



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 42

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Tuesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

28 November 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Before we get into routine proceedings I wonder if I might take this opportunity to ask Your Honour, on behalf of the House, to send a letter to a person who was involved in a national news story not too long ago. Michelle Mercer is the name of the individual. She is a an RCMP Officer recently graduated, I think it was in August, from RCMP training in Saskatchewan and now stationed with the RCMP in Prince Edward Island. She recently was probably one of the key figures in the capture of what has been known as Canada's 'most wanted criminal' in recent weeks and months, Mr. Legere in New Brunswick. It is a perfect example, I believe, of the need to recruit more women police officers in the RCMP Force and the Constabulary Force. It is also an example of women being skilled at very difficult police work and very dangerous police work in dealing with dangerous situations.

The most important point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, of course is that she is from Grand Falls. I would like to ask the Speaker with the concurrence of Members opposite to write her a letter and commend her on her performance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. DICKS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On behalf of the Members on this side of the House we share the hon. Member's pride in someone from his own District who, as we all know from the news report, has done exceptionally well.

I would like to add to that the pleasure at seeing a women evidence the merit of women entering non-traditional roles. Certainly, there was some thought in the past that certain things were suitable for men and others for women. I think, if anything should demonstrate to us that this is no longer the case, and certainly should no longer be the conventional wisdom, this certainly is an example.

And, of course, as the Minister of Justice, although the RCMP in Prince Edward Island does not fall within my jurisdiction, it is certainly an opportunity on which to comment as well on the fine service that the RCMP have traditionally afforded to the people of the Province over many years.

For these reasons, as well as those expressed by the Opposition House Leader, on behalf of all Members of Government we certainly concur with his suggestion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to advise the

Honourable House of the position taken by the Government of Newfoundland at the November 21st. meeting of the Atlantic Groundfish Advisory Committee (AGAC), with respect to the management of Northern cod. The AGAC structure provides a Government/Industry framework from which the management of all groundfish stocks within Atlantic Canada is addressed on an annual basis. This year's meeting, which was held in Halifax, was of special interest to this Province, since the 1990 management plan, for 2J+3KL (Northern cod) was one of the most important issues on the agenda.

As hon. Members of this House are well aware, there is considerable uncertainty surrounding the Northern cod stock. The Harris Panel, which was established by the Federal Government, submitted its interim report earlier this year, and indicated that its biological assessment of the stock could not substantiate a TAC above the 190,000 metric ton level for 1989. However, the TAC for 1989 was reduced to 235,000 tons from 266,000 in 1988, with the Federal Government indicating that the 1990 quota for Northern cod would be established once the Harris Panel has presented its final report, and once the Federal Government has assessed additional scientific data from expanded research surveys and 1989 commercial catch data. The Harris Panel is expected to submit its final report to the Federal Government by the end of this year. In the meantime, the Federal Government has established an interim total allowable catch level of 190,000 tons for 1990 for planning purposes, but has indicated that a final quota will be established in early 1990.

From this Province's perspective, Mr. Speaker, the two most important management decisions relating to Northern cod for 1990 relate to the actual quota level and the allocation of the resource amongst various user groups. Our officials advised the Atlantic Groundfish Advisory Committee that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador can support an interim total allowable catch for Northern cod of 190,000 metric tons for 1990. However, the Province also indicated that its final position on the 1990 quota will be guided by the final report of the Harris Panel.

Mr. Speaker, the Northern cod stock has been the cornerstone of the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery for centuries. This stock has shaped our very existence and continues to be of vital importance to this Province. Indeed, without this stock we could not survive as a Province. It is for this very reason that the needs of this Province must receive primary consideration in the allocation of the Northern cod resource. It would be totally unacceptable, Mr. Speaker, given the major reductions in this stock, that our dependence on it be placed on the same plane as other Provinces. Clearly, this stock must be managed with this Province's special interest at the forefront.

Over the years four key principles have guided the Atlantic groundfish management process - adjacency, economic dependency, community and fleet dependence, and economic efficiency and fleet mobility. These four principles have been applied, to varying degrees, in the management of all fish stocks, and have been supported by this Province since

the management plan was formalized some ten years ago. This Province, at the November 21st. AGAC meeting, reiterated this Government's full support for these principles, and tabled a position (a copy of which is attached to my statement) that the allocation of the reduced 1990 Northern cod quota should be guided by these principles. It is our view that an objective weighted applications of these four basic principles would safeguard this Province's special interest in the Northern cod resource and would accommodate the special needs of both the inshore and offshore sectors of our fishing industry. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, no other part of Eastern Canada can make the same arguments for access to Northern cod on the basis of fundamental groundfish management principles as can be made by this Province.

