



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 17

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas

Friday

15 April 1988

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform this hon. House that Mr. G. M. (Max) Hussey has been appointed to the position of Registrar of Motor Vehicles for the Province effective April 1, 1988.

Mr. Hussey was born in Cupids, Conception Bay in August of 1945 and received his early education at South Brook. He worked for a period of one year as a teacher in Woodstock, Western Bay before continuing with his education at the College of Trades and Technology where he completed a number of business courses.

Mr. Hussey's education and experience as a civil servant have prepared him well for the duties and responsibilities of his new job. In the almost twenty-three years since first being employed with the Motor Registration Division back in 1965 when it was part of the Department of Finance, Mr. Hussey has continually progressed through positions of increasing responsibility.

He first started as a junior clerk with the division and by the time this division became part of the Department of Highways in April of 1970 he held the position of

Senior Vehicle Inspector.

Mr. Speaker, within four years of the departmental realignment, Mr. Hussey was appointed Director of Motor Vehicles and Driver Safety for the Province. In 1978, he became Deputy Registrar and since the retirement of Mr. M. J. Haire as Registrar this past Summer, he has done a commendable job in carrying out the duties of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles on an acting basis.

In the interim, the Public Service Commission has recommended Mr. Hussey's appointment on a permanent basis.

As you are aware, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles is responsible for, among other things, the complete vehicle and driver licencing programme for the Province and I am most pleased to be able to formally announce in the House today, the appointment of Mr. Hussey.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the House, are quite happy to congratulate Mr. Hussey on his appointment. Mr. Hussey, as a career civil servant, no doubt deserves the promotion which he so justly deserves, and we are quite happy to congratulate him. I understand he is a personal friend of the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). That would make him a good man, I am sure, the fact

that he is a personal friend of the member for Port de Grave.

MR. BAKER:

I imagine the Public Service will be glad to know that.

MR. GILBERT:

I can assure you that we take great pleasure in welcoming Mr. Hussey to this job. I hope that he becomes a household name in Newfoundland, as Mike Haire, his predecessor did. Mike was well known to everybody in Newfoundland, and I am sure that Mr. Hussey will carry on the tradition so ably set by Mr. Haire. We welcome him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the occasion of the appointment of the new Registrar -

MR. YOUNG:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Consumers Affairs.

MR. YOUNG:

I would ask the Speaker to rule on whether the hon. member is properly dressed.

MR. FENWICK:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that to be properly dressed in this House one must have a shirt and a tie and a suit or jacket on. I have all those on, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I do not want to be particularly picky about matters such as this, but the hon. member says that he has a shirt and tie on. It certainly is invisible to the Chair. If we are going to establish a certain code of dress for the House, and it is traditional that members wear a shirt and tie, I think we should maintain that code unless hon. members wish to change that. In my view, the hon. member is not wearing that particular dress code, therefore, he is not properly dressed. The point is well taken.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, there is a shirt, there is a tie there. Is that adequate? Mr. Speaker, this is entirely unintentional.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I think this is a serious matter, not this particular instance, but we are dealing with serious matters here and we are not playing games. If the hon. member wants to play games, I am not prepared to play them with him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

The hon. member is not properly dressed.

MR. FENWICK:

May I speak to your comment there?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am not prepared to recognize the hon. member until he is properly dressed.

MR. FENWICK:

Well, do you want to know if I have a shirt and tie on, Mr. Speaker? I have a shirt and tie on.

AN HON. MEMBER:

If you want to take it off, take it off.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am prepared to name the hon. member if he does not-

MR. FENWICK:

Hold on now! I will take it off then, if you want. Be my guest.

MR. SIMMS:

I am very pleased today on behalf of-

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I will recognize the hon. the member for Menihek.

Mr. Speaker, I take it, then, that sweaters are out of order in the House. Is that what you have ruled in this particular instance?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Are you going to respond to the statement or not?

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, I will respond to the

statement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

You only have five seconds left.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, the only thing I would like to mention on the statement -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to update the House on the difficulties we experienced yesterday with power on the Avalon Peninsula. The difficulty occurred when a steel tower on one of the two lines from Bay d'Espoir, a tower in the vicinity of Holyrood, collapsed under the weight of ice. There was an ice build-up of about four inches thick on all the towers and cables in that part of our Province. In addition to that, several other towers received some structural damage but did not collapse.

The second line from Bay d'Espoir suffered some damage when an insulator collapsed; the conductor, in fact, actually fell to the ground. All of this happening, of course, shorted out the whole system, blew out the sub-station near Chapel Arm, and, as well, kicked out Holyrood when the extreme load was put on the thermo-generating station in

Holyrood. So, everything was tripped out and that is why we had a complete failure throughout the evening.

The first line, of course, is damaged severely and will take more than a week to repair. The second line from Bay d'Espoir was put back in service later last evening, when workmen were able to temporarily fix the conductor to the tower. It was done in quite a safe manner, but, nevertheless, just temporary repairs were made; they were not able to scale those towers because of the amount of ice that was coating the towers, but they did do some temporary repairs.

In the meantime, we had difficulty in getting Holyrood started because there was no load on the system at all. It takes about four hours to start up those thermo-generators and get them in service again, after they trip, and in trying to put them in service, in trying to synchronize that with the load in the region, we had several difficulties in trying to get the actual thermo-generators started.

Eventually we did that, and power was restored in blocks; first of all 15 megawatts of power, then in blocks of 5 from there on, and finally, of course, we were able to get that second line from Bay d'Espoir on. We are now operating with plenty of power, backed up, of course, by a couple of small gas generators, and so forth, that are in the region. By this afternoon we will have the third generating unit at Holyrood on stream, at which time we will be able to close-down, temporarily, the line to Bay d'Espoir and effect more permanent repairs. So, by later this evening we

should have one line to Bay d'Espoir completely repaired, we will have more than adequate power from Holyrood, with reserve power still available from Holyrood, and it will take a week to ten days to make final repairs to the other line.

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt the people at Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro did a commendable job in difficult circumstances in getting power restored as quickly as they did, but we should be alerted to what may well be a problem. We should ask the question, was that ice storm and that ice build-up of an unusual size, or was this normal and to be expected?

If it was nothing out of the ordinary but a normal Spring ice storm that you could expect in every fourth or fifth year, or something of that order, then clearly the lines are not of a strength and adequate structure to meet the need. So I think we have to ask the question, and the minister, perhaps, ought to ask Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to report on that, as to whether that storm was such as to produce an unusual buildup of ice. If it were, then obviously everything was in order. If it were not, we should take steps to have the lines constructed to a more secure standard.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. the President of the Council, I would like to welcome to the galleries twenty-one Grade VII students from St. Patrick's Girls' School with their teacher, Mr. Wade.

I would also like to welcome seventy-five Level XI students from Mount Pearl Senior High School with their teachers, Mr. Button and Mr. Bishop.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure Your Honour would want to have a closer look at that note he just read. I suspect it is not a Level XI group of students, but possibly Level II.

MR. SPEAKER:

Level II, yes.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief statement on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, who had intended to make this statement yesterday, incidentally, but because of the House not sitting he was unable to, and today he is on Her Majesty's Service, over on the West Coast.

On his behalf, then, I want to announce that the government's Private Sector Employment Programme, which was outlined in the budget, is once again operating within the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies. The response to the programme last year, Mr. Speaker,

as many people have acknowledged, including many Opposition people, was excellent, and, this year, with an increase of 50 per cent in funding, amounting to \$2.5 million additional dollars, bringing the total allocation to \$7.5 million, we are confident the programme will continue to be a huge success.

I wish to advise the House and the public at this time that applications are being mailed out to all employers who participated in the programme last year, as well as those employers who applied but were not successful. In addition to that, each member of the House of Assembly, at this very moment or sometime during the day, will also be supplied with applications to distribute as they wish, and to assist them in working with their constituents. Applications are, of course, also available from the department, and any enquiries the public may have concerning the programme can be made by calling collect, for the benefit of the press, in particular, to 576-2719.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to inform hon. members of the success of the programme last year. With the \$5 million that was allocated for the programme, approximately 2,000 jobs were created.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

The average term of employment was twenty-five weeks. Many of the jobs were for longer periods of time and, in fact, I understand many of those that were employed under the programme are still working, were kept on by the employers. So, certainly it was successful in that respect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

I would also like to tell hon. members that of the jobs created, 47 per cent were female and 53 per cent were youth, which were strong objectives of the programme.

Mr. Speaker, many employers of the Province, who would not normally have been given an opportunity to hire additional staff, were given one in this particular wage subsidy programme. As a result, many unemployed Newfoundlanders obtained employment.

With the additional \$2.5 million that is being allocated to the programme, the department and the government is hoping that we will be able to create, this year, 3,000 new jobs. Based on the response from last year's programme, we expect this year's will also be a success and will continue to be mutually beneficial to potential employees, the private sector, and, indeed, the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

We have had, I believe, seventeen years of Tory rule in this Province, and what is the Tory legacy, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER:

And seventeen more to go.

MR. DECKER:

Last month, 34 per cent of all our young people between the ages of nineteen and twenty-four were unemployed, 17,000 young people.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Shame!

MR. DECKER:

That, Mr. Speaker, is the Tory legacy. And the minister gets up and brags about 3,000 jobs which may or may not be created. No wonder the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies is not here today.

MR. MORGAN:

Do you not want them?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

He was ashamed to come and put this statement, he had to poke it off on the hon. the Government House Leader. He is ashamed to be here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the 17,000 young people who are unemployed today is only the official Statistics Canada number. Newfoundlanders will tell you that in actual fact there are probably 25,000 people unemployed in this Province today, young people who do not know what it is to have a real, proper job, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

The minister is not going to let me finish my statement, again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

He cannot take it. He cannot take it. He is taking my time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will be careful and not blow a gasket, I just want to make a point here. The point here is that it was a simple statement to announce that there were applications available for a particular programme. It had nothing to do with the youth unemployment rate or any of that kind of stuff. Absolutely nothing!

The hon. member is clearly out of order. If he wishes to comment on that, there are other opportunities to do so. Let him ask questions in the House of Assembly in Question Period for a change. Or let him participate in a debate on the motion that his own colleague has on the Order Paper, I believe, some time down the road, with respect to unemployment rates. But let him not abuse the rules of the House, where a member is allowed to respond to a particular statement and then takes off and talk about something else totally out of order. I think that is totally out of order and should not be permitted.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, all too often we see that this is what this particular hon. gentleman does. I have two minutes to reply. It was not a point of order, Mr. Speaker. He is taking my time so I cannot go ahead with my reply to this statement, which was perfectly in order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order. Hon. members responding to Ministerial Statements must confine their remarks to the particular statement itself. I do think the hon. member was getting somewhat off that path. I would like to inform the hon. member his time has elapsed.

MR. DECKER:

Yes, exactly! Sure it has.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

This is a sham. That is the only way to describe it. It is just a sham. We have a Ministerial Statement here that says that we are getting an increase from \$5 million to \$7.5 million in the Private Sector Employment Programme. What they do not say, at the same time, is that a \$7.5 million programme last year for employment within the government, in Summer jobs mostly for students and young people, has been totally cancelled. You add up the money that went into it last year in this department and you will find \$5 million and \$7.5 million, which

is \$12.5 million in total. If you add up this \$7.5 million and two other small programmes of \$1 million and \$1.5 million, you only have \$9 million. Mr. Speaker, that is a \$3.5 million reduction in spending on job creation by this government.

It shows, I think, Mr. Speaker, to the entire Province and to everybody, that they are trying to blindfold the devil in the dark. What they are saying is that they are spending more money by increasing it by 50 per cent, but they very conveniently forget that they have already cut \$7.5 million out of the programme.

Mr. Speaker, I say to them that we have examined the Private Sector Programme. We are awaiting reports from the minister about how permanent these jobs are, because we have certain questions there. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this government has dropped its spending from \$12.5 million to \$9 million on direct job creation in this department. This is a loss from what we had last year, and that is what it should be recognized as. That is why I say to them this is a sham, and they should not be allowed to get away with it.

Oral Questions

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, I want to address a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor), with

respect to his statements made recently about the unemployment rate, and his arguments that the unemployment rate is, in fact, only half the rate that is shown as the official unemployment rate in Newfoundland.

I would ask the minister if he, before he made those statements, read the House Royal Commission Report, and, in particular, looked at the table on page 75 which examines our unemployment situation in this Province from a variety of points of view. It sets out nine different standards for measuring it. By seven of those standards the unemployment rate in Newfoundland is twice the national average. Clearly, by any standard, it is twice the national average. In every other one it is clearly that much.

I would ask the hon. minister: Does he still stand by the statement he made, albeit outside the House but widely reported in the press, that, in fact, the official unemployment rate in Newfoundland does not truly reflect the unemployment rate?

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

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, the answer to all those questions is yes. I have looked at those numbers. I have also looked at all the figures from Stats Canada and those are the figures I used as the basis for the statements that I made. The fact of the matter is, and I made it very clear in this House as well as outside, that I do not question the validity of the numbers that Stats Canada has and that the House Commission Report is based on. In fact, I am using the same numbers, but what I am

doing is looking at them from a different point of view. If you consider the numbers as they are, that gives you a fair indication in relation to other provinces of Canada, and particularly in relation to the previous years in this Province. What it does not take into account is the seasonality of employment in our Province. I realize that they are seasonally adjusted, but what I am saying is that when you look at the total number of people who are employed that is a different number than the total number of people who are employed some time during the year. That is what I was talking about, the number of persons in the labour force versus the number of persons in the labour force sometimes.

If you look at the average number of persons employed, you are talking about 186,000 on an annual average basis. If you are talking about the number of people who are employed sometime during the year, you are talking about 276,000 people employed some time during the year. So when you compare those numbers with other provinces of Canada you will indeed find that we are not that far behind.

The problem here, as indicated by the numbers and by the analysis we have done, is the shortness of the duration of those jobs. Ours jobs in this Province tend to be of shorter duration, on the average, in fact, Mr. Speaker, some thirty-one weeks a year compared with probably something in the order of forty-three to forty five, I think it is, for other parts of Canada. That is what is reflected here, based on the standard method of calculating unemployment that Stats Canada does, and I would never question that. I am just saying there is

another way of looking at it and that you will, in fact, find that sometime during the year 94 per cent of Newfoundlanders who are in the workforce, who are looking for work, actually do find work.

