question that we have been putting to the Minister of Finance all Fall in Committee on Supplementary Supply. We heard the Government House Leader this afternoon go on and on and on about the fact that we took twenty-one days on Supplementary Supply and it was a waste of the time of the House. Indeed it was. If the Minister of Finance had given some answers to the questions, we could have had that all over with in two days. But we had to keep pushing and pushing him for answers.

We have another question for him. I wonder is he listening? If he wants this bill to go through, he should attempt to stand up and answer some questions about it. We need to know just how much that deficit would have been this Fall if he had not had American beer being sold in the Province this Summer. How much money did he make on that American beer? That is the question we are asking. He is now predicting his deficit is going to be out by another \$5 million. In other words, we are looking at \$75 million to \$76 million. How much would it have been, I wonder, if he had not had the American beer to make a few bucks off the brewery workers in the Province and off the beer drinkers in this Province?

MR. EFFORD:

A few million.

MR. TULK:

Millions to this fellow over there is like bucks to you and me. Just how much did he make on that American beer this Summer?

Those are the kinds of questions that we want the Minister of Finance to answer. If he gives us a commitment and assures us that when I get up tomorrow morning and have a cup of coffee in which there is a bit of alcohol that he is not going to put taxes on it, and my spruce beer and my blueberry wine is not going to be taxed, and that my mild stuff that I drink, Mr. Speaker, is not going to be taxed, if he will assure us of that -

MR. W. CARTER:
And your Geritol.

MR. TULK:
I would say the minister probably takes Geritol. He is probably taxing himself. I will tell you that the finances of this Province need some Geritol, or something like that.

MR. BARRY:
The economy could use a shot of Geritol.

MR. TULK:
It will not get it from him, though, not the kind of Geritol this economy needs. We will have to replace him or do something with him, replace the whole government, as a matter of fact.

MR. POWER:
You did not do too well in April.

MR. TULK:
Look at the minister of everything. He used to be the minister of budworms, now they have made him minister of everything and something. He is not sure exactly what he is.

MR. KELLAND:
Education, level 2.

MR. TULK:

Grade X we used to call it.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we want those two questions answered: How much did he make on American beer this Summer? How much did he gouge the beer drinkers of Newfoundland and, indeed, the brewery workers? He kept them out. I think he intentionally did it, according to what he said, when the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) was trying to solve this problem. He put him in an awful position down there, a decent and good young fellow. We cannot support it, can we?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No, we cannot.

MR. TULK:
We need the answers to those questions. We need to hear "Old Care Bear" over there stand up and tell us that indeed he is not trying to take it out of the hides of Newfoundlanders again.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I believe that in rising now I close debate on the bill, but I would be only too glad to answer the two questions that the hon. member brought up.

His first question was with regard to the extension of the definition of alcoholic liquor to include what is now a fairly popular drink in the Province, that is the light beer, the beer with a lower alcoholic content, the 1 per cent beer.

Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members will remember that we extended the vending of beer to other than the Corporation and retail outlets a little while ago and beer can now be bought in certain

establishments. But, in doing that, we put in the provision that those establishments should not be such where children and minors are likely to be making purchases, not for beer, obviously, but for other things like, you know, soft drinks and candies and so on and so forth. So the beer vending in private establishments now is limited to those where children and minors are not likely to have to go. And that is the intention here, that by bringing in this change, we bring these light beers in under that same provision, that they can only be sold in stores other than, say, the corner store where candies are sold and supermarkets and that type of thing. It is not the intention of the Corporation to in any way get further revenues under this particular amendment; it is purely to extend the same protection we now extend to the slightly higher alcoholic beers to this type beer.

The answer to the questions the hon. member raised with regard to the beer strike is contained in an answer that I tabled in the House today. That was in response to a question asked a short while ago by the hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). So it is there for the hon. member to see and it is available to the public.

One of the questions the hon. the member for Port de Grave asked was how much did the revenues of the Province increase as a result of the importation of beer from outside the Province. In my answer, I said that the precise figure cannot be determined at this time, it can only be determined at the end of the fiscal year. I pointed out that we get revenues from the Corporation on a regular monthly remittance basis and those

remittances from the Corporation, up to the end of October - I just do not have the figures for November - were exactly as were projected in the May budget. So, at this point in time, the Public Treasury has no increase in revenues, no increase in remittances from the Corporation over and above what were predicted in the budget. And what was predicted in the budget, of course, did not have anything to do with the beer dispute at the breweries.

Mr. Speaker, I really do not know if there is any other information to be given on those two points at this stage. I close the debate and move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973", read a second time, ordered referred to a committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 55).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Corporations Capital Tax Act," (Bill No. 37).

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, this is "An Act To Amend The Financial Corporations Capital Tax Act". Hon. members will recall that this particular levy was brought in and first went into effect in the 1982-1983 fiscal year. The present amendments are necessary. It is now three to four years later, there have been certain difficulties arising out of this new type of taxation approach, and we are now bringing in certain clarifications to the original act. The original act was

essentially based on similar types of taxation measures in other Provinces, particularly in Saskatchewan. As time has gone on, those other provinces found that they had difficulties. We found somewhat similar difficulties, and that is what the clarification is all about.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I will only be too glad to go through these one by one if required. Perhaps I could just point out that one of the things we are now prescribing is that the interest rates can be based on part of a month as well as on a full month. That is one of the changes there. We are changing the date of installment payments just to make the thing more easily administered, and we are clarifying the formula with respect to the allocations of paid-up capital tax where a company will be paying capital tax to various jurisdictions and not just to one.

Mr. Speaker, those are examples of the types of clarifying amendments. I move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I think we can support this bill, Bill No. 37. This is not directly related to this bill, but would the minister indicate whether the Province is keeping an eye on the state of financial corporations in this Province? We have seen an amazing situation develop in Canada where a number of the smaller banks, banks that evolved from trust companies, have gone under. And when one asks why this has occurred, while there are, I am sure, a goodly number of reasons

that have been debated in the House of Commons, one of the things that strikes me as perhaps the most outrageous thing that has been done by the Prime Minister of this country is that statement by him that the country is now bankrupt. Then we see subsequent to that statement, a run on certain banks and financial institutions. The Prime Minister is wondering why that occurs when he has gotten up and said that the country is bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Finance would indicate whether he agrees with that approach to providing a sense of confidence in our financial institutions? Is he prepared to get up and say that the Province is bankrupt as well as the county? Is that sort of statement designed to instill confidence in those people who have funds in not just the smaller financial institutions but some of the larger ones?

MR. J. CARTER:

He was being rhetorical, you know darn well.

MR. BARRY:

He was being rhetorical? He was being mischievous, maybe mischievously rhetorical, but it was a statement that I know that Prime Minister will rue the day that it came out of his mouth. We have seen where the Bank of Canada has had to step in since that statement and provide a cash flow to permit certain financial institutions to survive the withdrawal of deposits by depositors who lost confidence in the particular institution.

Now, the minister's bill here is designed not to bolster up the financial institutions of this

Province but to permit him to more clearly get his pound of flesh, if I understand correctly what the purpose of this bill is about, that there are certain problems of definition and so forth, problems in collecting a tax which has already been in existence. I think this is correct. Can the minister confirm that there is nothing new in the way of taxes? It is to make it easier to collect the tax that has been imposed and to clarify, presumably, certain inadequacies in previous legislation which has led to certain institutions being able to fight off the minister, keep him from getting his shovel into their stores. They have been able to fight him off, Mr. Speaker, and keep their assets away from the Provincial tax man.

We assume this is not retroactive. It is deemed to have come into force on April 1 - oh, it is! - 1984. This Subsection 1 is deemed to have come into force on April 1, 1984. No, we cannot support that section, Mr. Speaker. Was this bill tabled on April 1, 1984, or before?