Mr. Speaker, on a retrospective basis, it is clear that this Province's access to Northern cod was compromised by the manner in which the groundfish management principles were applied. Furthermore, the flawed scientific projections of this stock created unprecedented demands for access to this stock by user groups in other Provinces. Indeed, allocations were made to non-Newfoundland user groups on the basis of these flawed projections, with in excess of 22,000 tonnes of Northern cod being landed in other Provinces, primarily Nova Scotia. In view of these considerations, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador cannot accept a pro rata reduction over all user groups as the basis for the 1990 Northern cod management plan. Simply put, such an approach would have the effect of placing Newfoundland

user groups on the same plane as other groups in other provinces. Moreover, such an approach would be totally inconsistent with the basic principles underlying the Atlantic Groundfish Management Plan. Mr. Speaker, this Government also remains firm in its view that the inshore fishery must continue to receive first call on the northern cod resource. It is for this reason that the management strategy for this stock must recognize, first and foremost, the special needs of this fleet sector. This was the clear message that this Province delivered at the November 21st. AGAC meeting. In view of this critical consideration, this Government is not prepared, on the basis of the interim Northern cod quota, to accept any reductions in the inshore allocation from its present level of one hundred thousand metric tons. Moreover, the AGAC meeting was advised that the Province cannot accept any portion of the inshore allowance now taken by larger fixed gear vessels being placed under a quota. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to note that the Atlantic Groundfish Advisory Council is an advisory committee to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, the hon. Tom Siddon. In the normal course of events, the Federal Minister has a follow-up meeting with his provincial counterparts subject to the AGAC meetings, through the Atlantic Council of Fisheries Ministers. I wish to advise this hon. House that I will be availing of this forum to reiterate the position of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador on the management of the northern cod resource. Indeed, I will also be availing of this forum to reiterate this Province's concerns on other serious fishery matters as well, such as the

resource crisis in the 4RS+3PN (Gulf) cod stock, and the serious foreign overfishing problems on the "Nose" and "Tail" of the Grand Banks. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Minister for providing me with a copy of the statement well in advance of the House of Assembly, and of course that is the way it should be, and I would like to thank him for that courtesy. But, indeed it is a very important statement that the Minister has delivered today, it is a very, very important matter and a very serious matter for the people of the Province, from one end of the Province to the other. Of course we watch with great interest the AGAC meetings in Halifax and what really would come out of it, and of course the Minister was questioned in the House on what the position of the Province was, particularly concerning the inshore allowance. We are very pleased to know that the Minister is supporting its stay at one hundred and fifteen thousand metric tons. But apart from that, Mr. Speaker, what is in this statement is basically what has been in the statement, as the Minister said, for the last ten years. The four basic principles that the Minister has outlined, of course, has always guided this Province and been the basis for this Province's submissions and arguments to AGAC, and as well to the Federal Government when they talk about adjacency and economic dependency, community and fleet

dependency, and economic efficiency and fleet mobility. So there is nothing new in what the Minister has said, except that we are encouraged to know that the Province is not willing to accept a reduction in the inshore allowance.

I guess what this statement today does more than anything else is it outlines to the House of Assembly and those in the galleries and the people of the Province, that when you are in Government it is not as easy to reach conclusions and decisions and find solutions as it is to propose when you are in opposition. I say that because when the Premier was Leader of the Opposition, on March 18, 1988, he said in this House that if there is fish, then for as long as there is fish surplus to Newfoundland, we cannot be a dog in the manger about it, we have to provide access to other Canadians. We have to as long as there is surplus fish, with which, of course, no one can argue.

Then he went on to say, if there is no surplus fish next year, which is this year, then it ends. It is fairly simple. There is no trouble to control that. I guess what I would like to say to the Minister and to the Premier today, and other Members in this House, is that it was fine to be in Opposition and say that it is so simple, but what we have heard coming from the Government over the last three or four months in this Province, and again today by the Minister's statement, it is certainly a matter that is not simple to deal with. Of course, we knew that when we were in Government.

We pretty well had hoped today that the Minister would have had

something concrete to tell us, something new, not something that has happened in this Province and has taken place at AGAC meetings for the last ten years.