Now, that is not to say that is satisfactory, because many of those are short term jobs. But I am saying that there is only 6 or 7 per cent of the people who are looking for work who do not find work any time during the year.

MR. WELLS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, there are, of course, seasonal workers in every other province of Canada. What the Minister's comments really indicate is that all of the job creation activities mentioned by the government is really the ten weeks syndrome, they create temporary ten week jobs and try to pretend that they are real long jobs.

I would ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, if the officials of his own department agree with that approach, and how does that effect our position in terms of equalization and our entitlement to a level of equalization if the minister maintains that our unemployment rate is as he states?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, it has absolutely no impact. Equalization is based on the Stats Canada statistics and we are not questioning those. All we

are saying is that there is another way of looking at them. There is another way of looking at it if you want to see the effective rate of unemployment in the Province. I also made it very clear that I am still not happy with the effective rate of unemployment either, but, I think we we have to look at it in perspective.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Does the minister realize that the first step to solving any problem is recognizing that it exists? And if the minister refuses to recognize that we have an unemployment rate of nearly 18 percent in this Province we will never get it down to the 8 per cent that the minister talks about.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly do realize that. And I realize, as well, of course, that employment has increased by 2.8 percent, more than 10,000 jobs on a monthly average basis over the last year, and as a result of that the unemployment rate dropped by 1.4 percent in 1987. That is the largest absolute decline in the unemployment rate of any province of Canada over the past year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I have a question for my friend and colleague, the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn). He was before the Resource Estimates Committee a couple of days ago and I may say gave a good account of himself and his department, for which we thank him. I raised at that time with him in Committee the subject of federal mining tax incentives, and I now want to pursue it for a moment, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister indicated to the Committee that the flow through regime, the flow through shares provision, will be retained intact. And I asked the Minister is that is indeed the case. I recognize it is a federal issue but he indicated to the Committee that he is well on top of it. I ask the minister is that indeed the case and does he have it on good authority that the flow through regime will be retained in essentially the same form as existed prior to the statement of Mr. Wilson of June 18 last year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. DINN:

No, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, I indicated to the committee, and it has been well known now ever since last June, since the White Paper Mr. Wilson put out, that he had intended to change flow through. Of course, we objected very strenuously to that. Myself, the Minister of Finance and the Premier objected to what was proposed under changes to flow through. There were changes because of representations, of the Ministers of Mines. We held a Ministers of Mines meeting on it and, of course, there was no minister that I can recall in favour of what was

proposed as changes to flow through so I do not know where the hon. gentleman ever got the impression that we were happy with what was happening to flow through, because this is simply not the case. The depletion allowance, as I indicated to the hon. member, will be decreased this June to 16 2/3 per cent from 33 1/3 per cent, so that is obviously not something that we are happy with. It is very difficult. As well, each minister who has had any input at all to this has been totally opposed to any changes to flow through. So there are some changes as a result of what Mr. Wilson has done and we are not happy with that, or will not be happy. We are going to be monitoring it. Every Minister of Mines throughout Canada will be monitoring the situation to make sure of no detrimental changes to the depletion allowance.

There are two basic changes. One is the earned depletion allowance, and the other one is the maximum as it affects flow through shares. The earned depletion is one, and the other one is -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Flow through shares.

MR. DINN:
No. There are two changes, one is the earned depletion allowance itself -

MR. SIMMONS:
The other is the CED, the Canadian Exploration Expense.

MR. DINN:
No, it is not. The Canadian Exploration Expense is another one. The eligible Canadian Exploration Expense is another change that was pretax reform. I will think of it a little later.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fortune Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
While the minister is thinking, would the Page be good enough to give him this? The two things he is looking for are there, conveniently in yellow for him, and maybe he can inform himself.

Mr. Speaker, I want him to listen to this brief quotation, "There is nothing actually happening with respect to flow through itself." I would like the Page to give that to the minister because in case he is not sure who I am quoting, I am quoting him in Committee two days ago. Now, I would suggest to him and to the House that they read that statement in context.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister if he would compare that statement there, which he gave two days ago, with what he just told the House about two minutes ago and advise the House, either now or subsequently, how he can reconcile the two? Now either there is a change or there is not. Two days ago he said there was not. Today he says there is. He has now had a chance to bone up on Mr. Wilson's statement. Can he now inform the House? He was the man who introduced the question of happy or unhappy, I did not say that at all.

What I am asking the minister is if he would tell us, if he has got it on good authority, what he told the Committee two days ago, that

there was no change? His words are in front of him. Would he tell us if he does have that on good authority, or if want he said this morning is the accurate thing, that he has it on good authority that there will be changes?

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have to say that I am in kind of a peculiar situation this morning. I am taking lessons about taxes and tax reforms from the hon. gentleman. That is the first thing that I find a little bit incredible here this morning.

Flow through shares as they pertain to mining investment, flow through itself, there is really no change to flow through shares itself in the 100 per cent. It is in how the depletion allowances and the exploration expenses affect flow through shares. So both statements are correct in that sense. They are totally consistent. If you did not change one, if you did not have your maximum exploration expenses from \$500,000 reduced to \$100,000, there would not be an effect on your flow through shares. I can give the hon. gentleman a complete breakdown of it. But I am afraid that I would take up just about all of Question Period if I went through it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave!

MR. DINN:
By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave!

MR. DINN:
How much time is left in Question Period?

MR. YOUNG:
You have another hour.

MR. DINN:
So you were allowed, prior to the changes, the tax reforms, \$500,000 as a lifetime investment in capital gains. You were allowed \$500,000; that was decreased to \$100,000. That is number one. So if you invested \$10,000 a year, once you got to \$100,000 that is it. That was one change.

The other change was with respect to the depletion allowance itself. You were originally allowed, as a tax credit, 133 1/3 per cent; that has been cut down to 116 2/3 per cent. That will become effective in June, and next year that 16 2/3 per cent will be cut down again. So your flow through then will only be worth 100 per cent. So those are the two main changes in flow through that will obviously have an effect on investment.

As it pertains to Newfoundland, which is one of the reasons we said that we would have to watch it very closely, in the past three years investment in mining exploration in Newfoundland went from \$8 million to \$15 million to \$26.5 million. Next year we think that exploration in Newfoundland will go to well over \$35 million, with or without what happens to flow through shares. So it is very difficult, from the Minister of Mines point of view, to argue with the federal government about all of the adverse effects that the changes in flow through will

have on mining exploration, since it is going to go from, we believe, \$26.5 million this year to over \$35 million next year. But, as I said in my letters to the Minister of Mines and the Minister of Finance, and as my colleague said in his letters, we are going to watch it very closely.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune -- Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I think the minister's initial observation was correct. Judging by what we just heard, I or anybody else in this House could teach him a few lessons on tax reform. The difference between him and me is that I learned from my experiences. Now, let me talk about his experience.

Mr. Speaker, had he accepted --

MR. YOUNG:

Ask me a question.

MR. SIMMONS:

I have questions for the minister after, but I want to get to this minister first.

If he had accepted --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

When you are ready. When you are ready.

MR. MORGAN:

Very interesting.

MR. SIMMONS:

I see he is back from Cuba, Mr.

Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Mines, if he had accepted an invitation yesterday to the Prospectors and Developers Association meeting he would have had a very different view than he does now.

I ask the minister: Given that the Minister of Finance last June made changes in the earned depletion allowance which will effectively wipe it out within a year or so -- originally 1989, now 1990 --

MR. MORGAN:

Ask a question!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Take your time.

MR. SIMMS:

It is not your time, but the House's time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

If my friend, my cousin, would just hold his breath I would get to it.

I ask the Minister of Mines: Given that the minister federally last June made those changes, is he seriously telling this House that the \$35 million projected exploration this year is going to be untouched by that, that he is telling us that, even with the depletion allowance wiped out over the next two years, we can still expect gradual growth in the rate of exploration in this Province? Is he telling us, Mr. Speaker, that the two are unrelated? Is he

telling us that this depletion allowance cutback will have no economic impact on communities like Baie Verte and Springdale and Deer Lake, and others, which have a fairly large exploration supply component?

MR. SIMMS:

Would the member repeat the question?

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. gentleman now is confused himself. Last year when I went before the Estimates Committee I made a projection on how much exploration would be done in Newfoundland. And at that time I said about \$25 million.

MR. SIMMONS:

With the allowance.

MR. DINN:

We actually hit \$26.5 million. We had flow through and we had the depletion allowances and everything in place.

The Minister of Finance did not make any changes in June. What he did was he put out a White Paper and that White Paper recommended certain changes. We went back to the Minister of Finance and he did make some changes. He did not go back to exactly what they were prior to June, 1987, but he did make some changes. Now we would like to see it exactly the way it was prior to June, 1987. We are going to be monitoring the situation to make sure that if there are problems that we can indicate what the problems are and

hopefully get the Minister of Finance federally to change his mind, because we do not like what he is doing.

But I do say to the hon. member that this year, 1988, exploration in Newfoundland will top \$35 million.

MR. SIMMONS:

With the allowance.

MR. DINN:

Whether the allowance is there or not based on

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:

Wait now!

based on the information that we have right now that companies have given to us as to what they are going to spend this year. Just as an example, I announced yesterday, I believe, that there would be a \$3.5 million programme in Daniel's Harbour. The hon. the member from Daniel's Harbour will be interested in that. Two million of that will be spent by Newfields Minerals Inc. and Teck will be spending \$400,000 or \$500,000 that they promised under an agreement with the government for the reactivation of Daniel's Harbour. The following year they will spend \$1.5 million if the \$2 million programme is successful in finding zinc.

So if we take all of those and add them all up, then we will find that this year, 1988, we will have about \$35 million of investment in exploration in Newfoundland. And that is what we have done. That is what we did last year and that is what we are doing again this year. Now last year my prediction

was \$25 million, but it actually came out to \$26.5 million more than what I had predicted. I am predicting this year that we will have \$35 million. Now the hon. member was a little bit skeptical last year, and I know he is skeptical again this year. But the fact of the matter is that the one year that I made a prediction it came out fairly accurate. As a matter of fact, it was more than I had predicted.

MR. DOYLE:
\$1.5 million over.

MR. DINN:
Yes, \$1.5 million over. And this year I am saying \$35 million.

MR. SIMMONS:
And next year?

MR. DINN:
Well, I will know this time next year. Stay tuned. Because next year, if the hon. the Premier leaves me in the Department of Mines, we will probably top the \$50 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:
But, Mr. Speaker, over the past couple of years, since I came into mines, we have gone from \$8 million to \$15 million to \$26.5 million, and next year it could be even more.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. DECKER:
It is too bad the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor) does not make better predictions, like his

colleague. My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn). There are two methods of funding for school buses in Newfoundland, I am sure the minister is aware. One is for board owned buses, where the government pays 100 per cent of the cost, and the other is for contracting out, where the board has to pay 10 per cent. Would the minister explain why the same formula of funding is not used for both methods of busing in Newfoundland?

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

MR. HEARN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some time ago, when the government started to provide funding to operate busing in the Province for school students, it was done strictly by government at the time through the boards, as it is still done, on a 90/10 basis. A board Labrador West, I believe, was the original one - came in and said that they could operate a system more efficiently having more control of the system, etc., than the present system, and on an experimental basis they were given the go-ahead to do it. Because it costs the board extra in relation to administrative costs, and so on, the 10 per cent input that they would put in ordinarily was eliminated. Since that time a number of other boards have gradually taken over their own busing. Last year we had boards in two major areas of the Province coming together, the Integrated boards and the Roman Catholic Boards on the Burin Peninsula and Corner Brook, to do the same thing. It is getting to the point now where a number of boards are involved in running their own

system and they have been given the same incentive as the original board. Talking to people in the educational field, they feel, as we do now, also, that perhaps it does not take 10 per cent of the total transportation budget to cover administrative costs and so, and there seems to be a discrepancy. We are aware of it, it is being addressed, and we will have more to say on it in the very near future.

MR. DECKER:

a Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, as the minister says, the boards are doing it more efficiently, apparently. This is his department's interpretation. I ask the minister if there are boards in this Province who are not using the most efficient, safe way to operate school buses, then why has the government not directed all school boards to accept the most efficient, safe way to bus children? I do not see the point in allowing this to continue. By his admission there are boards that are not busing their children in the most efficient way, so why has he not directed all boards to take the most efficient way to bus their children?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, as usual the hon. member was not listening very clearly to what I said. I said the original approach from school boards stated that they, themselves, in their perception,

could run a cheaper and more efficient service. I did not say that we said it.

There has been a fair amount of discussion recently about the board run bus system compared to the contracted out system. There are pluses and minuses for each one. That issue is presently being studied, as a matter of fact in some detail, and, as I said, we will have more to say about it at a later date.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Maybe the minister will tell me how I can listen very clearly sometime outside the House, but that is another point.

I ask the minister -- and the bottom line is this -- when does the minister expect to remove the discrepancy from funding to school bus operators in this Province, the boards and the contractors? When does he plan to remove this discrepancy? Never mind explaining why. When will it be done, so that the board in Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir will not be paying fifteen dollars per student for busing?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, one of the things complicating the situation at present in relation to boards combining, as was suggested last year, with the Gander-Connaigre-Bay d'Espoir

Board combining to run bus services, and so on on, their own, is the recent study on board boundaries which is going to affect a number of the boards and would throw a lot of the plans into disruption.

There are a number of discrepancies out there in relation to the cost of one system with another as there are discrepancies with the pay of leaders.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins). My question is this: At the Committee Estimates hearing on the Department of Health several days ago, the minister, in an article, was quoted as saying that there is no nursing shortage in the Province and that a committee report indicated there was only a 2 per cent vacancy rate. The minister was kind enough to give us a copy of the report yesterday and, having looked at it, I would ask the Minister of Health to explain why, if there is no nursing shortage, a full 60 per cent of the Directors of Nursing in hospitals and 53 per cent of the Directors of Nursing in the nursing homes are, and I quote, "indicating dissatisfaction with the current level of nursing staffing." Is not, in fact, his argument that we do not have a nursing shortage just that we actually have a shortage of nursing positions and that many more positions are necessary in order to equalize the workload in our hospitals, primarily the ones

that have been caught in the hospital freeze?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, in the Health Estimates I gave a report of a preliminary report we got from a group made up of the Nursing Association, the Nursing Union, the Newfoundland Hospital Association, and the Department of Health. That is a group that has been in place now for a number of months studying the nursing situation in the Province, and they have put in that preliminary report saying that there is only 2 percent of assigned positions unfilled in the health institutions. In other words, there are 98 percent filled and there is only 2 percent unfilled, so on that basis this group reported that there is not a critical nursing shortage. Now the hon. member is asking, are there enough positions assigned. The way these positions are assigned is that there is study done by what we call in the Department of Health our nursing consultants. They go out and see what the workload is and what the demands are and discuss this matter with the hospitals. Quite often there is a difference of opinion, I do not say there is not, and that is not to be wondered at. But the people who are knowledgeable in the department come up, then, and say, here is what we feel would be an adequate number - not, shall we say, a maximum number, an adequate number - to do the workload, and it is up to government then to fund that number, or fund more if they wish. In view of the funds available to us, in most cases all we are able to fund at this point

in time is the adequate number that our nursing consultants tell us is required.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is that we have already had another report, released earlier this week from the same Minister, which indicated fifty-five nursing positions short - nursing, nursing assistants and ward clerks. And the report that was tabled by the Minister yesterday went on to indicate that few institutions use a workload measurement or pay and classification system that is adequate.