DR. COLLINS:

This got on the Order Paper.

MR. BARRY:

Well, if the minister would check. The only way we could support this clause, and we have gone into it with Bill 37 and we will go into it again -

AN HON. MEMBER:

This is Bill No. 37.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, it is another Bill 37 with another retroactive provision. But if this Bill was tabled on or prior to April 1 1984, or if the minister had given notice of this

provision coming into effect, then we would be prepared to support the Bill coming into effect as of April 1 if the Parties had been given notice at the time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Prior notice.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, at the time or prior. Otherwise, has the minister considered the effect this might have on the confidence of investors in this Province? This retroactive legislation is now taken so cavalierly, so casually. The minister has supported the Prime Minister of this country who has said, 'We will take away that backing from Petro-Canada because it changed the rules of the game - according to the Prime Minister, and we will have something to say on that - after the game started. We will have something to say about that. What is the minister doing here? He is trying to change the rules of the game after the game has started. Now, we do not want to blow this up into an impediment to the minister getting a good change to legislation, a change that may be needed, but we ask the minister to look seriously at this clause. It is retroactive and we cannot support retroactive legislation unless there was notice given, on or before April 1, 1984, to those who would be affected by it.

MR. TULK:

That is right up their alley, retroactive legislation.

MR. BARRY:

No, now, as I say, we do not want to build this up to an issue that is going to impede the passage of this Bill but I would ask the minister to take a look at it and when it comes to the Committee

stage, would the minister have a look at dealing with the aspect of whether or not this is retroactive legislation?

Mr. Speaker, that is all we would like to say on this Bill, other than that we would like to ask that the minister give us some indication that the financial institutions operating in this Province are in good shape, that any taxation is not going to help put them under. We do not think that is the case. As far as we can see they are in reasonably good shape, but maybe the minister would tell us. I do not think it is the minister who has primary responsibility for supervising these bodies in the Province, I think it is the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell). But the minister is obviously part of Cabinet and as Minister of Finance would have an interest there, as well. We would ask the minister to make sure that there is a close eye kept so that investors in this Province are not left holding the stick if these financial institutions go under, realizing that there is a government guarantee of deposit up to \$60,000.

With that, Mr. Speaker, we say we can support this bill subject to that retroactive clause being either explained or modified.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Actually there are quite a few retroactive clauses if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) would care to look at it. I think

there is one at the top of page five, "that retroactive to June 1, 1982." I think there is another one in the middle of page six, "retroactive to June 1, 1982", and so on. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address another aspect of it and that is that this particular piece of legislation is amending the Financial Corporations Capital Tax Act. I believe the minister said that was in 1982 or 1983. What was the initial year?

DR. COLLINS:
1982-83.

MR. FENWICK:
1982-83 it was passed. It is becoming apparent that we are proposing pieces of legislation with major flaws in them in that we are having to come back within two or three years and patch them up, so to speak. I think that is the only conclusion you can come to looking at all these retroactive provisions, that obviously the wording was faulty or poor at the beginning, and that raises a serious question about the way in which legislation is handled in the House in general. I am not going back to 1982-83 and criticize the members who were here, but I know, from the experience I have had in the last year in the House, that there is a tendency for putting through legislation without, in my opinion, putting it through the kind of screening that is necessary in order to make sure that these kinds of flaws and poor wording, and so on, are not allowed to exist.

It leads me to a suggestion that I would like to make to the House, which I have made before but I would like to repeat now, and that is unlike other legislatures, unlike the House of Commons, we

very rarely use the Committee system in order to examine this kind of legislation and I would like to suggest that perhaps maybe we should start looking into it. Because, quite rightly, a committee of, say, six or seven members who had some degree of expertise and long-time experience in this particular area would have detected the kinds of flaws and wording that exist here and would have been able to correct it ahead of time so that we would not have to go back and take the legislation - it is like a leaky boat, we keep on plugging one hole and then another one comes up, then it keeps on sailing a bit farther and we notice another board that is sprung in the ship of this particular legislation and so on. And I seriously recommend to, I guess, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), the Premier and the Cabinet as a whole, that there may be a better way of dealing with this kind of legislation if you would allow these kinds of committees to examine it.

Having said that, there is only one other comment I would like to make. I would like to pick up on a comment that the Minister for Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell) made last week in this House. We are talking about financial corporations here and he, in the course of debate on a previous particular piece of legislation, indicated that we have an inspection function being performed in his department on trust companies and other financial institutions which are provincially chartered. I believe that is what he was talking about. Yet, we only have one, single individual responsible for that and the minister indicated,

at the time, that he felt that additional staff were necessary.

I think it is a very important thing to realize at this point because we have had a number of federally chartered banks and trust companies in trouble over the last four or five years, and I would hate to think that the provincially chartered institutions we have in our Province are being so lightly inspected, as well, and as a result may end up in trouble.

I would like to suggest that maybe the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications would like to elaborate further on the particular point he made about the thinness of his inspection staff with regard to these institutions, during debate on second reading, because I think the people of the Province deserve to know how secure their savings and their investments are in these particular institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I dislike retroactive legislation. In some very rare instances I can see the need for it but, to me, sloppy drafting initially has made it necessary to do this kind of thing retroactively. The Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications is going. I was hoping he would at least give us his comments on the comment I made about whether or not he will get additional staff to make sure that we can have the kind of inspection we need.

I would also like the Minister of Finance to comment on whether, if we had had a properly constituted Committee system in the past, it would have been possible to fix these anomalies prior to that time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. minister speaks now, he closes the debate.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

On the retroactivity concerns that were expressed, the first concern related to Clause 1. Clause 1 is merely a clarifying clause, really. The companies which are taxed under this Act are those, essentially, which are licenced under the Trust and Loan Companies Licencing Act, but a strict reading of the definition in the preamble of the Capital Tax Act would require that these companies fulfill all three criteria; that they be a trust company, that they be a loan corporation and that they be registered under the act. That is what a strict interpretation is.

Now, most of the companies of this nature in the Province are not all three, they are either a trust company or they are a loan corporation, although they are all licensed under the Trust and Loan Companies Licencing Act. So this is not spreading the net any wider, it is just bringing the wording of the act into place so that it is now the same as current practice. These particular companies are the ones which are being taxed because they are licenced under that particular act, but it is now an either/or situation, it is not an and situation.

In regard to the other concern about retroactivity, that referred to Sub-section (2) of Clause 4. All that does there is we were finding that certain companies

were remitting the tax that was due but they were not giving us sufficient information as to which month - they have to remit on a monthly basis - the tax was related to and on what basis. In other words, their estimated total capital tax for the year. We just had insufficient information to correctly assign the tax that was sent in to the proper month and to make sure that the estimated amount was consistent with other information that we needed. So the retroactivity was really just related to information flow, it was not related in any way to increasing tax.

Now, the point that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition brought up was about financial institutions. Of course, I do not think I have to point out to hon. members that we do not have, in this Province, the headquarters of banks. All the banking institutions and, indeed, most of the other financial institutions in this Province are branches of mainland banks. These institutions are really controlled through their head offices and those are situated in other provinces.

I do not think that we here could have a great surveillance activity in place that would really give a true picture of whether a financial institution was getting into trouble or not, we would only be able to look at a very small part of its total operation. And even if we had a very detailed surveillance mechanism in place, or monitoring mechanism, I do not really think it would throw up much useful information in terms of deciding whether a bank was viable and its operations were legitimate and so on and so forth.