On the crisis in the cod stocks off our shores, I would like to say to the Minister that everyone is anticipating a TAC of 190,000 metric tons, but I think we have to fully realize that the northern cod stocks, while there needs to be remedial action taken to allow the stocks to grow, the northern cod stocks are not in as desperate a shape as the cod stocks off the Grand Banks. There is need to address the nature of the stocks and to let them rebuild, because ideally we want to have our fish stocks rebuilding, so that we can take more and more fish and create employment and greater income for our fishermen and plant workers.

But let me say to the Minister, as well, that on the issue of overfishing, it is a very, very difficult situation to deal with. My colleague for Bonavista South was in northern Europe just a few weeks ago, when I was in the south of Europe, and there were a couple of problems. Number one is they do not trust Canadians, they do not trust our motives for wanting them to stop taking as much fish; they think we want to take over their markets; they do not think the cod stocks are in as serious a state as they are, and these are very serious problems to deal with.

I would just like to say to the Minister, that in addressing the issue with the Federal Minister, the issue of straddling stocks is very complex, and even though the European community are not allowed to take cod in 2J+3KL, they are fishing outside, and taking thousands of metric tons of that

straddling stock outside the 200 mile limit and 2J+3KL, as well as taking thousands of metric tons outside the Nose and Tail of the Grand Bank. It is that straddling stock, and it is hard to make them understand that by them fishing outside it is affecting what is happening inside our zone. The first thing they will say to you is, 'Who is causing the problem inside the 200 mile limit? We are not allowed in there, so you must be causing the problem.' So it is a very complex issue when you are talking about dealing with overfishing, particularly by Spain and Portugal.

I would like to say to the Minister that in going to the Federal Government and talking a solution to the crisis that we are now into, I would ask the Minister to keep in mind that cod is renewable, fish is a renewable resource. If properly managed it will rebuild and there can be a good future for the hundreds of communities in our Province, and the thousands of fishermen and fish plant workers. Let us not shut everything down full scale and lose the very, very important people skills which are involved in the fishing industry, and lose the millions of dollars of infrastructure that is built up around our Province. Because if you do that, you will never have an opportunity to get it back; regardless of what happens to the cod stocks, which we know, if properly managed, will be rebuilt.

So in reaching a solution with the Federal Government, keep that in mind. Do not go kowtowing to Ottawa, tell them what you want done with the fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador. You are the Provincial Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. DICKS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In response to certain questions raised by the Opposition House Leader I have a brief statement which I would like to read to the House. I apologize to the Opposition House Leader. I received it hot off the press before I came to the House, and I did not get a copy to him until I came up here, Mr. Speaker.

The statement concerns the Grand Falls courthouse and the delays in the opening of that facility:

Public tenders were awarded for the lease of the Grand Falls courthouse in late summer, 1988. The contract was for the construction of space suitable for use as a courthouse. The facility, to be built on Government owned property, is to be leased to the department of Works, Services and Transportation for a period of thirty years. After that time the Department will own the facility. The general building layout was included in the tender call.

Construction was due for completion on September 1, 1989. The official opening would have followed sometime after. However, the developer, RedMall Ltd. of St. John's, has not to date completed the building to a level suitable for occupancy. The mechanical system, the air handling and ventilation, is not operating satisfactorily, and must be fixed prior to attempting to operate courts from the building.

The present schedule calls for occupancy by mid-December.

Furniture for the Judges' Chambers, boardroom, staff areas, etc. has been publicly tendered and a contract for its supply awarded to Office World.

In the interim the Judges and staff will use existing furniture, which will be replaced as the new furniture is delivered. This will not delay the occupancy of the facility.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, every statement the Minister of Justice brings to the House - as I recollect, the last one he gave was hot off the press, too. Perhaps he might ask his officials to move a little more swiftly.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday when the Justice critic, the Member for Humber East (Ms Verge) asked the Minister that question, he showed that he was not on top of what is going on in his Department with respect to very important projects around the Province. And yesterday, when I asked the same question, Mr. Speaker, he showed that he did not even take the effort or the time over the weekend, after the Member for Humber East raised it on Friday, to check into it and give an answer yesterday. Then, when I asked the question, of course, he showed his arrogance, and suggested, Mr. Speaker, that I go

talk to the developer and find out what is going on.

Finally, after all the pressure from this side of the House, we now find a very simple explanation as to why that facility is not open.