Would not the Minister, then, agree that he really has no idea what the reasonable number of nursing positions are in hospitals since we have already had an indication that they are up to 30 percent understaffed in one major nursing home in this Province, and the interim report from his committee also indicates that he has no effective measurement available to do an adequate job of assessing nursing jobs in all the rest of the hospitals in the Province?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I guess what we are getting into here is an understanding that the health care system is a very dynamic system. Things change quite often, the workload changes, the type of work that has to be done changes, the

distribution of services around the Province changes. It is a very, very dynamic system, so you cannot say at one point and time, yes, I know all about the system, and just leave it there and do no more learning, or no more investigation or analysis.

We are doing analysis and setting up groups, and the one I just mentioned is an example, all the time, because it is a very changing arrangement and you have to keep adjusting and you have to keep, shall we say, altering your guidelines in view of new circumstances as they arise. I do not think, when the study is done, that we can say that we now know forever and a day all about nursing in Newfoundland. But we will know a lot more when this study is completed. I hope it will be completed sometime in the mid or late summer, and I think it is going to be a very in-depth study. When that is completed I think we will know a lot more than we know now, but I am quite sure that two years hence we will need to do something else to learn even a little bit more about it.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.

MR. FENWICK:
My final supplementary is: On page 4 of the report they indicate that in excess of 30 per cent of the graduates of one of the St. John's nursing schools for the years 1985 and 1986 have now left the Province. And the report goes on to indicate it is because of staff shortages in the hospitals, primarily in St. John's, as a result of the freeze.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
Will the minister undertake to look at the interim report and see if some of the recommendations it has made about putting additional permanent positions in, especially in hospitals in St. John's and nursing homes in St. John's which have been subject to a freeze for about three years in terms of their budgets, to see if we can take initial steps to alleviate the nursing shortage, whether you call it a shortage of nurses or a shortage of nursing positions?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, immediately before I came to the House this morning I had a conference call with one of the institutions in the city, speaking to the Administrator on this very point. This is not unusual. These changing situations arise all the time, and we grapple with them as they come up. There is a particular, as I am sure hon. members know, situation at the Health Sciences Complex at the moment and we are grappling with this. It is one of those ups and downs things. It is a serious matter. We are not downplaying its importance, but it is just one of those things that come up recurrently, and we are grappling with it at the present time. We will work with the hospital and I am sure we will come up with a satisfactory solution.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. EFFORD:
By leave, Mr. Speaker?

DR. COLLINS:
There is always another day.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would at this stage like to welcome to the gallery an eleven member delegation from Harbour Mille and Little Harbour East.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to table issues of The Newfoundland Gazette for the period May 6, 1987 to March 31 of this year inclusive. Part two of The Gazette contains subordinate legislation filed under the Statutes and Subordinate Legislation Act. Under Section 18 of that Act, as the minister responsible for the Office of the Legislative Counsel, I am required to table this subordinate legislation.

MR. PEACH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister Responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Housing.

MR. PEACH:

I wish to table the report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation for the year 1985-86 and 1986-87.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

DR. TWOMEY:

I wish to table in the House, Mr. Speaker, the report of Public Tendering Act Exceptions for March 1 to March 31, 1988.

Notices of Motion

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Public Library Service In The Province." (Bill No. 31).

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills: "An Act To Amend The Alcohol And Drug Dependency Commission Act", (Bill

No. 29) and "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Act." (Bill No. 36).

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. YOUNG:

I would like to table answers to questions numbered 25 and 47 on the Order Paper, asked by the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey).

Petitions

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by 212 people of the town of Raleigh on the Northern Peninsula. The petition is addressed to the hon. House of Assembly and Parliament Assembled:

Whereas the road to Raleigh was constructed over twenty years ago and is worn down to the extent that it cannot be graded; and

Whereas this road provides access to the hospital, high school, shopping centre and fish plant in St. Anthony and serves as our link with the world while also providing access to our community and the Pistolet Bay Provincial

Park; and

Whereas the people of Raleigh have been requesting this government for nearly ten years without success;

We, the citizens of Raleigh, do hereby request our government to begin upgrading and paving of the ten miles of Route 437 referred to as the Raleigh Road during the Summer of 1988.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be perfectly in order today to compliment the people of Raleigh for the approach they are taking. Practically every time we turn on our radio or our television these days we hear about people blocking highroads.

We remember last year out in the Bellevue district where the people were so desperate that they had to get out and block their roads, Mr. Speaker, in order to draw some attention to the problems they were having. This way Newfoundlanders have learned is the only way they can get any attention from this government, to get out and have civil disobedience.

But the people of Raleigh are not taking that approach, Mr. Speaker. That is why I believe that this House owes them a compliment. They are not blocking roads, Mr. Speaker. The good people of Raleigh are following a tradition which they are proud of. It is a tradition, Mr. Speaker, which we have inherited from the British Commonwealth system of government. The people of Raleigh today are asking me, their member, to bring to the attention to the government here assembled the condition of the Raleigh road.

Mr. Speaker, I, more than any other person in this House today, am qualified to tell about the condition of the Raleigh road. The Raleigh road has been there for twenty years. It was there when we saw this revolution in Newfoundland, shortly after Confederation, when we had the great Premier Peck -- Premier Smallwood, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

I paused deliberately, Mr. Speaker. I thought that would catch their attention and it did. We had a Premier who was building this road and building this Province.

I looked at a paper the other day the former Premier had prepared when Term 29 was being challenged, and, Mr. Speaker, I was amazed at the amount of construction that had taken place in Newfoundland over a ten year period. It was unbelievable! I think the Term 29 dispute was ten or eleven years after Confederation. The amount of construction that had gone on in such a brief period was unbelievable. It has not been surpassed since the revolution which took place. During that revolution we saw roads built, including this road up in Raleigh to St. Anthony.

This government has not been able to maintain the road from Raleigh into St. Anthony, yet this government has enacted policies whereby hospitals have been centralized. The only medical treatment the people in Raleigh can get is into St. Anthony. This government has brought in policies whereby schools are centralized. The only schools that are

available for the high school children of Raleigh are in St. Anthony and they have to be bused over this road.

The whole Peninsula, like the rest of Newfoundland, is being centralized by this government's policies, and the roads that were put there during the revolution in this Province are not being maintained.

So the people of Raleigh today are asking that this road be upgraded and paved. Mr. Speaker, that is what I am asking on their behalf today. That is the petition I am supporting. I am looking forward to hearing the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doyle), when he stands up today, say, 'Yes, I am going to take this petition from the member for the Strait of Belle Isle and I am going to tell the people of Raleigh.' I am even going to let him make the announcement. I am not interested in making announcements. That is silliness! I am more interested in seeing the road upgraded and paved than I am in making some political points about announcing it, Mr. Speaker. That is foolishness! That is a game other members play. I do not get involved in that nonsense.

I want the minister to make the announcement today, and I will be proud to pass along to the good people of Raleigh that the minister is going to pave their road.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for indulging me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. The member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Speaker, I want to be able to use up my time in supporting the petition so ably presented by my colleague and friend for the Strait of Belle Isle because this situation, not only with the roads leading into Raleigh, but the roads all over the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, is reaching such an emergency and crisis situation that if something is not done, and done immediately, as the member for the Strait of Belle Isle has asked the minister to do, it is going to reach such a proportion that it is going to be beyond the point where any finance or any political form of government is going to be able to do anything about it. The roads in this Province are going to be in a situation where people are not going to be able to receive the form of transportation they deserve or be able to drive over these roads. They are not even going to be able to drive a wheelbarrow or a horse and cart over the roads like they did years ago, or even walk over the roads. That is the seriousness of the situation in this Province.

What has happened to cause this situation to deteriorate to where it is today? The situation, as it is today, has happened because of the political system used by this administration. There has been no fairness, no equality, and no balance used in the allocation of money coming in from the federal or provincial Treasury. We have had delegations, Mr. Speaker, coming from all over the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We

see, sitting in the Gallery today, a delegation from Harbour Mille and the same situation is arising, the government is not listening to the crisis situation in this Province.

The people from Raleigh have been taking a very serious approach and asking for help, but they have not been receiving any. We implore and we beg the Minister of Transportation to recognize how serious this has grown. In every district around the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador that is represented by Opposition members or by the third party they have been left with this sort of condition because of this sort of money allocation, no money whatsoever, and no recognition.

The Minister of Transportation just a couple of days ago was presented by the member for St. Barbe with an actual document where the Premier himself had promised to do the roads, and had promised \$900,000. What did the Minister of Transportation do? He completely ignored it. He closed his mind completely in front of the delegation and in front of the member when he knows full well that that amount of money was promised.

What do we have to do to get through to the Minister of Transportation and to get through to the government? The only way the people of Raleigh are going to be able to even walk over these roads is if something is done and done immediately.

If the Minister of Transportation has any sort of decency and any caring left in him, he is going to have to close out the political forum and recognize immediately he is going to have to put some money

in these areas before the crisis is beyond repair. He knows full well you cannot keep shutting away, you cannot keep covering up, you cannot do this, and expect that it is going to be solved on its own. The Minister of Transportation knows this full well, because we went through the same situation last year in the town of Makinsons with the water situation. He does not listen to the people.

MR. DOYLE:

We put a big, long stretch of pavement down in (inaudible) last year. Are you trying to say we never?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Where?

MR. DOYLE:

Did you get it or not?

MR. EFFORD:

Where?

MR. DOYLE:

Down in (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Definitely not. We did not get it. The minister knows full well that last year in the district of Port de Grave there was not one dollar spent on roads, not one five cent piece in all the communities. In all the communities, Mr. Speaker, there was not five cents given to a town council last year. Totally political!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:

Roaches Line is not in the district of Port de Grave. Roaches Line is in the district of Harbour Main, and he knows full well where it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:

And the Minister of Housing knows full well where it is.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would ask the Minister of Transportation to stop the political block funding of money and give it to all taxpayers of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to respond to the petition presented today by the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle. As I have said on a number of different occasions, I am always pleased and always happy to respond to any petition presented by members on this side or that side, as well, on behalf of their constituents, because, generally speaking, as I have indicated a number of times, the problems are legitimate and worthy of attention and worthy of a response from me.

At the same time, of course, Mr. Speaker, I try to block out as much as I can the politics and the partisan statements the hon. gentleman made a couple of minutes ago because it only serves to damage the credibility of the problem itself, Mr. Speaker. So I

do not even want to respond to these partisan statements by the hon. gentleman because they are not really worthy of any great response.

Having said that Your Honor, at this particular time of year, of course, we run into a number of problems especially as it relates to the maintenance of roads. We are in the time of year when you are getting a Spring runoff and a tremendous amount of runoff from snow and what have you, which is causing quite a number of problems on a lot of gravel roads in the Province where you have soft conditions setting in because of weather conditions. Hopefully a great deal of that will correct itself within a short period of time when decent weather conditions prevail.

In this particular instance, of course, the hon. gentleman is talking about upgrading and paving of the Raleigh Road and that is a legitimate concern of the people in that area. He points out that not all that much money has been spent in his district over the last number of years.

I would like to point out to him that federal and provincial monies over the last ten year period amounts to approximately \$25 million that has been spent in that particular area and hopefully that that funding will continue for sometime to come.

He also mentions the fact that it was before this government's day that most of the upgrading and paving of various roads in the Province took place.

I would like to point out to him also that since 1979, since this particular administration came

into power, the department has built, mind you, 2,200 kilometres of road costing \$234 million in this Province. I think that is a sizeable expenditure for this government to have undertaken. In addition to that, 1,700 kilometres of road at a cost of approximately \$145 million has been expended by this government and 233 bridges put in at a cost of \$55 million.

Mr. Speaker, I think that demonstrates beyond a shadow of a doubt the commitment that this government has to providing a decent transportation network for the people of the Province.

It is very unfortunate, that we cannot address all of the problems in any one given area but that is always a problem with funding, Mr. Speaker, and of course, this year we have a programme, both a provincial and federal programme, which is going to amount to some \$85 million to \$90 million and hopefully, Mr. Speaker, as time goes on, we will be able to address all of the legitimate problems that a number of areas of the Province has.

Again, I have to remind the hon. gentleman that we do have 8,600 kilometres of road in the Province and about 50 percent of these are paved. Nothing, believe me, would satisfy or make happier the Department of Transportation, or this government than being able to pave every single road in the Province that we have a problem with.

As time goes on, Mr. Speaker, I am sure this government could achieve that.

Thank you very much.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons).

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present a petition on behalf of about 400 residents of Harbour Mille and Little Harbour East, two communities in the district of Fortune - Hermitage.

As I indicated to the Minister earlier today, the petition is about roads and I am sure he will want, as he is doing, to give ear to the burden of the prayer of the petition.

Earlier today the minister was kind enough, together with one of his officials, the Assistant Deputy Minister, to meet with me and with eleven people from the two communities who are in the Gallery this morning, having gotten up at an ungodly hour and having driven for three to four hours to be here in time for their first meeting at eight-thirty this morning. They all look still quite wide awake and when you hear the kind of road they have come over, you will understand why they are very wide awake, even if they were not when they left home.

These eleven kilometres of road, Mr. Speaker, constitute one of four sections of very bad gravel road in the district about which I have spoken here many time, the most recent time being about a week or so ago.

The prayer of the petition is that steps be taken to immediately upgrade those eleven kilometres of road from Little Bay East around the Bay d'East area and into Little Harbour East and Harbour

Mille. This morning, as the minister will be aware, we met with him and the delegation at that time highlighted three concerns.