I do have to make this point though, Mr. Speaker, that the two banks which failed were those which were headquartered in Alberta. Now, we all know what happened in Alberta. Alberta was hit with a sledge hammer and that sledge hammer was called the National Energy Programme. Alberta, up to the time the NEP was brought into effect, was one of the underlying strengths of Canada. It was giving tremendous employment, particularly in the Western provinces but, indeed, in the Central provinces, too, because the energy industry in Alberta was going ahead very, very sharply and very, very smartly. Now, the NEP was brought in and it really undermined the economy in Alberta, and it brought the energy industry in this Province to its knees, in many respects. There were some good aspects to it, I suppose; it started some exploration up in the Arctic. Now, the explorations up there have been very disappointing in their results but, I suppose, no one could foretell that. But it did start some activity up there. But it really did great damage to the economy in Alberta and it was for that reason that those banks out there failed.

Now, in retrospect everyone realizes the NEP was a mistake, it was a very unfortunate policy thrust by the federal government at that stage and, of course, hon. members know which complexion of federal government I am referring to. It was an error in judgment, it was a bad policy, and it was a most unfortunate act that was brought in which directly - and few people will question this - to a number of bankruptcies in Alberta and, of course, that ultimately brought those two banks into great difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, with those comments I would move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Corporations Capital Tax Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 37).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Youth Advisory Council Act". (Bill No. 8)

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) who is on Her Majesty's service today, it is my pleasure to introduce this particular bill. It is a bill that is pretty straightforward, I think. It is something that the members of the Youth Advisory Council themselves have requested. The explanatory notes on the inside of the bill pretty well explain what the bill is all about.

It amends The Youth Advisory Council Act by doing four things: First of all, it provides that the age range of the membership of the Council would be changed from ages fourteen to twenty-one, which it is presently, to ages fourteen to twenty-four. This was a request of the Council itself to encompass a broader sector of the youth group.

The second thing it does, Mr. Speaker, is increase the number of members on the Council itself to

thirteen, nine of whom will be elected by the youth themselves on a regional basis, at regional meetings throughout the Province. Thirdly, it provides that the three appointed council members must be over the age of twenty-four. Those three appointed councillors, of course, are appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council but are recommended by the Youth Advisory Council members, the remaining nine members, themselves.

The additional amendment, Mr. Speaker, provides that the immediate Past Chairman of the Council become a member of the Youth Advisory Council, itself.

So that is pretty straightforward, I think. Even members opposite should not have much difficulty in understanding and comprehending that. I know the Opposition's critic for the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth will have a few comments to make on it. He and I have had indepth discussions on this particular piece of legislation, something which we both support. As a former minister of that department, Mr. Speaker, let me just say, if I may, that I had several occasions to meet with the members of the Youth Advisory Council. The then membership of the Youth Advisory Council has changed, obviously, over the years.

I also had occasion to attend a number of their functions and meetings throughout the Province and had occasion to meet with them and discuss matters of great interest and concern to the young people of today, and of yesterday, when I was there several years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also take the opportunity to mention some of the things that are done, not only by the Youth Advisory Council, because they do a lot of their work in consultation and in coherth, I guess, with the Youth Services Division of the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth. It is important to realize that that Youth Services Division is a division of the department and of government which provides services to a number of Provincial youth organizations throughout the Province. It has a specific mandate, if you wish, to provide whatever assistance it can financially but, even just as importantly, they provide a considerable amount of expertise from within that department and from among those who work in the department.

The other types of things, of course, that the Youth Services Division deals with and that the Youth Advisory Council are interested in are projects like the Katimavik projects which, by the way, I am sure most members opposite would be familiar with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
It is an excellent programme and for the information of hon. members, I understand that the deadline for volunteers for the upcoming Katimavik projects are February 5 and April 2, respectively. It is a programme that sends volunteers from the age of seventeen to twenty-one to one or more nonprofit organizations to undertake a nine-month programme. Projects are geared towards all kinds of different things of course, very general, if you wish. The volunteers who work

under the Katimavik project work for little money but, they gain a great deal of experience.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a suggestion, if I may, for the consideration of the House. It is something that I thought about in preparing for the introduction of this particular Bill and actually it is something that I have contemplated for a long period of time. It reflects the opinion of a number of people. It is another programme that the Youth Services Division of the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth may consider but, I think more appropriately, it would be a programme that this House should consider. Perhaps through Your Honour's office, the Speaker's office, or the Internal Economy Commission and it is one that dear to all of our hearts now being members of this legislature. I refer to some type of -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is that internal commission?

MR. SIMMS:

The Internal Economy Commission is the body that administers the House of Assembly and which the Speaker chairs. Perhaps this kind of an operation could be considered by the IEC or by the House itself. I am referring to a Parliamentary Internship Programme. There are various degrees of internship programmes throughout the country but, in Newfoundland there is no Parliamentary Internship Programme. I think that it is something that we in this House could probably consider.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It has already been recommended by the Select on Committee on Accommodations and Benefits of

Members.

MR. SIMMS:

I am not sure what the details were. Were there any details to it or just that there would be one?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is was based on other programmes (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

I know that in some jurisdictions there are programmes. The Federal programme is a nine-month programme, I think, and so is the Ontario programme. That may be a bit too rich for us, I do not know because I think the students that participate in the Ottawa programme get paid a stipend of \$9,000 and they spend half of their time with a Government member and then the other half with an Opposition member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, there is a foundation or something that handles it. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, it is just an idea that I wanted to toss out to you. I was not aware that the Select Committee had made the recommendation but, I am glad to hear that they have.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one more point if I may. I know the House Leader is anxious to move on but, there is an important point since we are dealing with a Bill of this importance and we are talking about the Youth Advisory Council specifically but, youth in general.

There was a letter in The Evening Telegram over the weekend that struck me with a great deal of interest. I do not know how many

members may have read the letter. It was written by a young teenager who lives here in the city of St. John's. This teenager wrote that she was sixteen years of age and, like a lot of other people her age, she works hard in school and at home from Sunday to Friday, and Friday and Saturday evenings are the evenings that she relaxes and socializes with her friends.

She says, "Contrary to popular belief, we, as teenagers, are also human beings and therefore, social beings." The young lady goes on to describe an incident that occurs frequently in a particular business establishment in the community, well, in fact, it is the Village Mall. She says young people up there are harassed, if you want, by security people who work in the Mall. I do not know how much fact there is to it, but I certainly know that she makes a great point in her letter to the paper. Those who have not read it, I would really urge you to read it. She says if you are over nineteen years of age, you can lean on the rail at the Village Mall, but if you are under nineteen years of age, you can be harassed and asked to leave. I really thought that that was quite a letter from a young girl sixteen years of age. I have been anxious to bring it up in the House because I agree with her.

There obviously is age discrimination there that should be eliminated. What hit me mostly was that she says, "I know I am 'just a teenager' and what I say may not matter to some adults...We are not all that bad. When I read The Telegram, I read about adults being charged with child abuse, rape, murder, robbery, and drug trafficking. But I do not jump to the conclusion that all

adults are bad. So people in authority, of course, should not think the same of us." Well, Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with that young lady. I think it was a superbly written letter. She made some excellent points.

That is the kind of thing that the Youth Advisory Council, I think, could deal with on a regional basis - and they do in their meetings around the Province. They have meetings and they encourage young people to put forth their concerns and their ideas and suggestions such as this, and to express themselves. And that is what it is all about. It is an excellent forum for all of them to do that.

The only damper I have on this whole debate, Mr. Speaker, is that I keep reflecting back to what my friend from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) said on Thursday. He, too, was talking about young people and he was alluding to the recent general election in Grand Falls. Mr. Speaker, he made the statement on Thursday, which I predict will haunt him forever and a day. I am certainly not finished with it because I have had all kinds of people make representations to me about it.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
I have so! I had a copy of a Hansard given to me by a university student. When he said there are 130 kids out there who worked on the campaign in April, 1985 in Grand Falls, "who do not know what is what," I think that that is an awful slur on the university students in this Province.