So, I hope the Minister has learned a lesson through that particular exercise. Now, I hope, too, that since he implied on two or three occasions that I, as the Member for Grand Falls, in my former capacity as President of Treasury Board, or whatever, perhaps was somehow wholly responsible for getting this courthouse for Central Newfoundland and for Grand Falls, a point which modestly prevents me from acknowledging, may I ask him to keep me in mind for the official opening, whenever that should occur?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations last night stepped uninvited into the homes of Newfoundland and Labrador and insulted thousands of Newfoundlanders, those employed and those unemployed. Hundreds of people, Mr. Speaker, in those homes do not have enough insurable work weeks this year to qualify for unemployment insurance because of the failure in the fishery, yet the Minister, with the satisfied grin of the Grinch that stole

Christmas, told those people in Fogo, Harbour Deep, Fleur de Lys, and in rural Newfoundland and Labrador, that if they wanted to survive in those surroundings and those communities in rural Newfoundland, they would have to go on social assistance. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister this, will the Minister tell the House when she is going to get off this incompetent kick of passing the buck to the Department of Social Assistance, or to the Department of Fisheries, or to wherever she can pass it, and begin to fulfill her mandate, which is to create employment opportunities for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:
Mr. Speaker, I will be able to address my mandate and the mandate of this Government when we have managed to tidy up the incompetence of the last seventeen years.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, if that is the answer, the people in Fogo, Harbour Deep, and those places will be really impressed with the Minister today.

The Minister has had eight months in office, and in view of the fact that during those eight months the unemployment rate in this Province has increased two full percentage points over this time last year, will the Minister tell the House how many new jobs she has created in the last eight months, since

she has been responsible for creating employment opportunities in Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Again, my comment is that it is not easy to try to correct the errors of the past. We are working at it and we are committed to it. We have a Department of Employment which is different, I might say, from the last Department of Manpower. Its mandate is very, very different. We have an Economic Recovery Commission, we have the Department of Mines and Energy, we have the Department of Development and, fortunately, we have Social Services to deal with those people who, in the short-term, need help, and who have relied on Social Services much too long in this Province. We are going to attempt to change that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Put them all on welfare, Mr. Speaker, that is the Minister's answer.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has been an unmitigated failure, a curse on the unemployed of this Province.

Now let me ask the Minister this: When is the Minister going to have the gall to go to Fogo, or to go to Harbour Deep, or to go to Fleur de Lys, go to rural Newfoundland and Labrador and tell those people face to face, man to man, woman to woman that her answer for them to survive in rural Newfoundland is join the welfare lines. When is

she going to get out of her office and go out into rural Newfoundland and talk to those people?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

I find it very, very strange that the word welfare is so distasteful. Perhaps if for the last seventeen years we had used the word welfare and acknowledged that people in Newfoundland had to live on welfare, and live in poverty, we would not have the problem we have today. But instead, it was looked at through rose coloured glasses and the word welfare was anathema.

Furthermore, I am prepared at any time to go to rural Newfoundland and tell people the truth.

When I went around campaigning I was told, Mr. Speaker, that people were tired of being misled. I do not intend to mislead them anymore, neither does my Government. If people are going to have to use welfare for a short or a long-term time, while we work towards solutions, we will tell them that, we will not disguise it with some kind of high-flung vocabulary that does not meet the requirements of the people of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister's vocabulary is an insult to Newfoundland and Labrador.

She could stand last night and grin all over the T.V. screens, and she sits back there in her

seat and grins again today, while people in the Province are starving to death, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister has now admitted to this House and to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that she cannot even attack the unemployment problem in this Province even on a short-term basis, and in view of the fact that she has belittled and insulted every Newfoundlander and Labradorian by telling them to join the welfare lines, when is the Minister going to do the honourable thing and knock on the Premier's door and ask to be relieved of her responsibilities so somebody else, who might have a grain of sense, might be able to attack the problem?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:
She is not even in her seat now. Look at the arrogance, will you!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

I am absolutely appalled, Mr. Speaker, and I think the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are equally appalled with the statements of the Minister of Employment yesterday evening in the news when she said, "Let them go on welfare."

I would ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, in view of these statements, and in view of the fact that the Minister has openly

admitted to the House that her Department has absolutely no plans, no programs until next year's budget to help those people who are going to be penniless this winter, will the Minister please tell the House how she can sit there day after day after day and not try to do something for the people who are unemployed here in Newfoundland? Was she serious yesterday evening when she said that she wanted the people in Newfoundland to go on welfare? Will she give us some indication of what the Government will be contributing financially to employment programs in Newfoundland and Labrador this year?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:
Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, with the hon. Minister of Fisheries, I am going to Ottawa to meet with the Minister of Fisheries, and on Thursday to meet with Barbara McDougall, at which time we are going to be discussing short and long-term solutions to this problem which has been brought to our attention by the Opposition and by our own constituents.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister is it still the position of the Minister of Employment, like the Government that she supports, that not one single dollar will be added by the Provincial Government to the \$5 million that the Federal Government is pumping into a Fishery Response Program? And

does the Minister have any regard for the dignity of people in rural Newfoundland, that she would make the kind of callous, uncaring statement she made yesterday evening and pass the buck over to the Minister of Social Services?