One of the concerns is embodied in this petition, the need to upgrade. The other two were the need to do something immediately about the situation I raised with the minister here in the House a week or so ago, the question of the Bay d'East washout during that heavy rainfall period in early March. The third are some concerns the delegation expressed to the minister and his official about the maintenance of the road.

I had a similar experience with the minister about a month ago with respect to a delegation from Hermitage-Sandyville and Gaultois, and at that time certain concerns were expressed about maintenance. I want to say publicly, in the minister's presence, in the presence of his colleagues and in the presence of people from Harbour Mill and Little Harbour East, that he came through. He addressed the maintenance concerns. I met with the council in Hermitage Sandyville in the last few days and I was informed they have noticed a marked improvement with respect to the issues they raised with him. I thank him for that.

I ask him to give full consideration to this petition because it is for the upgrading of a very bad section of road. The minister saw pictures this morning, he has seen them before, so I will not take the time of the House now to belabour the point, because I am fully aware that the minister is quite aware of the desperateness of this particular

situation and the road that those 300 or so people have to depend on to get to schools, to get to medical facilities, to get to shopping and to get to their jobs, in many cases.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, because it relates directly to the petition, I want to respond to a matter that the minister raised during his response to my friend from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). The minister is right. We ought to keep out those partisan concerns and considerations when we are debating issues of this importance. My friend for Port de Grave agrees with that, but he has the same problem I have.

It is very difficult, being ordinary human beings as we are, to sit here and bit our lip when we hear the minister say that in one mouthful, but in the next instance we hear things like the following: Yes, he has built a lot of roads. Nobody disputes that. What we debate sometimes is whether their priority about where the road building is being done is the right one. For example, when we see eleven people who have come all this distance this morning over a very bad gravel road, on the one hand, and we realize, I say to the minister, on the other, that last year in his friend's district, the member for Harbour Grace, the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Young) these days, when we realize that they have spent \$750,000 on a road down there last year with only six houses on it, do not stand here and tell me that we are playing the politics.

When I look at the former Minister of Transportation, the member for St. George's (Mr. Dawe) out in Round Pond paving a road of 1,200

feet and 20 feet wide, pavement up to a tree, because his father's cabin is behind the tree, and spends 68

AN HON. MEMBER:
That is shocking, that is shocking!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
- and spends 68

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:
It is the truth as well. It is the truth.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I know my good friend the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin) does not like it, but the truth often hurts. The truth often hurts.

The fair thing, Mr. Speaker, is the following: That \$68,000 -

AN HON. MEMBER:
\$48,000.

MR. SIMMONS:
- oh, it is only \$48,000. My mistake. What did they do with the other \$20,000?

MR. BAIRD:
Read your books.

MR. SIMMONS:
\$68,000, I say to the member for Humber West, was spent paving a road, Mr. Speaker, to one house.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member's time has concluded.

MR. SIMMONS:
Thank you Sir, I will conclude within one sentence.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister, we will keep the partisanship out of it if he will keep the partisanship out of it, but to the substance of this petition, I support it wholeheartedly and I ask the Minister to give it his support, as I am sure he will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan).

MR. MORGAN:
I would like to make a few comments on the petition as I understand that a delegation from the area is in the Gallery.

I think it is clearly obvious that the kind of approach just taken by the member for Fortune-Hermitage is not the kind that would be successful in getting things done in his riding. He stands up to put forward in a sincere way a petition on behalf of these people and rightly so. They want their roads paved and I support them. But the approach made by their member for the area in getting up and attacking the government and attacking other ministers besides the Minister of Transportation in the way he did, is not the right approach to get things done for his area. It is the wrong approach. He is doing damage to

the efforts of those petitioners, to the people from the area and the committee organized in the area. He is doing substantial damage to their efforts, which are genuine and sincere in trying to get 11 kilometers of road paved.

I fully support the efforts of these people getting their road upgraded and paved. I have been fully aware over the years.

Recognize the fact, Mr. Speaker, that since 1972, if my figures are correct and I think that they are, that this administration here, the P.C. administration which I was part of under both Premiers, has spent something like \$37 million in that riding, in Fortune-Hermitage. Hopefully more will be spent this year and in future years, but I say again, Mr. Speaker, in genuinely supporting the efforts of these people from the area, their member for the area has just done substantial damage in getting up and criticizing the former Minister, the now Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, in attacking him in the way that he did, in the partisan way that he attacked a minister in the government. That is not the way to go when getting things done for his district.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. the leader of the Opposition again I must draw attention to hon. members that this petition is not in order.

We have had repeated trouble, as all hon. members know, in petitions. A petition should be addressed to the House of Assembly. I do not feel very

happy about bringing this to the attention of hon. members. I will say that. I realize that people have come through a lot of trouble and inconvenience to come here to the House to hear petitions and it is not lightly that I would bring this matter to hon. members, but the fact of the matter is that I am bound to do so because that is my job, to point out that this petition is not in order.

This petition is not addressed to the hon. House. It says, "We, the undersigned, being residents of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, do hereby make petition to the hon. Minister of the Department of Transportation for the Province of Newfoundland." So I must rule that the petition is not in order.

If hon. members by leave want to discuss it, that is another matter, but this petition is not in order.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
If I may, not to belabour the point or anything, but this seems to occur from time to time, quite frequently, I am not sure. Maybe the Opposition House leader and I can get together and, I do not know about change them, but at least if members followed the same source, maybe go to the Clerk or something just to make sure that everything is right, we might stop this. Anyway, that is another problem we will deal with another day.

For this particular day we are

quite prepared on this side to allow the debate on this particular petition to proceed, especially in view of the fact that there are people in the galleries, rather than delay the matter any more. We are quite prepared to do this.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this has come up on a regular basis, and the Government House Leader's suggestion is good, to bring the petitions to the Clerk or some single source to make sure it is in order before presenting it to the House, provided that some of the petitioners, some of the members who signed the original petition, are present. But often, as the Government House Leader knows, we have petitions sent in from hundreds of miles away and the individuals sending them in are not around.

So I would recommend very strongly to the Government House Leader that consideration be given to an amendment to the rules of this House for petitions so that the Speaker can consider it in order to hear any form of communication which is, in substance, a petition that, by its nature, is of concern or of interest to members of the House. I would strongly recommend that because we are going to continue to have this problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition wish to have a further word along those lines?

MR. WELLS:

Yes.

MR. SIMMS:

Go ahead. I will wait.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

I just wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is just an insult to people for us to seek to apply our rules to their drafting of a petition. The presentation of a petition to this House is a time honoured practice that we have had ever since the House has existed in this Province. We should not now be saying to the people of this Province, 'Your petition cannot be heard because it is not, strictly speaking, addressed to the House of Assembly.' Most people in the Province think in terms of the government and the responsibility of the government to respond.

The suggestion of the hon. member for Mount Scio - Bell Island is a good one. We should change our rules. I think the hon. Government House Leader is prepared to agree to it. In the meantime, we should now agree that all petitions that are clearly intended to be a petition for presentation in the House to ask the government to respond to

something, be heard until we put our own rules in order.

MR. SIMMS:

Just to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Not to belabour the point, we have already indicated that we are quite prepared to let this debate carry on. I think there is one more speaker from that side allowed on this petition. Then I understand the Minister of Transportation would like to ask for leave to comment for a couple of minutes, because he did not get an opportunity. In any event, that is this particular petition. We have agreed on that. That is not a problem.

I think the suggestion of the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island was an excellent one, not specifically, now, what he had to say. I am not commenting on that. But the idea of us looking at and doing something to prevent this from occurring again, because it seems to happen almost every second day. So something is wrong with the process or the procedure.

In addition to that, I understand that the Select Committee of the House that is dealing with rule changes and so on may, in fact, be looking at that particular item as well. So we may be able to deal with it in due course, in any event.

Anyway, not to belabour it, perhaps we will take it under advisement and maybe I will have some conversations with my counterparts and see if there is

anything we can do to resolve that particular problem so that it does not continue to re-occur and put Your Honour in what I know is and has been an embarrassing situation, especially if there are people in the Gallery who do not fully understand what we are doing down here. I cannot really blame them many times.

So, having said that, let us leave it at that, I suggest, and get on with this particular petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The comments that were made are certainly excellent ones. It would make my life much easier if the rules were changed. With the rule as it is, I have no option, unless by leave the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support the petition and in doing so I want to refute the comments of the hon. member from Bonaville South (Mr. Morgan).

It is the responsibility of the members, particularly those members on this side of the House, to point out and explain to the public of this Province why roads are not paved or reconstructed in particular areas when we receive petitions such as this. The people of the district of Fortune - Hermitage should know why that

has not been attended to the same as the people in Raleigh in the Strait of Belle Isle should know why that has not been done. It does not in any manner diminish the chances of the prayer of the petition being answered, it does not at all. It probably increases it because it creates great political discomfort as it ought to create political discomfort for members on the government side of the House when the public are made aware of just what has been happening and what has been the record of the government in this regard over recent years.

So nothing that the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) said in any manner hurts or adversely affects the prayer of the petition or the chances of it being answered.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support and endorse the petition of the people of Little Harbour East and Harbour Mille. When one drives over those roads from time to time you can see just what the need is, particularly at this time of the year and you can see just what drives people to occasionally take drastic steps, as occurred last week in Bartlett's Harbour.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to be more sensitive to the needs and respond better to the prayers of such petitions. I heartily support this one.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Does the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doyle) have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
I am quite prepared to give him leave because we want to hear from him. The point should be made though that leave would not be required if the gentleman for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) did not hog the position that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doyle) should have had in the first place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DOYLE:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am very pleased indeed to stand and to respond to the petition presented by the hon. member. Just for the benefit of the delegation in the Gallery who may not fully understand what is happening and why we have to have leave, under the rules of the House only one member from this side of the House can respond to a petition, unless leave is granted.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that leave was granted because I did have the opportunity and the pleasure, of course, this morning at 9:00 o'clock to welcome the delegation from Harbour Mille and Little Harbour East who went

through a great deal to get in here today. I believe they indicated to me they had to rise this morning somewhere around 2:30 or 3:00 a.m. to get in for a 9:00 meeting. So I am sure they would want to hear their concerns addressed by me in a public fashion, even though, of course, I met with the delegation a little bit earlier, as I said, 9:00 o'clock this morning and went over their problems in great detail, so it may not be necessary for me to respond in any great detail here today, given the fact that we have already talked about some of the problems that they are experiencing on an 11 kilometer stretch of road in that area.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, some of the problems being experienced on that road are of a maintenance nature and due to the current weather conditions that we have. Just to be a little bit more specific about their problems, especially the flooding problems they mentioned, the department has experienced very severe drainage problems in that area because of the location of the road itself and the fact that it follows along the shoreline in some areas and extreme flooding occurs. There is a tendency for extreme flooding at this particular time of year. But as I indicated to the delegation this morning, I am only too pleased when whether conditions permit and when we do have our maintenance programme in place that we will be directing our maintenance people to have a look at these flooding problems and some piping problems that need to be looked after to prevent that flooding in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that will be undertaken at some point within

the next month or so, when we do have our maintenance programme underway.

Of course, the delegation is interested, too, in the upgrading of their road to a reasonable standard. A lot of work has been undertaken on that particular road over the years. In the late 70s and early 80s, my officials tell me, the road was upgraded to a reasonable standard, but without a doubt, I guess, it has gone down since then because of the fact that it is a gravel road and requires some extensive maintenance work to be undertaken right now. I talked to my officials this morning, as a matter of fact, out in that area, at the depot, who told me that quite a great deal of granular material needs to be placed over the surface of the road. Hopefully, that will be done, as I said, in the not too distant future.

As I said a moment ago, when I am responding to a petition I like to keep politics out of it, Mr. Speaker, but just to reiterate what my colleague said in responding to this petition, just in case there might be some doubt as to the amount of funding that has gone into that particular district ever since this administration took office, and back in 1972 when the previous administration took office, I do have figures that indicate that a total of \$37 million has been spent in that district, both provincial and Federal monies, not only on roads but on other services, and on ferry services as well, over the years since 1972-73, and that is a substantial amount of money. But not to take away, again, from the problem that the delegation has placed before

me this morning, as I said, a lot of it is of a maintenance nature and hopefully our maintenance crews will be mobilized within in the next month or month and a half and will start to undertake their programme, which will alleviate a lot of these problems on gravel roads right across the Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Orders of the Day

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to the Meech Lake debate I would like to move first reading of those three motions on the last page. Motion 4.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Energy to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Canada-Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation (Newfoundland) Act," carried. (Bill No. 32).

On motion, Bill No. 32 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SIMMS:

Motion 5.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend Certain Acts Having Regard To The Canadian Charter Or Rights And Freedoms," carried. (Bill No. 33).

On motion, Bill No. 33 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SIMMS:

Motion 6.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of

Consumer Affairs and Communications to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Purchasing Management Association of Canada," carried. (Bill No. 30)

On motion, Bill No. (30) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SIMMS:

We will move now to Motion 3, which is the Meech Lake motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion 3.

The hon. the member for Bonavista South adjourned the debate.

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to recall what I had to say last day, when I adjourned the debate. I stand to be corrected, but there are twenty minutes left of my time?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member has twenty-four minutes left.

MR. MORGAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think, first of all, Mr. Speaker, it is important to emphasize the importance of this debate, the importance of what we are talking about, how important it is to this Province of Newfoundland. It is a topic of discussion now all across Canada not just in Newfoundland. I think it is very important to always have clarified the positions taken by respective parties, especially parties which have members in Legislatures, or Assemblies, or

Parliaments in Canada, because there is considerable debate. I think it is very important to always stress the factual information put forward by respective parties. I did not read what I had to say myself, and I do not want to in any way misconstrue anything the hon. the Leader of the Opposition said, so I have here in front of me the Hansard containing the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition. I want to be very pertinent to the issue and to the factual position taken by the Liberal Party, by the Liberal leader.

It is clear to me and clear to, I think, members of the House of Assembly, and I think to the people of Newfoundland, if his comments were carried through the press, that the Leader of the Opposition is indeed now, on behalf of his party, advocating a position that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland is now very strenuously opposed to a weakened federal government. Any action taken under the Meech Lake Accord which will weaken the federal government, the Liberal Party of Newfoundland is indeed opposed to that, while at the same time being opposed to any strengthening of the provincial governments in Canada and their positions. I can quote from Hansard the position taken by the Leader of the Opposition. In fact I will do that right now to make sure there is no misrepresentation of the facts.