MR. BARRY:
Who said that?

MR. SIMMS:
The member for Windsor - Buchans said it. I say to the Leader of the Opposition that I trust that that kind of an attitude and comment is not reflective of the members in the Opposition who share seats with the member for Windsor - Buchans, because I really do think that it was a dangerous and inexcusable comment for the member for Windsor - Buchans to make. Nothing short of an apology will be satisfactory. I will be writing him to that effect to make sure that it becomes a public issue.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, those are just a few asides. Essentially, as I said, with respect to the bill, these are amendments that the Youth Advisory Council themselves have asked for. They do good work, and I think we should support them and support the bill.

I move second reading.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a pleasure to speak to a bill related to the Youth Advisory Council and any bill that will help make the Youth Advisory Council a more effective body to serve the youth of this Province.

I was interested in the comments by the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) as

he spoke about the letter that was in The Evening Telegram this past weekend. I must say, I was struck by the letter also. I think it indicates that youth in this Province are going to forge ahead. They have a good future and will hopefully create one because it seems as if they are going to have to create it on their own. The way this provincial government is operating, they are going to have no choice in the matter.

When it comes to the Youth Advisory Council, I have been attending a ton of meetings relating to their councils, their elections, talking with their officials and so on. After doing a lot of research I have come to the opinion that they can have a very effective purpose but in order to be effective you have to be listened to. From my conversations and from what I have read and seen, I do not think they have been listened to at close to an effective manner.

They have applied for a new budget for this coming year and I am sure that the minister responsible is going to make sure that this Advisory Council for Youth is properly funded. They need the funding to do the job. They are very limited at the present time and they are serving a very effective purpose, but in order to be more effective, they need the proper resources, the major one being funding. I have talked with a number of their members, very good, well qualified individuals and they are promoting the cause of youth in this Province very strongly, but again I do not think they have been given the resources. The minister should take heed that he has this Youth Advisory Council and he should

make them as effective as possible. I think he has not been doing that.

They put a report together in 1982 on the problem of youth unemployment. It was very good, well done and well researched. They travelled around the Province. A number of individuals responded to it and a number of individuals gave input to it, but the report is still sitting there. The responses that were made were minimal. They were not carried forth, and, to this day, those recommendations still sit there and very, very few things have been done to help alleviate what is the biggest problem on this Island and in Labrador today, youth unemployment. It is the biggest, most gigantic catastrophe that we have faced in many, many years. If something is not soon done about it, we are probably in for a very, very difficult time down the road.

They made some excellent recommendations just three years ago and they have been just sitting on the desks of whoever and not responded to in the proper manner. When the minister brings in a new bill on the Youth Advisory Council, while I agree with everything that is going through here, I think it is just adding a few things that are not going to make them as effective as they could be. I think what could make them more effective is by giving them more power and also putting some acknowledgement of their resources so that they are going to be listened to. In the Act it states that they are advising the provincial government on concerns of youth, but it is one thing to advise, and another thing to listen and do something about it.

This provincial government has been very, very lax in that response as can be seen, firstly, by the unemployment rate that exists, which is a shocking figure. There is no other word for it. There are a lot of words, I suppose, that are related to shocking but they would either have to be more of an extreme.

The unemployment rate in this Province for youth is wicked in that we do not have a proper programme or even an attempt to try to answer that problem by arranging specific programmes for youth in this Province. It is beyond me and it has totally amazed me. I have had many conversations with university people, with people in youth agencies across this Province and youth themselves. There have been attempts made by other provinces in other provincial jurisdictions to handle the problem of youth unemployment.

Manitoba just brought in a programme which is very good promoting youth entrepreneurs, a very good programme, something that certainly could be done down here, but it does not seem that we have the foresight in the provincial government to try and attempt something like that. They were concerned with the youth unemployment rate, they were really shocked with the youth unemployment rate of about 13 per cent. They were overcome by that. They thought that was a catastrophe. I do not know what they would think if they could read and see what we have down here today.

So, when we talk about the Youth Advisory Council and amendments to the act, we should bring amendments in that would give them

more authority, give them a say in what goes on in developing policy, anything along those lines so that they will be listened to. They have not been listened to effectively. That is definitely seen by the unemployment rate we have today with youth, whereas they have made recommendations, good ones, very good ones as far as I am concerned, that could have been acted upon, but have not been acted upon, and it does not look like in the future they will even get presented.

It is too bad the minister is not here because I would have a chance to get his reaction to that, but I am hoping that he will react down the road. I keep saying down the road. Down the road for this administration, I do not know when the date is going to be, but this unemployment rate that is existing here is gone crazy and the effects of it on the student population and the young people in this Province, under sight of what they can do in the future, is wicked. They have to try to get up every morning and go out in this world and on this Island and try to create a better life for themselves, but they are finding it increasingly and more increasingly difficult.

We see these hunger strikes going on all over the Island, a scattered place here and there. They are desperate people out that way. I think that the youth of this Province want to see some action. They are kind of waiting and waiting and waiting and they have been waiting for so long. I hope that they see some action by the provincial government because right now they are in a state of submission or they have been beaten. Their energies are going to waste. They are not working

and I think it is time the provincial government started to address this problem by giving provincial policy and directives to that instead of waiting for it to go away because it is not going to go away.

Again, as I said, other provincial jurisdictions have tried to handle the problem and have made attempts. As a matter of fact, they have been successful in certain areas. We have not done that and unless we start doing that we are in for a hard, hard time in the future. The future of this Province depends on these people. First off, they have got to stay here so we can help solve the problem. The biggest problem they have now is they are leaving and they are not going to come back. If they do not stick around, well, there is not much of a future for any of us, as a matter of fact. They have got to stay here and work on this Province and create a better economy. But the way it is right now, there is no way in the world they are going to stick around here and do nothing because young people have a certain spirit and they want to go to work.

I hear a lot of times this attitude that they do not want to work, that they do not want to do this, that they are lazy and this and that. If you could get into a school and see them or if you could see them working for a week, I think everybody could understand in this House of Assembly. Everybody knows, everybody out there should realize it, that these young people just wanted an opportunity.

Years ago there were a lot of opportunities. There were not so many regulations. The world

economy was in better shape, etc. These days we have to face many more difficult problems, more complex jobs and a more complex society. It is time that we addressed those problems instead of waiting for them to go away. You cannot wait for these things to go away. They are not going to go away and we are in jeopardy down the road. We are in jeopardy now. We are in a state of jeopardy. We are in a state of wicked confusion and of a desperate situation. These young people need, at least, some sense of direction. If they do not get that, then she is going to be all over.

This amendment, like I said, I cannot disagree with anything in it. It is just going to expand the number of members and so on in the age group. But I just want to make sure that when the amendment goes through that the Youth Advisory Council, in its role, is taken more seriously by the provincial government and by the minister respectively and that he takes the Youth Advisory Council a lot more seriously because they have not been taken as seriously as they should. They have a great contribution to make. The young people of this Province who are trying desperately to make a contribution, have not been given the avenue to do that.

I would ask the minister responsible, and the provincial government, to take the Youth Advisory Council and its good recommendations that it has on many issues concerning youth in this Province, and listen to them very, very, very closely because they are based on good research. I must say I am very impressed with the ladies and gentlemen who are on the council. They are

doing a good job, but doing a good job with very limited resources.

I am sure that the minister is going to approve everything that they have applied for in their budget to make them more effective. As a matter of fact, they should be getting more than that. I want to see that this advisory council is given a proper respect because they are trying to help solve the problem of youth on this Island. Any attempts made by any group should be definitely welcomed by the provincial government because we cannot let this situation go on anymore. It has come to the point now where people are not even bothering, they are just getting up and going. I think we are in a bad situation.