Mr. Speaker, I think the bottom line is that this Minister cannot handle the responsibility of providing jobs to the people in Newfoundland. Will the Minister immediately apologize to the working people of Newfoundland and commit herself to jobs for Newfoundlanders now? And not only now, but in the next budget as well?

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

MS COWAN:
I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I will never have to apologize for saying what is the truth. I am going to Ottawa because of my Government's concern, because of the very legitimate concern of every individual in this House to see if we can find solutions. We do not need, it would appear, any extra monies from Ottawa. If we find that we do for the particular programs that have been identified here related to the fisheries, then, of course, we will ask for more. What we do need money for, and which I am well prepared to ask Barbara McDougal for, are employment programs generally that will help us through this period, while our people adjust to the new unemployment insurance programs. I have no problem with asking for money like that, or seeing our Government putting money into programs that will support the general unemployed person in this Province and get them into the job market in some sort of meaningful,

long-time work.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker, the Minister continues to avoid answering the question. The question is what does her Government plan on doing to address the problems of rural Newfoundlanders and the unemployed people of this Province? Is the Minister speaking for Government, Mr. Speaker, when she says let the unemployed go on welfare, or is it part of an overall scheme that the Government has, that if they can make it rough enough on the people of Newfoundland, rural Newfoundlanders, that they will fit them into some kind of a madcap scheme to centralize them and make it cheaper on Government? Because you have amalgamation, you have the downsizing of the fishery, cancellation of employment programs, and now the Minister says let them eat cake, and that is what she is saying. Is this the plan the Minister has for the unemployed? And I am asking her to be a little bit more specific this time in answering the question. The people want to know what plans the Minister has right now to address the problems that the unemployed have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
This year. Now. This year. Not next year.

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

MS COWAN:
Thank you.

First of all, may I say there are

none so deaf as those who do not want to hear.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Ha, ha, ha. Are we supposed to laugh at that?

MS COWAN:

No, it is not supposed to be amusing. The problem is not an amusing one, Sir.

MR. SIMMS:

Answer the question, then.

MR. RIDEOUT:

You should go to Fogo today.

MS COWAN:

I have answered the question now on several occasions. I did not use the expression that is being attributed to me.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, you did!

MS COWAN:

I have stated that short-term and long-term solutions are being worked on and if people find themselves in horrendous situations, social assistance is there to help them. That is what we have social assistance for in this Province. It is nothing to be embarrassed about, it is something that is there and we are glad that we have it at this time. And we are going to continue to need it until we rectify the problems we have inherited, and have a sound economy where, when we have one dislocation in one part of the work force, it can be absorbed into another more healthy part of the work force. So that is what we are aiming towards, and that is what my Government is aiming towards. We are committed to the development of rural Newfoundland. All the employment

programs coming from my Department are focused on rural Newfoundland and where -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

- where we are not getting applications from rural Newfoundlanders as we would like, we are actually going out into rural Newfoundland to make sure that the people are aware that these programs are there and will take advantage of them.

MR. RIDEOUT:

You have not created one new job in eight months. Not one!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question, too, is to the Minister responsible for Labour and Employment. Yesterday in response to media questioning, the Minister suggested - and she did say it, she can stickhandle and squirm as much as she wants to - in response to the Media question, the Minister said that these people would have to resort to the welfare rolls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINSOR:

The Federal Government has admitted that it made a mistake in the management of our fisheries. This Minister made a mistake yesterday, too. The Federal Government took away their livelihood because of mismanagement; this Minister stripped them of their dignity by suggesting to these people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WINSOR:
- that they resort to welfare. These are not chronic welfare people, these are vibrant, energetic Newfoundlanders. Will this Minister do the honorable thing and stand in this House and apologize to the people of Fogo for the statement she made yesterday?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MS COWAN:
Thank you very much.

It is very difficult when you have to keep finding new words to say the same thing over and over again. There is no need, as I said earlier, to apologize for telling the truth. What do you suggest we do? If you have people in your constituency who are hungry, who need medical care, or who need some sort of help with their mortgage, or whatever, until these short-term measures are found to help them out, what do you suggest they do if they do not go to their local welfare office? I do not know where else they would go.