On the Senate issue - that is one of four topics I want to discuss. I quote the Leader of the Opposition: "Patronage is wrong, whoever practices it" - that is an interesting comment "or whichever government practices it. We cannot be assured of

having in the Senate the people who will protect the interests of the whole Province if they are appointed by the government for political reasons." Now, that is clearly outlining the position of the Liberal Party, through the leader, on appointments to the Senate. But the fact is that the Government of Canada, under this Accord, have already confirmed the position that they will give the provinces a right to have a say on any appointments to Senate. And to add to that, and it is all tying in, they will go further and look at Senate reform. So it is not just the end of things by saying to the Provinces, 'We are going to give you now the right to have a say in appointments to the Senate,' it is, at the same time, the beginning of further discussion and debate on Senate reform. In fact, one of the terms of the Constitutional Conferences, beginning this year in 1988, is not just on the matters we will discuss later, the Fisheries roles and responsibilities, but is on Senate reform. So, now we know the position of the Liberal Party in Newfoundland on that one issue, on Senate reform.

Let me go a little bit further on his commenting on the Supreme Court.

For example, the quotation from Hansard - this is the official document of the House of Assembly and I would assume there is no question now of the official position the Liberal Party - "But it also provides that the judges are to be appointed from lists generated by provincial governments and that I do take issue with. I think it will result in our having a poorer quality Supreme Court in the long term."

AN HON. MEMBER:

No!

MR. MORGAN:

So he and his party are now opposed to the Province having any say with regard to appointments to the Supreme Court. That is the official position of the present Liberal leader, the present Liberal Party in Opposition in the House of Assembly.

MR. YOUNG:

Why, I wonder?

MR. PATTERSON:

He should resign.

MR. MORGAN:

Now, that is the position on these two issues.

Now, the most important issue that concerns me and bothers me as Newfoundlander, tying in his statements and his position that he does not want to see a weakened federal government, tying in his position which he enunciated not just in this debate, but, Mr. Speaker, back as far as August 14, 1987, the present Liberal Leader, the leader of the Opposition said then that he disagreed with Newfoundland seeking legislative jurisdiction over the fishery.

MR. TOBIN:

Shameful! Shameful!

MR. MORGAN:

I thought, at the time, Mr. Speaker, that that was indeed a misquote. I thought for sure this was not and could not be the official position of a party in Newfoundland which is representing, in this case, many rural areas of our Province where the fishing industry is the only industry and is, indeed, the lifeblood of these rural parts of

our economy in Newfoundland.

MR. TOBIN:

That was the Twillingate agreement.

MR. MORGAN:

That was the position that was taken then. It is now backed up. I thought that was a misquote, at that time. So, Mr. Speaker, I said, surely the Liberal Party is not committing political suicide? They must be able to debate this issue in a reasonable way and come forward with something more concrete than someone saying on behalf of their party that they are opposed to any additional jurisdiction over the fishing industry. But, lo and behold, in this very debate, that same gentleman speaking for all of his party - I will dare anybody else speak for his party - I understand that is the position of that party at the present time. And I have to be fair to the hon. gentleman to make sure this is now the official position, so I want, again, to quote from his speech in this very debate.

"I have expressed the opinion, and it is the view of this party, Mr. Speaker, that this Province does not have the financial capacity to pay for the jurisdiction we have now, let alone seeking jurisdiction to manage 200,000 square miles of the North Atlantic. It is a charade. It is a sham." In other words, it is a sham, Mr. Speaker, it is a sham for the Province to gain any more authority or jurisdiction under the Meech Lake Accord, and it is disgusting, even further, to see any weakening of the federal government and its powers.

Now, I do hope today, in fact, I am rather confident we will see, a more rational position being taken

by at least one member of that party, of the Opposition. I do not know whether the other members are blindly supporting, or being forced to support the position taken by their leader. I just cannot rationalize in my own mind how the member for Bonavista North, the member for Twillingate, the member for Fogo, the member for Port de Grave, and others who are representing fishing areas, can say it will be a sham; their party to take the position that it will be a sham for us to have more say over the fishing industry, when every day of the week they must be in a position that was brought forward to them, examples of where we do definitely need more say over the problems that we have in the fishing industry to be able to resolve them at the local level.

So, Mr. Speaker, it was no surprise when I read a headline in **The Evening Telegram** a little while ago which stated that at least one member was going to break ranks with his party and was not going to adopt the position now being put forward by the leader of that party. I can understand why that same gentleman, when he was leader and he spoke for the same party back in May of 1987, the member for Mount Scio, took a more reasonable position, a more rational position, and, I think, a position that all Newfoundlanders will accept, the same position the government is taking.

For the new leader to come in and suddenly say, 'No, what the former leader's position was is all wrong and the Government of Newfoundland is all wrong,' I would say, Mr. Speaker, he thinks most of the people in Newfoundland are wrong, because they are all saying the

same thing. In my travels I have not found one person involved in the fishing industry today, with the exception, maybe, of Mr. Cashin himself - he would go differently from everybody else - but would agree that the Province has a need to have more say over that most important industry.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Cashin (inaudible).

MR. MORGAN:

My colleague said Mr. Cashin, and rightly so.

For example, let me just give a little quote from the former leader, speaking for his party, and the very good position he had. I will just quote a major part. Says Mr. Barry: "I do not think there has been any great opposition from this side of the House to that principle" speaking of the principle of additional jurisdiction - "I think all Newfoundlanders recognize that the existing state of jurisdiction relating to the fishery is not sufficient protection for this Province." He was so right then, I am hoping you will hear the same thing again today, that he disagrees with his party in this stupid position they have taken in opposing this Province having more say over one of its most important industries. And not just one, I would say the most important industry that we have.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, some members on the other side attempting to leave the impression that we were looking for total jurisdiction over the fishing industry. How wrong that has been. The documents are available. The position was put forward by the government, not by a minister. When I was minister

and, indeed, when my friend for Twillingate was minister, it was put forward to Ottawa that because we had so little say over the fishing industry, we were seeking shared jurisdiction. That is the key word, 'shared'. We have never gone to Ottawa and said, 'We want total control over the fishing industry.' Never, at any time.

What do we want shared with us? That is a key question. The leader of the Opposition should have surely asked these kinds of questions in the debate before adamantly closing the door and saying, No, no shared jurisdiction or no additional jurisdiction. Ottawa should not give Newfoundland any more responsibility over the fishing industry. That is the position of the Liberal Party.

Can fishermen in Twillingate, or in Valleyfield, or Wesleyville, or Musgrave Harbour, or in Fogo, or Seldom, or out in Port de Grave, wherever it might be, now feel comfortable when they have a problem with the Federal government setting quotas in the bays, whether it be on any species, and they disagree with these quotas being set, or when a fisherman has a problem, he cannot get a full-time fishing licence despite the fact he has fished full-time for the last five or six years, or he cannot get the appropriate registration for his vessel because she happens to be fifty nine and a half feet when it should be fifty-nine feet, or something of that nature, can these fishermen now go back to their homes and feel, 'Oh, well, look, because the Liberal Party says Ottawa should have it all, Ottawa will resolve it all?'

All the minister is saying at the

present time on behalf of government, and the Premier is saying, and the reason why he has so adamantly fought to have fisheries responsibility under the 1988 Constitutional Conference, a major success in itself - this Premier was successful. Nova Scotia was not pushing for it, New Brunswick was not pushing for it, British Columbia was not pushing for it, despite the fishing areas on these coastlines, the man who fought for it and got it in the Atlantic Accord, was Premier Peckford of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

And that is what sours the Liberal Leader today. He will not give credit where credit is due. That is the whole problem.

But the former leader stood in this House and I read from the comments he made. The hon. House Leader of the time, now a member of the Senate, stood here in this House and brought forward a report from the issues the day they reached a decision on the Meech Lake Accord, and the former leader stood up here in this House as a man, and rightly so, on behalf of Newfoundland and sincerely congratulated the efforts of the Government of Newfoundland in getting these issues brought forward, in getting fisheries responsibility on the Constitutional Conference coming up this year, and in making sure we are going to have a shared jurisdiction.

MR. BUTT:

Bring back Barry. Bring back Barry, I say.

MR. MORGAN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that members of the caucus did something quite unfair to the member for Mount Scio. There is not one Newfoundlander but will agree to that. But to suddenly take his policies and his positions, which were good for all of Newfoundland, and twist them around and go totally against them because they happened to be a positive thing for the Government of Newfoundland and for the Premier of the day, that is nothing short of total irresponsibility.

And that leader, Mr. Speaker, there is no question, is going to suffer the political consequences of his position. Because if he travels to Bonavista Bay and says to the fishermen, I am opposed to the Newfoundland Government having any say over the licencing of inshore fishermen and their boats -

MR. TOBIT:

He has already said that.

MR. MORGAN:

He has already taken that position. He can wallow in this for awhile and try to twist it around against the advice of my good friend from Twillingate, who I am sure is so, so much opposed to this whole matter, the position taken. He has to be. I have watched that man perform. He is one of the best grassroots politicians in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

He was a good member of Parliament, he is a good grassroots politician, and he was a good Minister of Fisheries. And I will tell you something. I have

heard him many times, and I agree with him fully, say that we have so little to say that we have practically no control, we cannot even decide if a fisherman sitting out in Toogood Arm has the right to fish or not, or if he can have a licence for his boat or not. And even when that is done by the Federal Government, we have no say on what type of fishing gear he can use, we have no say on when that fisherman can go fishing, what time of the year the seasons will open, and we have no say over how much fish they can catch.

Now, Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the agricultural industry of Western Canada, and the wheat industry, being controlled in that manner by the Government of Canada? Never, never, never. They would never tolerate that. And can you imagine the situation if they did control the agricultural industry of Western Canada and suddenly the Government of Canada said to the provinces, yes, we are going to give you some say over a major industry you have? If members of the respective legislatures said no, no, no, we oppose, they would be hove out of their province. Seriously. They would be.

MR. BUTT:

They would be tarred and feathered and run out on a rail.

MR. MORGAN:

I mean, it is something unbelievable. Can the liberal Party now rationalize going down and talking with the fishermen and saying to them, well, fellows, we knew last year that you had a problem with the setting of quotas on herring in the bays, we know you have problems with quotas that were set by the Federal Government on the mackerel in certain parts

of the bay, we know you have a problem with regard to how many lobster traps certain fishermen can fish in the season, we know there is a problem with regard to the cutting off of the season for salmon and the opening dates for salmon, and, Mr. Speaker, after saying all that they will say, yes, we know the problems are there, but that is all Ottawa and we say leave it all with Ottawa. Oh, the votes they are going to get by doing that. The votes they are going to get.

The member for Port de Grave, I am sure he agrees that his fishermen are good fishermen. Some of the best in the Province are in his riding.

AN HON. MEMBER:
No doubt about it.

MR. MORGAN:
There is not one fishermen would agree but the Province should have not total say but should have more say, a little bit more say - a little bit more say - over the fishing industry.

And that is all, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Newfoundland is looking for. And the fact that this year, 1988, there will be a Constitutional Conference dealing with that very issue, Fisheries Roles and Responsibilities, this Province may have to fight the view points of Nova Scotia, from my own perspective, the way I see it. They may have to fight the view points of New Brunswick and Quebec on this issue, and how sad to have to go to these conferences with the Liberal Party in Newfoundland also fighting them. How sad it is, Mr. Speaker, when all we are doing as a government is fighting for Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders.

Now, I had my disagreements with ministers in Ottawa over fisheries matters when I was minister, everybody knows that, and I still do now as a member. And I do not think there is one member, either on the Opposition side or the government side, but will come down to the point and actually say we have had our problems in dealing with federal ministers, whether they be Progressive Conservative or Liberal. And God forbid the NDP ever take office. But suppose they did. They will always have problems getting the issue resolved at the level of Ottawa because they are so far away from the actual activity. They are not involved with it daily at the local level. All the Premier has been saying over the years is, let us deal with the local problems, the local issues. Give us enough jurisdiction and responsibility to be able to resolve those problems which are local, important to the needs of our fishing industry. That is all we have been saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:
We never did say, Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition tried to say in this debate, that we want control over the 200 mile economic zone. We never said that. That we want all the say in dealing with foreign nations or international negotiations. We never said that. We never did say we want all control over research in the fishery in the 200 mile zone. We never said that. What we did say [I will repeat again. We said we want the following, and this is very important, Mr. Speaker, because in saying we do not need additional jurisdiction, it is important to know what the

Premier is going to be asking for. My good friend the Minister of Fisheries, when they discuss this very issue, Fisheries Roles and Responsibilities at the upcoming Constitutional Conference that is now being covered and guaranteed under the Meech Lake Accord, my understanding is, and the minister has spoken in this debate, that all we are going to be asking for is the following: We want control over, number one, licencing of inshore fishermen and the licencing of the inshore boats. Now, why would that be so bad, according to the Liberal Party now? The inshore fishery and the inshore boats are totally local. They only bring the fish into the plants, and the plants are under the control of the Province through licencing. They do not do any international selling themselves. That is number one.

Number 2, we want control over negotiating the share of the total allowable catch among the provinces. Now, if the provinces cannot agree, our position is that it go to arbitration. So, all we are saying is that the provinces in Atlantic Canada have a control over setting the total allowable catch within the region of Canada, a constitutional right, as my colleague said. That is Number 2, we are asking for under Additional Jurisdictional Responsibilities.

MR. BARRY:

What was the first item?

MR. MORGAN:

The licensing of inshore fishermen and their boats. Inshore, specified.

Number 3, we will be asking for the setting of local quotas for the bays and certain sections of

the coast. Not out off Labrador, in the 2J+3KL NAFO areas, or in semi-international waters or at the 200 mile zone limit, but within our bays and our coastline around the Province. To have a say in setting of quotas in our bays. Now, is that not local to the needs of the fishing industry of the Province, having a say over that most important issue? That is number three.

Number four, which we have now and we want to keep control of that, is the licencing of fish plants. That is now in provincial jurisdiction. I think it will always remain there.

Number five, is really, really important, to be able to approve the fishing plans and the harvesting plans of fish companies. Why would a company totally located in Newfoundland, employing Newfoundlanders fishing, employing Newfoundlanders processing fish in plants, why would they, and why should they, have to go to Ottawa to get their business plans approved for their activities in the fishing industry? It is absolutely crazy! Let these companies here be given that right.