Related to that, there is now, I believe on Thursday night, going to be a Youth of the Year Award given in this International Year of the Youth. There were twelve nominees for that and I am sure that these twelve people will be honoured in a respective fashion. I would like to see more of that. Make it an annual event to honour these twelve young people who have made big contributions to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. But, again it is like, "We will shove it off maybe this year, because it is International Year of the Youth." We should continue the practice and keep it going.

I go along with the amendments, like I said, but the Youth Advisory Council is being followed. They are not being listened to. They made good suggestions and it is about time that the Province decided to say, "We are going to do something about this wicked situation,"

because there is no other term for it. Unemployment in any respect and for any age group is probably the wickedest thing that you can go through in your lifetime, but for that age group to face what they are facing out there today, the lack of opportunity and the lack of effort being put into provincial policy right now, results in hopelessness. They want to have some type of hope and come out and take their initiative and build a better economy, but they are not going to get the opportunity unless the Province decides to tackle the problem head on with some actions.

On that note, I support the amendment. It is just four things that have been changed. It has been put forth by the Youth Advisory Council. It is good to see that they are being listened to in that sense, but on the major recommendations that they have made, and that they are going to make, the provincial government should listen to them very seriously. They are making a contribution and they are trying to change things around. They are making a very positive contribution and it is time for the Province to move forward and try to solve the problem because it is gone way, way, way too far, it is gone to ridiculousness, and it is time that we addressed that problem and get it solved because you cannot have a 40 per cent youth unemployment rate in this Province. It is a wicket-catastrophe to go through. I end my comments on that note.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on it. I understand these are amendments that have been recommended by the advisory board itself and, on that basis, I see nothing particularly onerous about them.

One of the clauses seeks to change the age of membership on the council from fourteen to twenty-one, to fourteen to twenty-four, broadening it out by three years, is a curious change. I know it is in correspondence with I think the federal definition of what a youth is now, at least I have seen it done that way, but it is almost like we have started to say, "Well, let us expand our definition of youth." To me I think it is a recognition that young people have a harder time getting in the work force and that, therefore, we will expand the time period that we consider them youth and consider them under training options and so on and so forth. It is a curious way of redefining the problem, so to speak, and I think in terms of their unemployment rate that is probably one of the reasons that we have done it that way. However, it is just an observation that I want to make that it seems sort of curious to change that.

The other one is section (c) "that the three appointed council members be older than twenty-four years." I understand it is a recommendation from the council and I do not object to it, but I was wondering.

We have now a constitution that says that you cannot discriminate against people on the basis of their age. Obviously, with a

Youth Advisory Council, there is some point in making sure that youth are the people who are on it. But I find it curious that the appointed members should have a restriction that they be older than twenty-four years of age. I am just wondering if the minister who piloted this legislation in has taken into account that that actually might be ruled unconstitutional sometime as a discrimination based on age.

For example, if the nine elected members, I believe it is nine, perceive clearly that they have three other people that they want to put on it and these people are, unfortunately, under the age of twenty-four or younger, why should they not appoint them if they are reasonable people? I am just wondering if there was a rationale put forward that these three individuals should be older than that.

Mr. Speaker, with that comment, I will sit down because I do not really object to it. It is just that these observations went through my mind as I listened to the minister introduce it and the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) reply to it.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. minister speaks now, he closes debate.

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, just briefly on the point that the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) just make with respect to the possible challenge, I guess, under the constitution with respect to age discrimination or whatever.

MR. FENWICK:

Do not forget my first part.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, I was not going to address your first part because I thought that was sort of irrelevant but, the second part of your comment-

MR. FENWICK:

(Inaudible) rational reason for having the younger one.

MR. SIMMS:

What I was going to say to the hon. member for Menihek is that I do not know if he read the Youth Advisory Council Act itself.

MR. FENWICK:

Do you have it there?

MR. SIMMS:

No, I do not have it here. I just wondered if he had read it because I think if you read it, you will find that there is provision in the legislation itself for three adult advisors. As I recall, the Council itself have now determined that the adult in this case would be somebody who is not a youth on the Council, i.e. somebody over twenty-four years of age. I do not know if the member for Stephenville agrees but, I believe that that was the rationale behind it. Whether or not it will be challenged, I do not know. I mean that is what the legislation is there for, I guess, if anybody wants to challenge it they can certainly do so.

With respect to the age change from fourteen to twenty-four as opposed to fourteen to twenty-one, I think it has a small bit to do with the unemployment rates and so on and I think that is the age category that is used. But, I recall having discussions myself with the Council a couple of years

ago when I was minister and I think the overriding factor for them to want to change was the turnover. They had considerable turnover problem, so they wanted to broaden their base, I guess and that was one of the other reasons. There are probably others.

Just to address briefly the comments of the member for Stephenville, I would have to disagree with him, having experience it and been there as minister, I do know that we did listen very carefully to the Youth Advisory Council whenever they met with the Minister. That is one of their major roles, to meet with the minister and make recommendations. He was using the youth unemployment issue as the only issue. I would point out to him clearly that they have advised the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth and it's minister, I am sure, on a lot more matters and a lot of other matters and issues other than the youth unemployment issue. I think, I do not have it at my fingertips but, I am sure that if one were to go to the department for some information with respect to the types of things they recommended, I think you will find that the department has, in fact, co-operated with them and acted on a lot of their recommendations.

With respect to the budget, I do not have to tell the hon. member, of course, that the minister does not approve the budget. The budget is part of the budgetary process and it goes through the whole entire government but, in that minister's department under the Youth Services Division, there are forty-odd different Provincial youth organizations that get funding. The Youth Advisory

Council is one of forty-odd, Provincial Scouts, Provincial Guides, Provincial Cadets and the whole bit and they all want more money, and rightly so, if you can find the money. The question of the budget is one that will have to go through the budgetary process but, I am sure the government will consider their requests, as they always do, and provide whatever sympathy it can and whatever money it can. That will come forth in due course. I just want to say to him as well on the youth conference that was sponsored a couple of years ago, I happened to be the minister at the time. I attended that conference and spoke to the conference at a luncheon. They did a tremendous job, a fantastic job, in fact, of researching the issue, of providing some suggestions and of debating the issue, which was one of the major focuses of that particular conference.

But I do not think it is true to say that all of the recommendations were sitting there on somebody's desk or on somebody's shelf. That is not quite fair or accurate. A number of the recommendations, I recall, were addressed and were acted upon and some require a lot of expenditure. So the responses to those types of recommendations are out of the hands of the minister or the department itself. It is again an issue that government has to deal with.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that youth unemployment is a very serious problem in the Province, but to say that it is the fault of the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth or the minister is a bit unfair, because that is not the function of that department to create employment.

That is not their function. Their function is to provide human resources and expertise in whatever field they can. They have a tremendous staff down there, I might say, a small staff, and they suffer from the same problems of a lot of departments.

But I can tell you they consult with the Youth Advisory Council and I can tell you they listen to the Youth Advisory Council and wherever practical and feasible and possible I know that the officials of the department down there work very hard in trying to carry out whatever recommendations are made.

With those few remarks, just to respond to those comments, I move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Youth Advisory Council Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Style The Department Of Development As The Department Of Development And Tourism." (Bill No. 9)

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo, on a point of order.

MR. TULK:

I recognize that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has the right to call whichever bill he wishes to call on the Order Paper. But as I understood it, there was a gentleman's agreement behind the Chair, behind the curtain, that we would start at Order 10 and move down through the

Order Paper.