Certainly, another thing I would like to say, too, is if you have identified people with serious problems, let Fisheries know, let my Department know, and perhaps we can be of assistance in helping them. Do not sensationalize them. We are here to provide sound Government. We are now panicking, we are going about this in a reasonable effort.

It is not my job to know of individual cases on Fogo, it is the job of that MHA to bring them to my attention, as MHAs do to other Departments.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Two hundred people have to move away, and it is not your job. Talk about incompetent performance.

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

MR. WINSOR:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A supplementary to the Minister.

The Minister, I guess, in her answer, asked a question. She can initiate the Private Sector Program and she can put some provincial dollars into the Fisheries Response Program, if she is looking for some solutions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. A. SNOW:
She can exercise leadership.

MR. WINSOR:
And she can exercise some leadership in her Department.

This administration has publicly said there are too many people in the fishery. It has been said time and time again that there are too many people. The people of Fogo are experiencing considerable hardship as a result of the failure of the fishery. The Minister said these people would have to either go on welfare -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman has been given quite a bit of leeway; I gave him

quite a lengthy preamble at the beginning. I wonder if the hon. gentleman would now proceed with his question.

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker, my question is is the Minister suggesting to the people of Fogo Island that they have two choices, welfare or resettlement to Toronto or Alberta, because her Government cannot initiate a program?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Mr. Speaker, I will say again we are looking for ways to keep the people of Fogo in Fogo. We cannot wave a magic wand and change overnight what has been going on for forty years. We are working on that. It is not an easy solution. As the hon. gentleman said earlier, responding to the Minister of Fisheries, we are working on it.

MR. WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:

I would like the Minister to tell this House what programs she has geared to rural Newfoundland. We have not seen any. The Minister suggested we have some money that could be spent for welfare to assist these people. Can the Minister now not convince her colleagues to take that same money and put it into a meaningful work program for these people?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have, in the Department of Employment and Labour Relations, several employment programs which are aimed at rural Newfoundland. One is the Canada/Newfoundland Youth Strategy, which has an emphasis on rural Newfoundland. We have another, the Graduate Employment program, which again is aimed at keeping young graduates in rural Newfoundland. Those are two programs that are ongoing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is not new. That was our program.

MS COWAN:

Yes, and you had the foresight, I must say, to introduce the Canada/Newfoundland Job Strategy, and also the second one, the Graduate Program. I applaud you for that. However, we felt it did not have enough rural emphasis and did certainly change that very, very early, as a Cabinet.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister, as well. I think it is about time she came clean with the House and admitted that she gutted 3,000 jobs in Newfoundland under the Private Sector Program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in another few months they will have been over there for a year, and in that period of time the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations permitted the Premier to interfere in the collective bargaining process in the Marystown Shipyard and, as a result of that, over 300

people are unemployed. Will the Minister tell us, since in another few weeks, another month or so, the UIC of over 300 people will be running out in Marystown, if she or the Deputy Premier, the hon. Mr. House, has done anything to create jobs for these individuals?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

I will be discussing the matter with the hon. Barbara McDougall on Thursday.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Why do you not go to Ottawa and stay there?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Minister that these people who are about to have to resettle in Toronto, or some other place where a lot of them have gone so far, are hard-working Newfoundlanders, skilled trades people who need the protection of Government and not the interference of the Premier. Let me ask the Minister if her remedy for the workers of the Marystown Shipyard who were laid off is the same remedy she said last night on TV for the people of Fogo, if you want to stay home go on welfare, if not, move away?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

My answer is to do exactly what I have been doing, and I have repeated it on several occasions. My answer is not to stick my head

in the sand and ignore it, as was done by past Governments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS COWAN:

This Province has been reliant on make-work projects for so long that people do not know any other way of life. I did not send the thousands of people, nor did this Government send the thousands of people, to Ontario who went in the last ten years, I will have you know.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. Minister that she has sent more in seven months than were sent in the last seven years.

Mr. Speaker, if they want to stay home they have to go on welfare, so let me ask her if her Department is thinking about bringing in any sort of plan to help people resettle to the Mainland?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes. Are you going to buy tickets? What travel agency do you have set up.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is also to the Minister. In her former role, the Minister was known as a fighter for better wages and benefits for those for whom she was responsible. Now that she is

responsible for the working people of the Province, and is in a position where she can be proactive, she says, let them go on welfare. I ask the Minister how she can condone insulting these hardworking people who have had such a disastrous year in the fishery?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how he can condone exploiting, which is what he is doing, and sensationalizing a very serious problem which is being addressed by this Government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

(Inaudible) making statements, and then you turn on us for asking questions. What an incompetent!