And the last one, Mr. Speaker, which I think is straightforward, that the Province should have control over inland fisheries and fish farming, aquaculture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

To my knowledge, these are the six major points which my colleagues, the Minister of Fisheries, the Premier, the Government of Newfoundland, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and

others will put forward at this Constitutional Conference. I think I am being fair in what I am saying, and I am being accurate.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave!

MR. MORGAN:
If I can conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that is what this Province stood for in its talks through the Premier and the ministers at the discussions leading up to the Meech Lake Accord, and what we stand for now.

We know what the Liberal Party stands for officially through the Liberal Leader and his statements and comments. He is opposed to a further weakening of the Federal Government of Canada, he is opposed to the Province having a say in appointments to the Senate, and he is opposed to any additional say over the fishing industry and that, Mr. Speaker, is very sad.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Land.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words in support of the motion that is before the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, although I realize it can be twisted for partisan purposes, I am not doing this to give my colleagues on the other side of the House any ammunition, I am not doing this in order to deviate from Liberal Party policy. I should point out that what I say is basically, not in all cases, but basically consistent with the policy of the federal Liberal Party, and I believe, personally, that it is consistent with the views of many members of the Liberal Party within this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
However, it is not consistent with the position of my colleagues in caucus, and I appreciate the fact that I have been given no difficulty in speaking out on this particular issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:
I think there are certain issues where, whether it is a problem for you or not, you have to speak out because there are certain issues that go beyond caucus solidarity, go beyond Cabinet solidarity. Issues as fundamental to this Province and this nation as the motion now before the House is one of those issues on which every member should be heard clearly, every member should speak out honestly, and every member should put the Province and the country before the party and before personal ambition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not do this to create difficulty for the current leader of the Liberal

Party, but it is my plan, it is my decision, as long as I remain in this House of Assembly, to speak out. I do not know, at this point in time, whether I will be running in the next provincial election. I have not taken a decision yet. I have told people who have asked that I will take that decision closer to when the election is called.

However, if I do not run, if I am here only for another few weeks or months or days, I intend, as long as I am here, to speak out on the crucial issues and to speak out what I believe, with no fuzzyness, with no muddying of my position. I will not change from positions that I have taken in the past in this House unless I am persuaded by members on this side or on the other side that my position is wrong.

I have to say that I have not been persuaded that the position I set out and that other members of this House, on both sides of this House set out with respect to legislation over the fisheries, is wrong. I adhere to the position that was stated, that was quoted by the member for Bonavista South. I reaffirm that.

That is one of the reasons, just one, but a fairly important one, why I support the Meech Lake Accord because I believe that it will be useful, it will be helpful, to have fisheries jurisdiction in front of the ten Canadian Premiers and the Prime Minister of this country when they sit down at constitutional conferences, because we do not have enough say, at this point in time, in the management of our fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Members on this side of the House do not disagree with that. The present leader, as I understand it, does not disagree with needing to have more say in the management of the fisheries. But I, with respect, have to say that it is naive to believe that you can have an adequate say in management of the fishing industry without having a certain greater degree of legislative control than we have now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

I will say that I came into this House of Assembly in 1972 and I came into Cabinet as a strong believer in a strong central government. I have to say to members of this House that my views changed and changed fairly quickly because of the years that I spent in Cabinet seeing how ineffective we were in getting the ear of the Government of Canada on behalf of the legitimate concerns of people in this Province in areas where we did not have legislative jurisdiction. We are not listened to.

It is like the old story of the farmer, who his neighbor sees goes out to get his mule and the first thing he does is picks up this 2x4 and gives it to the mule right between the two eyes. The neighbor says, 'What, in heavens name, are you abusing that poor animal for?' The farmer said, 'I just wanted to get his attention.'

Mr. Speaker, sometimes you feel that that is the only way. When you are in Cabinet, when you are

dealing with Ministers of the Crown in Ottawa, sometimes you feel that that is the only way you can get their attention. Even though it is a matter of great significance to the Province, they have other things on their mind. They are more interested in other issues. Their time is taken up by other concerns.

If you have legislative jurisdiction, then they have to listen to you. They do not have any choice. That is why I believe that more legislative jurisdiction is necessary than we have right now.

Mr. Speaker, I could go into a great legal dissertation on the Meech Lake Accord, and to a certain extent I will deal with legal issues, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Constitution is too important to be left to the lawyers. The Constitution is for all the people of Canada.

The position that one takes, Mr. Speaker, on the Meech Lake Accord and on the Constitution generally depends upon what one believes about federal provincial relations, about the role of provincial governments, about the relationship of the provincial government to the federal government, and it reflects the person's view of the Canadian and Newfoundland society generally.

Mr. Speaker, let me say first that I do not accept that the position of the current Premier and Cabinet, the administration of this Province, has adequately reflected what is in the best interests of this Province, because I think they have gone too far. I do not fault their motives. From time to time they lapse, but generally their motives

are to do better for this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier and other members on the other side of the House, I submit, have gone too far in terms of creating an image across the rest of Canada that all we are interested in is ourselves, that we are greedy down here, that we have no concern for the Canadian nation, that we are out 'Gimme, gimme, gimme, more oil, oil, oil, fish, fish, fish.' This is the image unfortunately that exists on the mainland of Canada and it exists, to a large degree, because of the Premier and members of his Cabinet not maintaining an adequate balance. It is a delicate balance, Mr. Speaker. I admit it is not an easy job.

Let me say, before I get into my remarks, that Newfoundland has suffered. Everything I said with respect to the offshore, the offshore negotiations, and the problems that would result, when I said it in 1981, Mr. Speaker, I do not have to take back a word of that any more than I have to take back a word with respect to what I said about the fishery. It has happened, Mr. Speaker.

The position of members opposite caused a delay in getting a settlement and we missed the boat. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate part is that thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders lost employment, lost the dignity that an adequate salary brings to their lives.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that both sides of this House have to consider where they go in communicating their position from this Province to the people of Canada because that is one of our jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that my view of Confederation, of the relationship of Newfoundland to the rest of Canada, is not greatly different from that of many people in this Province. I believe that a greater degree of decentralization is better than the situation we had before the Meech Lake Accord and, to a certain extent, we have some decentralization as a result of the Meech Lake Accord. We have more provision now for negotiation between the Government of Canada and the Province. They have to negotiate on certain items now which they did not have to negotiate on before.

We do not yet have adequate control over our marine resources, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion. The Meech Lake Accord will not solve that but it moves it in a little direction by putting that item on fisheries on the constitutional agenda. It helps a bit in moving towards a greater degree of control. Some decentralization of control over our marine resources I think would be good. Not complete control, that is not what we are looking for down here, but some decentralization.

The list that my colleague from Bonavista gave is not very far out from what I would accept as legitimate concerns and areas where the Province should be involved. I will not take the time to go through it in detail now. Mr. Speaker, those who oppose the Meech Lake Accord, at times I feel as though they are frozen in time, as though the ideas were frozen in time, not pre-1980, but pre-1970 because what has been going on in this country and in this Province must cause us to recognize that national reconciliation is

necessary.

What went on with the Pequiste in Quebec, the Party Quebecois? What went on with the referendum? We were fortunate to win it, but do not let anybody assume that that vote on the referendum is going to solve the problem of the Separatist element in Quebec forever and a day. The only way that we will maintain a strong Canada, which I believe in and support, is by keeping Quebec a part of that Country. That does not mean that we give up everything, or give them everything that they want. That does not mean that. It means looking at their legitimate concerns with respect to preservation of their culture and their language and doing what is reasonable, taking a well balanced view of their requests and giving them, to a reasonable extent, what they seek in terms of protection.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Meech Lake Accord is a reasonable balance in terms of what we give for national reconciliation. We have not given too much, and it is very, very, important that we give as much as is requested there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I will come back to the Quebec issue in a moment. Just generally, with respect to the philosophy of those opposing the Meech Lake Accord, there is a fundamental, logical, inconsistency in the position from time to time.

On the one hand, it is said, 'We oppose the Meech Lake Accord because it weakens the power of the Government of Canada,'

particularly the power to distribute to the poorer provinces. On the other hand, it is said, 'We oppose the Meech Lake Accord because we want to be able to reform the Senate and the Meech Lake Accord makes it difficult to reform the Senate. We want to have an elected Senate.' Why? 'In order to give greater regional representation.' In other words, to take power away from the central government, to take power away from the centre. Now which is it? Which is it? It has to be one or the other.

Either, Mr. Speaker, we opt for a stronger or as strong a federal government as we had since before the Meech Lake Accord, or else we opt for a less strong federal government. Because, if we will reform the Senate, Mr. Speaker, whether it be by electing Senators or by any other means, if you reform the Senate to give it greater input from the regions, to give the regions greater input into the Government of Canada then, Mr. Speaker, are you not weakening the power of the central government? I believe you are. I do not think that those two positions are consistent because, if you reform the Senate and give it more power, it automatically means there is less power in the House of Commons.

Now, the Senate is part of the central government. Let us not forget that, but what we are talking about is permitting the Government of Canada, the central government, to take decisions that are in the best interests of the entire nation. If you are putting greater regional representation on the Senate, that is going to be greater regional representation, not just from Newfoundland. It does not mean it is greater

regional representation just from Newfoundland or just from Atlantic Canada. There is going to be greater regional representation from B.C. and the West. Central Canada, no, you are going to have the Ottawa-Quebec numbers on the Senate reduced. But the West? That is why Alberta is pushing for the triple E Senate because they want to have greater input.

Everything that Alberta seeks is not going to be in the best interests of Newfoundland, far from it, from time to time, whether it be dollars or whether it be in policies or programmes that are brought in.

So I believe that this choice of an elected Senate will cause a reduction in the power of the Government of Canada to proceed with national programmes such as members of this House say they want to keep the federal power for in order to permit distribution of funds to the poorer provinces and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, there is also, I fear from time to time, a going back to the beggar mentality that existed in this Province for a long time, for too long. That the only way we can get enough of this Province out of Ottawa is if we go there with cap in hand, you know, have our lobbies behind the scenes, if we are nice and if we are quiet and so forth. I do not believe that.

I believe that the way we will get the most out of Ottawa is by the force of our ideas, by the force of debate in this House and in the Province, and by the action which we take to show that the people of this Province have serious concerns which must be listened to. And we have to get those

ideas and, we have to get the debate, not just in Newfoundland, not just focused down here, but across the nation.

I have always believed, Mr. Speaker, that if we say more across Canada to point out how you will have a stronger Canada and a better Canada if you have economic viability in Newfoundland, I believe that we can convince people right from Victoria right across that yes, it makes sense. It is not just a matter of Newfoundland saying, 'We want more and more because we are greedy.' It is a matter of saying, 'Let us have a strong Canada from coast to coast. Let us have a Canada where the people of Newfoundland and Labrador do not have to see a lower health care because they cannot afford to provide the dollars, or a lower standard of education because they cannot afford to provide the dollars.' We are Canadians!

Good heavens, I have to say we do not have a very good image as Newfoundlanders in Toronto. Some may say, 'Well, what the heck. Why worry about it?' Why do we not have a very good image in Toronto?

It is because so many of our people have had to go to Toronto so poor and have had such great difficulty even in Toronto, where there is lots of employment now, in surviving with the cost of living, for example. If they go up there with no money in their pockets, they live in a way in Toronto that is not dignified; they live in a way that results in frustration on their part. They get into trouble, whether it be through drinking or whatever. There are regular reports in the Toronto papers of another

Newfoundlander having done this or another Newfoundlander having done that.

Mr. Speaker, that is a bad image for this Province but I do not blame it on the people who have gone to Toronto. My heart goes out to them when they end up in a big city with no money in their pocket, no place to stay, and when they have had to go there because they cannot find jobs to support themselves down here.

They get a job and all their money is going just to pay \$400 -- I have spoken to young fellows who have gone up -- \$400 for a single room, bare walls, a single room! That is the going rate in the central part of Toronto now. While there is a lot of employment in Toronto, a lot of the jobs are at the minimum wage.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like seeing that, but to get back to my point, I do not like the impression that is given. I do not think it does anything for the Canadian nation, not to say for Newfoundland, to have the existence of that situation where, because there is not economic viability down here, people are driven out of the Province. Often they go away without the education because the dollars were not there, either because their parents were not employed properly or because the quality of education in the school was not up to scratch, because the dollars were not there for the resources, whichever. The Canadian nation suffers where Newfoundland suffers in this way.

I believe we have a legitimate case to make right across Canada. We can change the image of Newfoundland by getting out and debating issues and it is that

way, by getting across the force of our ideas and our concerns, that we will establish our entitlement as a right to better treatment than we are getting now from the Canadian nation. We do not have to go with cap in hand, and I do not think very many members of this House think we do.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why I support the Meech Lake Accord is because I think the time has passed for constitutional debate of the magnitude that we have had over the last several decades. I think we have to get on with national reconciliation. I think we have to get on with finalizing the work that was started on the constitution, not forever. There will be other amendments, as I will mention in a moment, that should be made, but, Mr. Speaker, our energies should be devoted to creating jobs rather than engaging in esoteric debate on the constitution. That is a very strong reason, I think, why members should consider supporting the motion now before the House.

The status quo, by the way, is not there anymore. It is the same as free trade. We are not doing a free trade deal because we really wanted to, because that was the most pressing thing on our agenda.

We are doing a free trade deal because if we did not, we were going to be cut off from exporting our goods to the United States. We had no choice! Mr. Speaker, in the same way, we have no choice in this country because the status quo prior to the Pequisté, prior to the referendum, prior to Mr. Levesque refusing to sign the last constitutional amendment, the status quo is not available to us anymore.

We have to get on with the future. We have to work for the future and the way we do that is by supporting the Meech Lake Accord.

People say, 'It gives special status to Quebec.' Every province has special status in one way or another. Look at Newfoundland with its denominational educational system. We are special! But we have to ask, is it to an unreasonable degree? Is it going to divide the nation? Are we going to have 'Two Solitudes', not speaking to each other in Quebec as a result of the Meech Lake amendments? No, I would say the greater risk of that is if we do not pass the Meech Lake amendment. Then we will get back to Quebec moving further away from the mainstream of Canadian life.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at that provision, by the way, for preserving and promoting a distinct society, you have to look at all that section. You have to look at the fact, Mr. Speaker, that right at the end of that section it talks about no derogation from the powers of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, you have to look at many of these sections where concerns have been raised, where it says that they are merely affirming. Where they talk about the fact that Quebec is a distinct society, they are only affirming that that is now the case, recognizing what is already existing.