I wonder why the hon. gentleman all at once wants to jump all over the place? That was the understanding that we would move down to the bottom of the Order Paper.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I told the hon. that we would proceed at Order 10 and go down through the Order Paper with respect to those bills that were on the Order Paper and on the list that was given on September 25, which had been circulated. Now he will find 11, 12, and 13 are not on that list. So we are going to do 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and then we are going to skip 22 because it has not been circulated and it is a complex bill. Then we will go down to 23 and so on. Compare this list with what is there. Is that okay?

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this bill, I introduce this on behalf of the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett). It is, as its title says, merely to restyle the Department of Development as the Department of Development and Tourism, consequential on the

assumption by the Department of Development of the Division of Tourism, that was previously in the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, a rose is a rose is a rose. A rose by any other name would smell as sweet.

Mr. Speaker, would that it were so easy for the administration merely by styling a department the Department of Development and Tourism, instead of just the Department of Development, would it were so easy to see great improvements in our tourist industry. That seems about all they have done, Mr. Speaker, that and a Grey Cup parade float mentioning 1,000 years of tourism. It should have been called 1,000 years of tourism neglect.

MR. TULK:
That is right.

MR. BARRY:
Especially, Mr. Speaker, neglect over the last six years. We have certain tremendous opportunities in this Province and I am happy to see, Mr. Speaker, the developments that have taken place at Red Bay in the Eagle River district in the Strait of Belle Isle, combined with L'Anse-au-Meadow, Mr. Speaker. Government should be commended for zeroing in on that particular theme for their float. L'Anse-au-Meadow, Mr. Speaker, is a world-class tourist site. I would venture to say that Red Bay,

before very long, is going to be an equally recognized world-class tourist site. Unfortunately, it is not quite a good site yet because it has not had the money put in by this administration, it has not had the bucks put in. It has the great potential.

MR. SIMMS:
It is being developed.

MR. BARRY:
Yes, but too slowly. With the level of unemployment -

MR. WINDSOR:
He has never been in Red Bay.

MR. BARRY:
Yes I have been in Red Bay. With the level of unemployment we have in this Province, Mr. Speaker, any opportunity to create jobs, any opportunity to bring new dollars in -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Have you been to Cape Chidley?

MR. BARRY:
Cape Chidley? I have been to the Button Islands North of Cape Chidley. Do not forget that is part of this Province, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Button Islands may not become a tourist attraction, but Red Bay, L'Anse-au-Meadows, and Marble Mountain are tourist attractions. We can see a trail, Mr. Speaker, the Viking trail, start at Port aux Basques and we can see the tourists streaming in and being hooked just as they get off the ferry. You can steams of them, Mr. Speaker. We can divert one stream up. Once they finish their relaxation in the district of LaPoile with the tremendous Salmon fishing, Mr. Speaker. What really bothers me is they are sent out of LaPoile district before they are

informed that they have the real Newfoundland fishing villages down in the South Coast. All they have to do is take a little detour down to Rose Blanche. They drive for 500 miles and they do not see a fishing village. That is what they are coming to Newfoundland for. There should be a sign, Mr. Speaker, just as they get off the ferry, telling them to detour right for a genuine Newfoundland fishing village. Bring your cameras, Mr. Speaker!

In Peggy's Cove in Nova Scotia they have to beat them away with a stick and all they have in Peggy's Cove are some rocks, Mr. Speaker. What we have, Mr. Speaker, is a lack of organization as far as tourism is concerned, a lack of imagination and a lack of ideas. Mr. Speaker, there should be, pointing out to tourists not just the attractions of the fishing communities on the Southwest Coast, but also the tremendous salmon fishing potential as they move up along the Codroy Valley, Mr. Speaker, along the West Coast and then to Stephenville. How many Americans, Mr. Speaker, drive on past Stephenville and not know that they had a significant contribution to make there in developing the culture of Stephenville. Mr. Speaker, with the Summer festival, the drama festival there, tie that in, and then move up to the Bay of Islands area and the Humber Valley. There is tremendous hiking and fishing, Mr. Speaker, and tremendous scenery and boat tours.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about Port au Port?

MR. BARRY:

Yes, I moved on too fast, Mr. Speaker, and the tourists move on too fast, too. How many drive

past and do not realize that on the Port au Port Peninsula they can be exposed. They do not have to drive as far to get over to St. Pierre and Miquelon, they can be exposed to the real French Canadian culture with a French folk festival, Mr. Speaker, in Port au Port.

Mr. Speaker, it is when they get to the Humber Valley they are going to be given a choice. You are going to see some streams diverted East and some streams diverted North, if the government were doing its job properly.

MR. PEACH:

You are awful sick looking today boy. You should sit down. You are pale. You are dead white.

MR. BARRY:

What is wrong with the Peach fuzz, Mr. Speaker? The fuzz is off the peach! "Milton, thou shouldst be living at this hour."

Mr. Speaker, if we had a series of programmes well-advertised, well-marketed - just picture tying all that I have said together with the Gros Morne National Park, together with L'Anse-au-Meadow, together with Red Bay. I mean, what more would any red-blooded North American tourist want?

MR. PEACH:

The widow Pike.

MR. BARRY:

Ah, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) is going to get up in this House. Let him talk about this and other things. Let him talk about it, Mr. Speaker. If the member for Carbonear were saying anything that was intelligent, I would engage him in a little repartee but, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that is about as much as

we have heard from the member for Carbonear since he has been in the House. All he does is waste time. If the Speaker would keep him quiet while I give him a few ideas. He is not going to get into the Cabinet that way. He has been trying for years, Mr. Speaker. He is not going to get into the Cabinet by heckling from his seat. The Heckle and Jekyll tag team match, Mr. Speaker, has never worked to get members into Cabinet and neither has engaging in low comment. That has never, Mr. Speaker got a member into Cabinet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Now, you go East to the East Coast and you have other potentials that are not being advertised, Mr. Speaker. But let me just say, without going into the various trails we could have, the various routes, there could be dozens all around the Island, the Labrador portion of the Province, that tourists would pay fortunes to see.

Let us look at the statement that has been delivered to members by the Unemployment Action Committee, some of the ideas that they are setting forth, Mr. Speaker: Tourism - encourage boat charters on inland waters such as Grand and Gander lakes; encourage cottage building on inland lakes to coincide with the above; encourage the establishment of bed and breakfast houses. Mr. Speaker, these are good ideas.

Now, they have another one in here: Eliminate the degrading,

racist spectacles such as 'Screech-ins'. Now, I am not sure that I can go as far as to put that serious a connotation on them, although I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that the occasional 'Screech-in' does sort of pass beyond the pale. I have seen, Mr. Speaker, elderly tourists coming down here, being asked to kneel for three-quarters of an hour on a hardwood floor preparatory to kissing the salt cod and downing what has often been, I would say, a dangerous quantity of that black stuff known as Screech.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should take a look at setting out some guidelines.

MR. YOUNG:

(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

Now the member for Harbour Grace should be quiet because we were down in the member's district on Saturday night, down in his hometown, Mr. Speaker. We had a packed hall, Mr. Speaker, and are they waiting for the next election? Are they ever ready to go! Are they ready to get at it again!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG:

You could not sell all your tickets for \$15 double. Lord save us.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there was standing room only. They had to stand up to eat their cold plates, Mr. Speaker, standing room only to eat the cold plates. And were they

ever ready to go!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
I tell you that the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) are going to have the opportunity to meet me out in Carbonear this Saturday night and no wonder he is squirming over there, Mr. Speaker, no wonder he is squirming, because that is the other district, that is the other one where he is gone, Mr. Speaker, that is where he is gone.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Carbonear, the member for Harbour Grace - the cards are dealt on those, Mr. Speaker. The member for Grand Falls, he almost did not get in there this time.

MR. SIMMS:
No thanks to your crowd though.