MR. SIMMS:

How incompetent, and idiotic and silly.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Take your responsibility, or get out!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister, perhaps, should know that I have never had as many phone calls from irate constituents as I had today concerning the phrases uttered by the Minister on TV last night. That is a far cry from the battle cry of the Minister when it was 'a

fair share', and the word, 'equality' was her operable phrase. I ask her now if these words are still part of her vocabulary. If so, where is the equality and fairness for the fisherpersons around the Province? Is she going to be fair and equal with them so they can live in dignity?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

This morning I had the interesting experience of sitting in on a workshop, or an information session, in which we were given some information on the fisheries. I noticed, and in fact it was very startling, that the annual income of fisherpeople in Newfoundland is way, way below that of their counterparts in other parts of Canada, and I noticed that those statistics were collected and gathered during the time you people were in Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The question I should perhaps ask is what has that got to do with the price of fish? However, I will say that this Government prides itself on fairness and balance, and I now ask the Minister where the fairness is in asking the poor people of this Province to balance their budget on welfare.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have been living sadly, Mr. Speaker, very sadly, on welfare, make-work programs and unemployment insurance for generations. That is grossly unfair. We, on this side of the House, are committed to changing that, to see that the parts of the Province that cannot look after themselves in a fashion that is dignified, we will be there to shore it up. We have, as I mentioned, many Departments responsible for doing that: Development is doing some very, very important work; we have the Economic Recovery Team. We are committed to bringing fairness to these people who, for so long, have gone without it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

What a hopeless failure.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just say to the same Minister that hunger is sensational enough. In the last two or three weeks I have had calls from people who are hungry because their earnings from the fishery was so low. And, yes, people in this Province have had a poor five or six years in the fishery, but they have had some earnings from the fishery and they have been able to stay alive. But

if this Minister, and this Premier and this Government gets their way, they will not have any income except welfare, which is less than they have been taking from the fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Now let me ask the Minister this question, Mr. Speaker: The unemployment rate for October, 1989 is two per cent higher than it was -

MR. TOBIN:

Two point five.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Well, 2.5 higher than it was for October, 1988. Would the Minister please explain to the House why that increase, why the unemployment rate in the Province has gone up by two per cent for the same month last year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

Obviously it is a reflection of the economy, an economy that is not in good shape. We would be the first people to admit that, and we are making every effort we can to rectify it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say to the Minister, before I ask my supplementary, that upon taking office, she wiped out 3,000 jobs in this Province - three thousand jobs - in the Private Sector Employment Program, which

was costing Government \$5 million at the time, and \$5 million was coming from the Private Sector - 3,000 jobs in one swoop. Now, that is certainly a significant contributor to the unemployment rate rising by 2.5 per cent. Three thousand people in Newfoundland and Labrador is very significant. Let me ask the Minister would she make representation to her Minister of Finance and the Cabinet to ask for the \$5 million surplus the Minister brought in this year, the \$5 million surplus that was left lying there for emergency contingency plans in the Province? Would the Minister make representation to the Minister of Finance and to the Cabinet and ask for that \$5 million for an employment program for the 6,000 to 10,000 people who are going to be displaced from the fishery in this Province? The Premier told the people 6,000.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

I do not play games with statistics, and I will refuse to do it. It was a favourite practice of the past Government, in the way they looked at the world through rose coloured glasses and distorted it. Now you are trying to look at it through shaded glasses of another type. Those statistics you quote are not correct.

MR. RIDEOUT:

What do you mean? Three thousand jobs in the Private Sector Program is correct.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Tell us the correct one.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, two statistics: Three thousand jobs were created last year under the Private Sector Employment Program; the unemployment rate for Newfoundland and Labrador has increased by 2.5 per cent over October of 1988, calculated by Statistics Canada, not by us or by you. There are two facts, so my question to the Minister is, in light of the fact that there is a surplus in the provincial Budget of \$5 million, and that coupled with \$5 million from the private sector is \$10 million which can create 3,000 jobs minimum in this Province, and in light of the fact that 6,000 people minimum are going to be displaced from the fishery, as the Premier says, will the Minister ask her Cabinet colleagues for the \$5 million surplus in the Budget to develop an employment program for the people of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:

What sort of proposal would you like me to bring you, Sir? Perhaps another Sprung?