Mr. Speaker, when they say the constitution must be interpreted to recognize that fundamental right, people get terrified. 'Oh, this is going to take away the

rights of women, this is going to take away the rights of aboriginals, this is going to take away this right and that right.' Who is going to be interpreting the constitution? It is not Mr. Levesque.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:
No, unfortunately he is no longer with us. It is not going to Robert Bourassa.

It is going to be a panel of Supreme Court of Canada judges of whom the great majority are going to be English-speaking Canadians. Why should anybody fear that that court is going to end up giving an interpretation to the constitution that is going to depart significantly from the protection of those fundamental rights which all Canadians should have in all parts of the country? I just do not see it.

I do not think that is exercising common sense to assume that the Supreme Court of Canada is going to place an interpretation on those words, which are merely interpretive, which are set out to declare what already exists, which are set out as not intending to take away or restrict the existing rights of legislatures. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a false alarm, a false fear and I do not see it as being a significant reason for opposing the Meech Lake Accord.

I have heard recently - I am sorry he is not here today - from the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Fenwick) in this House and from others that the situation in Saskatchewan is an example of the weakness in the Meech Lake Accord. That is not an

example of a weakness in the Meech Lake Accord. If anything it is a weakness in the prior amendment to the constitution where you have this 'Notwithstanding' clause where provincial legislature is able to say, 'Notwithstanding anything in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, we do this or we do that.'

I would hope, by the way, that members opposite or the present administration would do that with great, great caution. I would never like to see members opposite come into this House with a bill that starts off 'Notwithstanding anything in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.'

MR. WELLS:
It should never be done.

MR. BARRY:
No, and it should not have been in the prior amendment, in my opinion, but, that was a negotiating factor I assume had to go in in order to get the thing signed. So, it is like everything else, a part of a loaf is better than none. You cannot get perfection. Meech Lake is not perfection, by the way, as I will mention in a moment.

But what has happened in Saskatchewan has happened because there was a statute on the books that could be repealed. It was not part of the constitution there, as it is in Quebec, and as it is in New Brunswick, that the French language is enshrined. I think it is unfortunate what Premier Devine has done. I think it is a big mistake. I think it hurts the process of national reconciliation. But he had done it. We will have to see whether the Supreme Court of Canada upholds the present situation

now. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not because of Meech Lake.

As far as the effect on equality rights, womens' rights and on aboriginal rights, I am prepared to recommend that in the future there be amendments for greater certainty, not because they are needed, but put them in and say for greater certainty the provision with respect to Quebec is not intended to affect whether it be the rights of women, the rights of aboriginals, and the fact that multiculturalism is also a fundamental feature of Canadian life, and the Constitution should be interpreted to reflect that as well. Put it all in there, but let us not hold up the Meech Lake Accord for perfection, because you are not going to get perfection in this world, Mr. Speaker. The practical reality is if we do not approve Meech Lake, if we hold it up because we want to see amendments, you are not going to get your amendments except after much debate over a long period of time, and, in my opinion, irreparable harm would be done. As far as relations with Quebec are concerned and the rest of Canada, we would see irreparable harm, and for what?

What is there now, Mr. Speaker, is acceptable. It is not perfect. I do not like, for example, the fact that the Yukon and the Northwest Territories are not given input into Supreme Court of Canada appointments or into Senate representation. That is not right. I think there have to be amendments to give the inhabitants of those areas rights, which they do not now have.

I am not happy with the process of Supreme Court appointments. I have to say that that is one area

where I do think what should have happened is there should have been provincial councils, not necessarily given to provincial politicians, but provincial councils with -

MR. MORGAN:

So the province has more say.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, and with input from the provincial government and not just leaving it to the provincial administration of the day, because, let us face it, there are names that go on there because there are certain political connections. It is being done all across Canada in the past, not just here.

It is not necessarily wrong, by the way. I, as a member of this House, get livid when I hear somebody say, 'Oh, you cannot appoint so and so because he is just out of politics.'

If you want a sensible decision from a judge that you appoint, who is going to have a better sense of how people feel in the community than a politician who has been out there on the firing lines dealing with people for years? So I support it, as members might say. I support it.

There was a furor about whether or not the member for St. John's East should be appointed to the bench because he was just out of this Chamber. There is absolutely nothing wrong with that. There is absolutely nothing wrong with appointments of politicians because they have a good sense of judgement and a good knowledge of what impact their decisions are going to have upon the people affected.

Mr. Speaker, I have been given a one-minute warning. If I could, I have just a few more points to wind up. There has been a lot of concern, not just about the Meech Lake Accord, but about the Charter, that there are things now going to be passed over to judges, taken away from the hands of elected representatives of the people.

I have to say, I am a minority, I think, in holding this view amongst my legal colleagues, but I can defend my position. I believe that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and Meech Lake far from taking control away from Parliament gives more control to Parliament than we had before. Now, why is that? Before the Charter of Rights and Freedoms was there, a judge could basically go into any case and go one way or the other. In virtually every case, a judge has to make a choice. 'Do I go this way or that way?' He or she can find a legal rule or principle that can support whichever way they go. So if you ignore the fact that judges do, in fact, have that choice, that they do make law in that sense, you are putting a blindfold over your eyes and pretending that what goes on does not really go on. In other words, you are giving the judge total arbitrary power.

What you have to do is recognize that the judge does have that choice to make and you have to tell the judge, 'Now, judge, when you make that choice, do not do it because of what you had for breakfast, or because of the way you grew up, or because of way you were toilet trained, or because of your own particular hang-ups. You make that decision using these criteria that we are setting out,' and that is what the Charter of

Rights and Freedoms to a large extent is. It is criteria as to how judges should decide in order to get decisions that properly reflect the concerns of individuals and the concerns of their elected representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the last point that I would make, again, is to come back to the - there are other members who want to speak and I do not want to abuse the good will of the House in giving me leave - but Mr. Speaker, I would reiterate again that it is just not practical for us to wait until we get perfection.

The Liberal Party of Canada has set out, and I have it here in front of me, certain amendments which they would like to see. There are one or two points I do not agree with, but most of them I agree with. "Amend in order to recognize aboriginal peoples, multicultural and regional identities," I have mentioned that. "Offer more protection to official language minorities." I believe that that can be done. We can improve Meech Lake, and we will by future amendments. Just as I hope we will improve the provision relating to the fishery in future amendments.

We can get still better wording with respect to ensuring that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms is paramount over anything that is in Meech Lake, but I do not have very great concern, when you consider who is interpreting it and when you consider the wording. I do not have very great concern that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms is going to be abrogated. I mean, what are we saying? Are we saying that we do not trust the people in Quebec to have the same regard for fundamental rights and freedoms as

people in English Canada? Even with that recognition of a distinct society in Quebec and recognition of the right of the provincial legislature to promote and preserve that distinct society, why do we feel that that is going to result in a weakening of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms?

I think that is a awful implication there because what we are saying is we do not trust the legislators in Quebec to respect fundamental rights and freedoms in their own Province. I think they had just as much regard for those basic rights and freedoms as we do. I do not see, even if they that absolute right in that clause, which they do not, but even if they did, I do not think there would be any great change or any great impact upon the rights and freedoms that people would have in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, the opting out from shared cost programmes is not going to weaken the ability to implement a national day-care system or other national programmes that would be of benefit to this Province because the provision is there for having national objectives followed. Now, I like the wording that has been recommended by the federal Liberal Party where they say that we should talk about minimum national standards. So that is another area where we could get better wording than is there now. But these are just some examples, Mr. Speaker, of the way in which Meech Lake could be improved.

If we stop, however, the process until we get these amendments, we all know Meech Lake will go nowhere, future amendments to the constitution will go nowhere, and

all relations with Quebec will go nowhere. This nation will be harmed irreparably and I do not support that. So I ask all members to give serious consideration to these points.

If I could say, in the words of another former leader of the Liberal Party, there is a choice to be made. He said, "I chose Canada." I would end by saying, I choose the new Canada.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise and support the Meech Lake Accord.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

It is also a pleasure for me to see, before I speak, the hon. the leader of the Opposition and the member for Mount Scio make up. I

suppose you could say, kiss and make up.

Mr. Speaker, in 1949 we became a province of Canada, and since 1949 great strides have been made in all aspects of our environment. It certainly is pleasing, I think, to the majority of Newfoundlanders.

But Confederation did not bring perfection and there have to be changes implemented to make our society a better place in which to live.

I am going to have to quote the previous speaker, and I must compliment him on his very, very fine, articulate speech. 'Those,' he said, 'who are against the Meech Lake Accord are frozen in time.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

I look across and see a lot of hon. gentlemen on that other side who I know personally and who I have a lot of respect for as individuals, their policies, no, but as individuals, yes. I cannot see for the life of me, I just cannot see that they can get up and speak against changes. That is all we are speaking about, changes that gives more responsibility in the right areas.

Newfoundland, I suppose because of our lateness joining Confederation and because of the changes that are taking place worldwide, as economics generate much more enthusiasm, perhaps in 1949 there could have been a better deal. In this Meech Lake Accord perhaps that situation, Mr. Speaker, is addressed.

We will go to Quebec as a distinct society. I had until recently misgivings about anyone having any more rights than anyone else within this family of Confederation. But, Mr. Speaker, was not Quebec always distinct because of its language, because of its culture? It was never enshrined to this extent. When Quebec stayed away from the family situation, that was certainly a minus as far as Canadian country was concerned. To give Quebec its rights to be a distinct society, as far as I am concerned, only reaffirms what was already there and there was comparatively no change. Certainly there will be minor changes, as we expect minor changes as it relates to Newfoundland.

I must say again, quoting something that the previous speaker said, 'We are treated differently, specially, even in our educational system, compared to the rest of Canada. Why not, if there are special arrangements that can be made for other provinces I say to this hon. House, why not, if it is going to be beneficial?

We talk about appointments to the Senate which came up. All we have to do is look at the last Senator that was appointed. Was it not great to see a man of his calibre appointed to the Senate? He is a world renowned figure.

I was in Quebec at a conference last Fall and that Senator today, who was then House Leader, spoke to the convention. You could hear a pin drop.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He was respected.

MR. PARSONS:

There was respect for the man. Now through the Meech Lake Accord, with the Province having something a major role to play as far as Senate appointments are concerned, is it not apropos to what our line of thinking is that we should send the best we have to the Senate? I am sure that we did. We sent the best we had. I will not take a step backwards on that. He is the best we have. So, why not? Is it not good, is it not great, Mr. Speaker?

On the Supreme Court appointments, again, why not? Why not let us have something to say in all our jurisdictions, in all our every day activities? The Supreme Court is very important. Why should the decisions made by the Supreme Court be handled completely by one area of Canada? Let everyone have an input into it.

We hear so much about it having a weakening impact on the structure of Canada. Why will it? That is nonsense. We would have a better and more realistic provincial input, a shared right with Ottawa. What are we going to do? Stick with the old Liberal Leader's philosophy, 'if you do not like it, fuddle duddle.' That is what he would say. He is against it. Why should he not be against it? That is what he said everytime that Newfoundland wanted anything shared. I can go back. The Leader of the Opposition laughs. I can go back to when he spoke here at the university as it pertained to our offshore. There was nothing for us.

At least now we are in the process of that type of thing being erased forever in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I hear today, as well, people talk about the

advantages of the Mainland part of Canada, of the Ontario part of it, and how hard it is for our own people to go up there and find jobs. Perhaps since I started in this House I have always been saying that I have had the experience because either I was there or someone belong to me was there.

I went to Ontario, Mr. Speaker. Like many other Newfoundlanders, I worked in Ontario. I worked any place I could get a job, but I wish that when I went to Ontario we had a little more to say and we were a little more respected. When we went there, we did not have very much money in our pockets. There were no thousands involved then, it was hundreds.

Today my son is in Ontario working. He could not get a job in Newfoundland and he had to go to Ontario. There is nothing new about it.

MR. EFFORD:

It does not say much for your government.

MR. PARSONS:

It does say a lot for our government. It shows what freedom we have in this Canada of ours. It shows, if you cannot do something you want to do in the Province you are in, it gives you the right to travel to any other part of Canada. I have a son in Halifax. Well, he wanted to go and he was better equipped to do the job that he had there, so, why not go? Our grandfathers went. My grandfather went to the Mainland and went to the States pogy fishing.

I hear so much about how we are going to take away the rights of the central government. We are

going to give more rights to the provinces. If the provinces had more rights, perhaps they would not have to go away, perhaps there would be more jobs created here.

We want as many rights as we can get. We want rights in all fields of endeavour and I agree with most aspects of the Meech Lake Accord.

Like I said, when I first thought about the Quebec bit, I had a job to convince myself that Quebec should have a distinction, but the more I delved into it, Mr. Speaker, the more I appreciate the fact that they already had it. They had it, Mr. Speaker, and it was only just again putting something in writing. That is all. If Quebec is stronger, Newfoundland is stronger, the other provinces are stronger, there is less ability by the central government to control, and what is wrong with it?

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to go to perhaps the most important aspect of the Meech Lake Accord because everyone has a responsibility in this Province to act to his or her best ability as it pertains to our major industry.

I was amazed, I was amazed, Mr. Speaker, when last year the Leader of the Opposition was quoted as saying that we should not have any more jurisdiction than we have at this present time. I know members on that side of the House, I can look at them, I can see their faces and know that that is not what they believe. I read that in the paper. That was last year, before he came into the House, before he was elected. Now, that is not what I am saying. Look, I have the deepest respect for the hon. member for Twillingate. I do! I am like the rest of the

members in the House, I think he is really a grassroots politician, a good politician.

With the Speaker's permission, I am going to read from a resolution-

MR. SIMMS:

Perhaps the hon. member could adjourn the debate for today, rather than come up with anything heavy. I do have a couple of matters I would like to deal with, if the hon. member would not mind.

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The debate is adjourned by the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for agreeing to conclude a little bit early so that we could deal with a couple of matters of House business.

In particular, I would like to now, with the concurrence of the Opposition, move a motion that would form the make-up of the new Public Accounts Committee. The hon. members have spoken to me about a change which they wish to make, and we, too, on this side, wanted to make a couple of additional changes, as well.

I will say, by the way, even though the members of the NDP are not here, that the Leader of the Party did speak to me about their

participation or appointment on the Public Accounts Committee. I told him we would give it consideration. We have given it consideration, and we do not feel it is appropriate at this time.