MR. BARRY:
But I am being detracted, Mr. Speaker, from the serious matter of job creation. If members opposite were interested in job creation, the tourist industry has a big, big potential, Mr. Speaker, for job creation. Members opposite are not doing what should be done to put the jobs out for the people of this Province in tourism. Passing an act to change the name of the department, I mean that is the extent. They can now go out and tell people have they have legislation on the tourist industry. They changed the name of the department. Mr. Speaker, that is one of the more significant steps they took to develop the tourist industry since we have been in this House, one of

the more significant steps to change the name of the statute and the department.

Mr. Speaker, let me just end on this note, that members are going to have to do more than change the name of the department, putting 'tourism' in the department's name, in order to see the jobs created which can be created in this area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker, I will be rather brief on this because the bill itself is rather brief, "An Act To Style The Department Of Development As The Department Of Development And Tourism." We heard the Minister of Forestry Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) make a comment while the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was talking about Red Bay. I briefly want to talk about Red Bay.

A major write up in National Geographic is being done. The residents in that area expect an influx of tourists next year to come in as a result of that publication. One of the things that we are rather concerned about in the district of Eagle River, and particularly Red Bay, is when the residents come from outside of North America and inside North America, they find out that they have a rough gravel road -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Is the road paved?

MR. HISCOCK:

No, it is not paved.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How far down?

MR. HISCOCK:

Thirty kilometers. Also once they get there they find out that there is no motel, there is no restaurant, no public toilets, and nothing down there in the way of catering to tourists.

The Labrador Straits Tourist Development Association have set up a corporation, the businessmen and the women in the area and the tourist committee have set up a corporation and what they basically said to the government, to the Minister of Development is "Give us so much money and we will develop some basic services so that when tourists come they will not be turned away and will not go back to the Minnesota, New York, California, Texas, Montreal, Vancouver or whatever and tell to their friends the type of conditions they found Red Bay in and discourage other tourists from coming.

The other part on it is that National Geographic, the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) pointed out to me, also did an issue on tourism of all the provinces in Canada, except Newfoundland and Labrador. I would like to ask the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) why was it that only Newfoundland and Labrador was left out in that major publication where they did all the nine other provinces?

The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) talked about craft sales being up 20 per cent. We lauded that, we spoke about this on this side of the House for years. I

will again now make a comment to the Minister of Finance with regard to tourism. Helping our culture and helping our Newfoundland artists in this Province, will he think about doing away with the sales tax of any art bought in Newfoundland.

Now, if you reside outside Newfoundland and you buy art and you leave the Province you can get a rebate of 12 per cent. Considering that now we have a show in Vancouver, a retrospective Mr. Christopher Pratt and also David Blackwood has a show in London. We have had Scott Goudie winning honors in Cognac, France. I think the residents of Newfoundland and Labrador should be allowed to buy these things tax free, just like anybody from the Mainland can come in and buy them tax free and get a rebate. I think it would help the artists in our society. I hope the President of the Council will take note of that and in the next year's budget we will see the elimination of sales tax on art that is developed by local artists here in Newfoundland.

This government is in a rather dangerous situation if you look at the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council. In the main window they have, there is a picture of the Confederation Building and it is occupied by turkeys. That is what the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council is now beginning to think of this government. I would say this is an excellent way of commending and trying to build bridges and trying to help the artists of this Province because we know that there is no arms-length funding any more. You have to be a special friend of the Premier in order to get any grants and get any money. So I would

hope that this government will see fit of offering an olive branch to the artists of this Province and that is to eliminate the 12 per cent sales tax on art that is produced in this Province.

DR. COLLINS:

You cannot remove that for the artists in the province.

MR. HISCOCK:

Just local Newfoundland and Labrador artists. Of course, you can.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Under the Charter, you cannot discriminate.

DR. COLLINS:

You would have to do it right across the board.

MR. HISCOCK:

Well, do it right across the board then.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Are you recommending we cut for British Columbia, Ontario, Alberta and all artists coast to coast?

MR. HISCOCK:

My comment to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) is one would find out, if you go to the local galleries here in this Province, they are filled with works of art that cannot be sold by Newfoundland artists and very few of them are from outside the Province.

This is the attitude, Mr. Speaker, and the members here have seen it all too often, when you bring up a half decent recommendation, the first thing that the government sees is road blocks and obstacles, instead of looking at ways of how those can be overcome. If we did

it with the crafts that are only made in Newfoundland and Labrador, does that discriminate against crafts from Quebec and Ontario?

DR. COLLINS:

We did not do it only for Newfoundland crafts, it applies to all crafts, even those made in Korea.

MR. HISCOCK:

All crafts. I would ask the Minister of Finance for a four or five year period to help nurture our artists.

The part I am trying to get at is help nurture our artists in this Province and in tourism to be able to give them that. I hope that the minister will see fit to act on it.

With regard to Red Bay, in cluing up, the Labrador Straits Association have set up a corporation and have said "we will go on and develop some temporary buildings of toilets, of accommodation buildings, some small interpretation centers, until the federal and provincial governments and get together and decide what is going to happen with Red Bay."

I would ask the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) who knows that area and was very keen on it, that he would help the Minister of Culture, Recreation Youth (Mr. Matthews) who is keen on it. Here is the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) whose act we are changing and he is not even here. As far as I am concerned - maybe I am wrong - but I do not think the Minister of Development and Tourism is very keen on Red Bay. I am not really sure if he knows where Red Bay is.

So, in concluding, I do not think it is good enough to bring in a bill just to change the name from the Department of Development to the Department of Development and Tourism. We have seen very little take place under Development. Hopefully, we can expect a lot more to take place under tourism.

I would say to the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), I think it is about time, being on the government side for the past six or seven years, that some type of tourist potential be developed in Cupids, John Guy's settlement, Carbonear Island and x number of other places in Conception Bay, Mr. Speaker. We have not heard yet on the government side any member get up and talk about tourism in their own community. Now, of course, just having it on a piece of paper does not mean that much.

I would say to the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) and the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), get together and encourage and support the Tourist Development Corporation that is set up in Southern Labrador in the district of Eagle River to soften the impact of tourists coming into that area so they will not go away and give this Province a bad name because of lack of facilities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
I just want to add a few comments

to my hon. friend from Eagle River's comments. I had occasion over the last five days to go and visit, as I have done many times, the visitor's center at the Gros Morne National Park which is on Highway 430, on the Viking Trail which the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) knows all too well about, I am sure. He keeps busy trying to keep the sheep off the highway up there, Mr. Speaker. I have been after him for community pastures for so long and he says, "We do not have a programme for this. We do not have a programme for that and every other thing." Again the shirking of responsibility.

I had occasion to drop into the visitor's center and talk to some of the Gros Morne park attendants and a number of people who explain to visitors what that region of our Province is all about. They are telling me they have a very deep and abiding fear and the fear is this, that he tourists who do go up North, who do go into the Bonne Bay area - and it is one of the most beautiful places in the Province, nobody would argue with that - they are frightened that the South side of the Bonne Bay area is going to be isolated and frozen out from any tourist dollars because of a decision taken by this government to remove that \$130,000 of subsidy from the Bonne Bay ferry operator.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if many people in this House are aware but the Table Lands, which is a picturesque and beautiful set of mountains on the South side area leading from Woody Point down into Trout River, is being considered as an international historic site, Mr. Speaker. As everybody knows, from reading about their

geography, 600 billion years ago, when the Continents were colliding, the Table Lands were the underneath part of the earth. When the continents finally came into place the Table Lands - and the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) knows this, he has been there many times - are filled with, what archeologists and explorers call, 'the devil's minerals' because they have come from the bowels of the earth, essentially.

All of this is well and good, Mr. Speaker, but nobody is going to know about this beautiful section of Bonne Bay. Who is going to tell them to go over there? Because what their big fear is in the Visitor Centre, and my big fear is - and every member who is hon. in this House ought to have the same fear - is: Who is going to backtrack for that extra hour and a half? The signs are still up indicating that the ferry is still running. These visitors are going into the Visitor Center and they are being told by the National Park attendants, "No, we are sorry, the ferry was cancelled. It was discontinued." Yes, it would have been fourteen minutes, Mr. Speaker, it would have taken you fourteen minutes to go from Norris Point to sail across the tuckle over the Woody Point and then another twenty minutes drive and you are into that picturesque Table Land.

The Table Land could be a international historic sight, Mr. Speaker. There is a section there called the Green Gardens which has caves and because of the nature of that particular piece of ground, has natural green growth all year around -

MR. SIMMS:

That is a Provincial Reserve as

well, is it not?

MR. FUREY:

- and it is a Provincial reserve around. But, what are we doing? The Minister of trees continues there but, what are we doing? Are we in this Province, and he knows this, spending hundreds of millions of dollars to the Federal Governments Parks Canada programme, initiated under the Federal Government - and continuing under the Progressive Conservative Government, I might add - are we spending hundreds of millions of dollars to say, "Hey Canada, come here because this is a great part of the nation. It is a beautiful part of the nation?" Nationally, are we building up Bonne Bay and Provincially dismantling? That is the picture that has been presented and painted across this Province. The Provincial Government is tearing down and the Federal Government is building up. The left hand does not know what the right one is doing.

The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), who is pretty quiet today, mentioned in the House a number of weeks ago that they cannot even figure out how much it is costing, the ferry operator will not table his books and will not show the numbers. Do you recall saying that a couple of weeks ago that we do not even know how much this man is making in profits, whether or not the subsidy is warranted, the whole bit? Well, he has tabled his numbers. He has to give a monthly report ever since he has been operating that ferry. So, to say that is not very good.

MR. J. CARTER:

How does he do it?

MR. FUREY:

Well, he had six men hired and he has to pay, I think \$100 a day in fuel, it all adds up. He showed me some of the figures. He is preparing them now with his auditing firm to send them to me personally and I think, off the top of that subsidy, \$70,000 goes right out in expenditure. But, that is not the real issue. The real issue is an issue of principle. I drove along the South side of Bonne Bay just yesterday, and I talked to a lot of people, the storekeeper and the motel owner and the man who just, through the Department of Tourism was given a \$17,000 grant to restore an old manor. It is called, "The Victorian Manor" and it is beautiful. It is attractive but it is not fourteen minutes away from the main body of land on the North side anymore. It is one hour or an hour and a half. People generally are saying that this government removing the subsidy is breaking the spirit, breaking the backs of the people on the South side of Bonne Bay. You can break that spirit but, you will not break that resolve because when we are swept into power the next time, that ferry is going in. You can be certain of that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

As the Leader of the Opposition was saying when he finished debating the Bill as far as his few words are concerned, it is not enough for this government to change the name of the department

and to add the word tourism to the title of the department. That will not do. The real problem with tourism in Newfoundland is not in the title of the department, it is in the title of some of the ministers from the other side that have occupied that office and have not, as the Leader of the Opposition and the member for St. Barbe were saying, developed the tourism potential of this Province. Mr. Speaker, one of the big problems has not been addressed by this government and has not been addressed by the federal government either, and is one that the Department of Transportation should take a very close look at. I know my friend down there, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) is very interested in this kind of thing. I would suggest to the Minister of Labour that since the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is not in his seat, that he should bring it to his attention. I would tell the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) over there but there is no point, his attitude is too cavalier, anyway. But I know the Minister of Labour is a very serious man and I would suggest to him this is one of the things that he should bring to the attention of the Minister of Transportation and, indeed, to his Cabinet colleagues, and attempt to get the Minister of Transportation to get his own Atlantic Tory buddies to try to get in place with the federal government an agreement to make the Gulf Ferry Service free for tourists, at least one trip a year. I am told that that would bring untold numbers of tourists to this Province.

I am also told, and the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), I would say, has some ideas on this,

because I believe at one point the Department of Tourism was under his control.

MR. FUREY:

Yes, unfortunately.

MR. TULK:

I did not have too many dealings with the hon. gentleman. But I would suggest that one of the things which has to happen in this Province before we are going to develop a tourism trade is that we lessen the cost of crossing that Gulf. There is very little point in us developing all the things which need to be developed in this Province if it is going to cost somebody \$300 just to get from Nova Scotia to Newfoundland. It is the only Province in Canada, Mr. Speaker, where you have to pay that exorbitant amount of money. If you are going to take a family of six, four children and two parents, and take a trailer, for example, and a car, you are looking at \$300 for just coming to Newfoundland and getting back.

You would have to be some sort of a fool if you are a common person to say, All right, I am going to spend \$300 to get from one province to the next, when you could use that \$300 to spend a week in a Mainland province, for example, the Province of Prince Edward Island or the Province of Nova Scotia.

I am told that what we now get in revenue from the CN ferries is only about 20 per cent of the total cost of operating them anyway. I am also told that if you cut it out the tourism trade in Newfoundland is doomed. Now, of course, once you get people across the Gulf, the next problem you have is how do you get them to come back. What are the

attractions you put in place to get them back? And this is where this government has seriously fallen down.

We have seen the Department of Tourism, like every other department over there, used for pork-barrelling districts; Tory district get looked after in certain ways whereas Liberal districts -

MR. J. CARTER:

That is a lie.

MR. HISCOCK:

That is not a lie.

MR. TULK:

Say it a little louder, 'John', so I can get you on the-

Mr. Speaker, you heard that. Did you hear him, Mr. Speaker, or does he have to say it louder?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that this government, with every action they have taken - but it is starting to backfire on them - you have to be PC. I mean, that is the nature of the person who sits in that seat. Not the person who is sitting there now, I am not referring to him. He may have designs on that chair, but he is a long way from sitting in it. The person who sits in that chair is putting a philosophy in place in this Province that if you do not vote for the government side then you do not get anything.

MR. CALLAN:

Right on.

MR. TULK:

Now, that is backfiring on them. I can tell them they can use that all they like in Newfoundland, the people of Newfoundland have had enough of them. As a matter of fact, during the last election campaign, in Fogo, I said, Look, let them say that, we are not going to be bought, they cannot buy our votes in Fogo. I am sure they cannot buy Newfoundland votes, anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few more comments that I want to make on this and, since it is one minute to 6:00, I will adjourn the debate.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

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

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

December 2, 1985

QUESTION 25: Mr. Aylward (M.H.A., Stephenville) - To ask the Honourable the Minister Responsible for Housing to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What are the percentage increases at other NLHC apartment units across Newfoundland and Labrador?

ANSWER:

The information on planned rental increases for NLHC market rental units in Stephenville has already previously been tabled in response to a question from the Honourable Member for Stephenville. Percentage increases for other NLHC market rental units across Newfoundland and Labrador are as follows:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Rental Increase</u>
Marystown	10%
Goose Bay	14%
St. John's	Various rate increases ranging from 5% to 14%

QUESTION 26: Mr. Aylward (M.H.A., Stephenville) - To ask the Honourable the Minister Responsible for Housing to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Why are three (3) employees at the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation office in Stephenville being transferred as of January, 1986?

ANSWER:

The transfer of three (3) positions from Stephenville to Corner Brook arises from a restructuring of the regional operations of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation on the West Coast of the province. The realignment of responsibilities and jurisdiction of the Corporation's Corner Brook and Stephenville regional offices, involving the transfer of three (3) positions, will result in enhanced program effectiveness and provide improved public service to residents of the West Coast.