I would like to move the following motion, but, first of all, just to the preamble. The Official Opposition would like to replace the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), who now, of course, is not a member of the Opposition but a member of the government, with the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland). I understand that is correct.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

We, on this side, would like to replace the member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) with the member for Bellevue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

The other change we would like to make, we would like to replace the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), who has been a long-serving member of the Public Accounts Committee, the longest, as a matter of fact, and who served well, with the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

So, the simple way to do it now, having explained everything, would be to move the motion with all these as well as the others. I will mention all the names and then, as I understand it, the

Committee will meet and choose their Chairman and their Vice Chairman in due course.

So, the make-up of the Public Accounts Committee would be as follows, Mr. Speaker, and I move that the make-up of the Public Accounts Committee be as follows:

The hon. member for St. John's North; the hon. the member for Bellevue; the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern; the hon. the member for LaPoile, who is on Her Majesty's Service, I think; the hon. the member for Gander; the hon. the member for St. Barbe; and the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

I so move the motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I am not exactly sure on this, but perhaps the Government House Leader might check with the Clerks and look at the regulations that govern the Public Accounts Committee, because I believe that the only election that is necessary at this time, according to the regulations, is the election of Vice-Chairman, which was held by the member for Humber West, I believe. According to the regulations, the Chairman is still the official Chairman. I think what we are looking at is an election for Vice-Chairman to replace the member for Humber West. I think that is correct.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, I will have to check that. I understand that may have been the practice. I do not know if there is a regulation that says it or anything, so it may have been the practice.

If hon. members would permit, we are not anxious to move the Chairman. We have no intention of taking the Chairmanship away from the member for Gander. None of that. Not at this time. So perhaps we could leave it to the Committee.

MR. TULK:

You will not have enough to form a committee.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes. Well, I appreciate the advice of the member for Fogo who has tremendous experience in these procedural matters. I appreciate his advice and guidance.

Did Your Honour put the motion?

MR. SPEAKER:

We have a motion.

All those in favour of its adoption please say, 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against, 'nay'.

Carried.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could agree to stop the clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is agreed to stop the clock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SIMMS:

I just want to give members next week's schedule as we have it up until now for the Estimates Committees.

On Monday, April 18, at the meeting held in the morning, 9:30 a.m. - there is only one meeting on Monday - the Social Estimates Committee will deal with the estimates of the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

On Tuesday, the morning meeting at 9:30 a.m., the Resource Estimates Committee will conclude the estimates of the Department of Mines - they think perhaps for a half hour or so - and then, approximately at 10:00 a.m. Tuesday morning, the Resource Estimates Committee will deal with the estimates of the Department of Forestry.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I have Development and Tourism down.

MR. SIMMS:

No. I understand this has been worked out. I think the Minister of Development is not available on Tuesday now. So it is Mines first, to conclude, then Forestry at approximately 10:00 a.m.

Tuesday night, the Government Services Estimates Committee will deal with the estimates of the Department of Labour at 7:30 p.m. No meeting Wednesday morning, of course, in keeping with our practice, and the Social Services Estimates Committee, on next Wednesday night at 7:30 p.m., will deal with the Estimates of the Department of Environment and

Lands.

I am advised by the Chairman that we should leave it at that for now because we are not quite sure if any of these departments would be carried over. So, hopefully Monday, certainly Tuesday by the latest, we will have the Thursday schedule and that should be acceptable to all hon. members.

With respect to the Committee that was not able to sit last night, the estimates last night that they were not able to continue because of the power outage, we have asked the Committee Chairman to bring it to the attention of the Committee at their next meeting for discussion to see what way they wish to work that particular matter out.

May I also advise hon. members that next week in the House, which members would like to be aware of and particularly Cabinet ministers, I am sure that they would want to be aware of this too, Monday and Tuesday we will continue with the Budget debate. Wednesday, of course, we will continue debating the Private Member's Resolution put forward by the member for Humber Valley. While I am not saying anything absolute at this time, I want to, perhaps, put people on notice that next Thursday and Friday, because we have been open now for a few weeks, I would like to move into some legislation. We may just hold Meech Lake for further debate later on, but we may move into some legislation and the approach that I would like to take is we would like to follow the Order Paper - we will follow the Order Paper - as closely as we can. The first one we will begin with is the Act to Amend The Remembrance Day Act, I guess, if we get into

that.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, before I move adjournment I want -

MR. TULK:

You know that right now the Speaker is supposed to have left the Chair.

MR. SIMMS:

There was a request and it was agreed to stop the clock, I understand. Was it not, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes.

MR. SIMMS:

Of course, it was.

MR. SPEAKER:

The clock has been stopped.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes. Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment I would like to take this opportunity to wish the Leader of the Opposition, in particular, a very pleasant weekend. Everybody else, too, but particularly the leader of the Opposition. I understand the leader of the Opposition will be down on the South Coast somewhere this weekend. I am told in Marystown and Grand Bank - to attend dinners, and I further understand that the Liberals down in that area have been giving away free tickets in order to attract a big attendance to those functions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

I trust he will have a pleasant weekend, anyway.

I move that this House adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, April 18,

1988 at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

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

Index

**Answers to Questions
tabled**

April 15, 1988

~~_____~~
Need 5 more copies

QUESTIONS FROM THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
Tuesday, March 15, 1988

QUESTION NO. 47

Mr. Furey (St. Barbe) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) How many persons do you have on your ministerial staff?
- (b) How many of these persons were appointed by Order-in-Council?
- (c) Each title and salary applied to that title.
- (d) A job description for each Order-in-Council appointment.
- (e) Were any of these jobs advertised in order to give the unemployed the chance of applying?

ANSWER

- (a) Three - Secretary;
Special Assistant;
Press Secretary.
- (b) Secretary: Permanent Public Servant
Special Assistant and Press Secretary: Order-in-Council.
- (c) Secretary to Honourable Minister
Salary: HL 12 Salary Level

Special Assistant to Honourable Minister
Salary: SA 02 Salary Level

Press Secretary to Honourable Minister
Salary: SA 01 Salary Level
- (d) Please see attached.
- (e) Secretary - Permanent Public Servant
Special Assistant - Job filled in accordance with Public Service regulations.
Press Secretary - Job filled in accordance with Public Service regulations.

PRESS SECRETARY

The Press Secretary is a special assistant to the Minister, responsible for public relations and media liaison and a member of the Minister's staff.

Some of the duties include: research and writing of speeches, writing of news releases, monitoring the media for stories relevant to the Department and the Minister, ministerial advertising, arranging and conducting news conferences.

The Press Secretary arranges media requests for interviews with the Minister or other departmental officials and fully briefs the Minister and Senior Officials on all direct contacts made by the media with the Department.

Any information emanating from the department for public consumption is co-ordinated through the Press Secretary's office, ultimately flowing through the Minister's office as well as the appropriate senior management personnel.

1988 03 25

DUTIES OF SPECIAL ASSISTANT

Carries out regular duties associated with the position similar to the Special Assistants of other Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition.

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOURTH SESSION, FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND:**

Hon. P.J.McNicholas.....Speaker
Mr. Glenn Greening.....Deputy Speaker

Chairman of Committees

Mr. Kevin Parsons.....Deputy Chairman of Committees

MEMBERS

NAME	AFFILIATION	DISTRICT
Mr. K.Alyward.....	Lib.....	Stephenville
Mr. R.Alyward.....	PC.....	Kilbride
Mr. Baird.....	PC.....	Humber West
Mr. Baker.....	Lib.....	Gander
Mr. Barrett.....	PC.....	St. John's West
Mr. Barry.....	Lib.....	Mount Scio-Bell Island
Mr. Blanchard.....	PC.....	Bay of Islands
Mr. Brett.....	PC.....	Trinity North
Mr. Butt.....	PC.....	Conception Bay South
Mr. Callan.....	Lib.....	Bellevue
Mr. J. Carter.....	PC.....	St. John's North
Mr. W. Carter.....	Lib.....	Twillingate
Dr. Collins.....	PC.....	St. John's South
Mr. Dawe.....	PC.....	St. George's
Mr. Decker.....	Lib.....	Strait of Belle Isle
Mr. Dinn.....	PC.....	Pleasantville
Mr. Doyle.....	PC.....	Harbour Main
Mr. Efford.....	Lib.....	Port de Grave
Mr. Fenwick.....	NDP.....	Menihok
Mr. Furey.....	Lib.....	St. Barbe
Mr. Gilbert.....	Lib.....	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Mr. Greening.....	PC.....	Terra Nova
Mr. Gullage.....	Lib.....	Waterford-Kenmount
Mr. Hearn.....	PC.....	St. Mary's-The Capes
Mr. Hiscock.....	Lib.....	Eagle River
Mr. Hodder.....	PC.....	Port au Port
Mr. Kelland.....	Lib.....	Nascopie
Mr. Long.....	NDP.....	St. John's East
Mr. Lush.....	Lib.....	Bonavista North
Mr. Matthews.....	PC.....	Grand Bank
Dr. McNicholas.....	PC.....	St. John's Centre
Mr. Mitchell.....	PC.....	LaPoile
Mr. Morgan.....	PC.....	Bonavista South
Mr. Parsons.....	PC.....	St. John's East Extern
Mr. Patterson.....	PC.....	Placentia
Mr. Peach.....	PC.....	Carbonear

[CONTINUED]

[CONTINUED]

Premier Peckford.....	PC.....	Green Bay
Mr. Power.....	PC.....	Ferryland
Mr. Reid.....	PC.....	Trinity-Bay de Verde
Mr. Rideout.....	PC.....	Baie Verte-White Bay
Mr. Russell.....	PC.....	Lewisporte
Hon. Mr. Simmons.....	Lib.....	Fortune-Hermitage
Mr. Simms.....	PC.....	Grand Falls
Mr. Tobin.....	PC.....	Burin-Placentia West
Mr. Tulk.....	Lib.....	Fogo
Dr. Twomey.....	PC.....	Exploits
Ms. Verge.....	PC.....	Humber East
Mr. Warren.....	PC.....	Torngat Mountains
Mr. Wells.....	Lib.....	Windsor-Buchans
Mr. Windsor.....	PC.....	Mount Pearl
Mr. Woodford.....	PC.....	Humber Valley
Mr. Young.....	PC.....	Harbour Grace

THE MINISTRY:

Premier A. Brian Peckford.....	Energy
Mr. R. Alyward.....	Forest Resources
Mr. Barrett.....	Development and Tourism
Mr. Blanchard.....	Labour
Mr. Brett.....	Municipal Affairs
Mr. Butt.....	Culture, Recreation and Youth
Dr. Collins.....	Health and Deputy Premier
Mr. Dawe.....	Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Dinn.....	Mines
Mr. Doyle.....	Transportation
Mr. Matthews.....	Career Development and Advanced Studies
Mr. Peach.....	Minister Responsible for Housing
Mr. Power.....	Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
Mr. Rideout.....	Fisheries
Mr. Russell.....	Environment and Lands
Mr. Simms.....	President of the Executive Council President of Treasury Board Government House Leader
Mr. Tobin.....	Social Services
Dr. Twomey.....	Public Works and Services
Ms. Verge.....	Justice
Mr. Warren.....	Minister Responsible for Northern Development
Mr. Windsor.....	Finance
Minister Responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro	
Mr. Young.....	Consumer Affairs and Communications

CONTENTS

Friday, April 15, 1988.

Statement by Ministers

<u>New Registrar of Motor Vehicles Appointed:</u>	
Mr. Doyle.....	817
Mr. Gilbert.....	817
Mr. Fenwick.....	818
 Proper Dress in the House, Point of Order.....	 818
 <u>Power Outage Update:</u>	
Mr. Windsor.....	819
Mr. Wells.....	820
 <u>Private Sector Employment Programme Update:</u>	
Mr. Simms, on behalf of Mr. Matthews.....	821
Mr. Decker.....	822
Mr. Fenwick.....	823

Oral Questions

<u>Unemployment:</u>	
House Royal Commission report and contention the official unemployment rate in Newfoundland does not truly reflect the unemployment rate. Mr. Wells, Mr. Windsor.....	824
Equalization entitlement and the Minister's claim about the unemployment rate. Mr. Wells, Mr. Windsor.....	825
Alleges unemployment rate will not be reduced until Minister realizes it stands at 18 per cent. Mr. Wells, Mr. Windsor.....	826
 <u>Mining:</u>	
Changes in federal mining tax incentives. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Dinn.....	826
Alleges contradictory statements about flow through. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Dinn.....	827
Impact of changes in the earned depletion allowance on projected investment in exploration. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Dinn.....	829

Education:

Why two formulae for financing school
bus transportation. Mr. Decker, Mr. Hearn.....831
Order boards to use the most efficient
means to bus children. Mr. Decker, Mr. Hearn.....832
When will discrepancies be removed.
Mr. Decker, Mr. Hearn.....832

Health:

Nursing shortage. Mr. Fenwick,
Dr. Collins.....833
Alleges no effective measurement to assess
nursing jobs adequately. Mr. Fenwick,
Dr. Collins.....834
Study interim report recommendations to
alleviate nursing shortage. Mr. Fenwick,
Dr. Collins.....834

**Presenting Reports
by Standing and Special Committees**

Tabling of The Newfoundland Gazette.
Ms Verge.....835
Housing Corporation reports for 1985-86, 1986-87.
Mr. Peach.....836
Public Tendering Act Exceptions for March, 1988.
Dr. Twomey.....836

Notices of Motion

An Act Respecting The Public Library Service
Mr. Butt.....836
An Act To Amend The Alcohol and Drug
Dependency Commission Act and An Act To Amend
The Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance Act
Dr. Collins.....836

Petitions

Transportation, road conditions:
Mr. Decker.....836
Mr. Efford.....838
Mr. Doyle.....840

<u>Transportation, road conditions:</u>	
Mr. Simmons.....	841
Mr. Morgan.....	843
Petition ruled Out of Order, continued by leave.....	
	844
Mr. Wells.....	846
Mr. Doyle, by leave.....	847

Orders of the Day

<u>First Readings:</u>	
Bill Nos. 32, 33, 30.....	849
<u>Motion 3, the Meech Lake Accord:</u>	
Mr. Morgan.....	849
Mr. Barry.....	857
Mr. Parsons, adjourns debate.....	867
Motion to amend Committee membership.....	872
Adjournment Motion.....	874