MR. RIDEOUT:

They will take anything but welfare.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

The only proposal you have is welfare, and Sprung is better than that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to

throw the unemployment rate and the misfortunes of this Province into the lap of Sprung, but let me say to the Minister that it will not be Sprung that will haunt this administration but, rather, the Economic Recovery Team, which is costing five million bucks this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:
Five million dollars for five or six jobs, that is what it is costing you for the Economic Recovery Team.

Let me ask this supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the Minister persuade her Cabinet colleagues, if she cannot get the \$5 million surplus out of the Budget, which the Minister of Finance stood in this House and said is there for employment, to scrap the Economic Recovery Team and take the \$4 million or \$5 million they are wasting on that this year for an employment program for this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

MS COWAN:
The Economic Recovery Commission is a fine, fine commission. It is not a band-aid solution. You people cannot understand anything that is long-term; you can only think of something that will come along, stop the problem for four or five months and then back we are, right where we started, or worse.

The Economic Recovery Commission is there to work with us to make sure that that type of mistake never comes to haunt a Government

in this Province again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Go to Fogo. Go to Fogo.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Go and show (inaudible) once. If you went to Fogo, they would throw you over the wharf.

MR. SPEAKER:
Question Period has expired.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

On behalf of hon. Members I would like to welcome to the galleries today, thirty-four, Level III students with their teacher Mr. Brian Manning from St. Clare's High School, Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, in my absence yesterday questions were asked by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition about LIA negotiations. I am reading from Hansard now. The hon. Government House Leader undertook to get the information and I am now providing it.

The first one appears on page R3 of yesterday's Hansard. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that "...the Province adopted and made public a provincial policy respecting provisional measures that the Province would adhere to, and that would guide the Province

through the course of those negotiations, and in view of the fact that one of those provisional measures the Province adopted required the Province to consult with the Labrador Inuit Association before taking any action that might impede or impact in any way on the LIA's land claims."

Now let me correct that misstatement first, Mr. Speaker, by reading from the policy itself. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, we have not done anything to this policy. We have not yet had a chance to make the changes that may be necessary. For the moment at least, we are still following the policy that was adopted by the former Government of which, I assume, the Leader of the Opposition is fully aware.

The three relevant points are these. Point number one: the rights to subsurface both marine and terrestrial as well as water management rights remain with the Province. Point number two: claimants will be given an opportunity to advise on the management of lands and resources in the settlement area. Point number three: claimants will be consulted regarding any major developments proposed for the land claim area during the course of negotiations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is quite a bit different from what was suggested. Now to answer the first question posed. 'Could the Minister tell the House why it was that the Minister of Mines and Energy could execute a twenty-five year lease with the Iron Ore Company of Canada without any consultation whatsoever with the Labrador Inuit association, thereby clearly flying in the face

of the adopted government policy?'

Mr. Speaker, nothing that was done flies in the face of the policy. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, a statute enacted at the behest of the former administration as the Minister of Mines and Energy explained a number of days ago in the House on November 21st, 'the holder of a licence may at any time during the currency of the licence apply to the Minister for a Mining lease of all the minerals in, on or under the land or part of the land covered by the licence, and the licensee has the right to the issuance of the mining lease.' Now, that is not a statute that this Government asked the House to enact, the former Government did that. The Minister was simply, as he is bound by law to do, issuing the licence as the statute requires, so the Minister issued the licence, which I should explain for hon. Member, Mr. Speaker, gives the right to the minerals, but not the right to any development of it, not the right to start a development. If, as, and when they want to start mining, they have to go through an environmental impact statement, at which time there is ample room for consultation and input by everybody that has an interest or has any claim, but there is no ability in the Minister to choose not to issue it.

Now the second question, Mr. Speaker, also has a wrong premise. The Leader of the Opposition suggested the problem here is that the Government is adopting their land claims policy, and their Provincial Provisional Measures policy has said that they would do one thing and they have ended up doing something else. Mr. Speaker, that statement is wrong and unfounded, so I will now

go on to the question. Could the Minister tell the House this: on every occasion when Government negotiators have sat down with the LIA - Mr. Speaker, I might even ask my own hon. Members if they would just keep the noise level down while I am answering the questions. On every occasion, as I understand it, when the Government negotiators have sat down with the LIA negotiators, they have repeatedly said to those negotiators, 'we must bargain in good faith, we must trust each other.' Can the Minister explain to the House how this failure to consult with the LIA on this particular Strange Lake lease squares with the position the Government negotiators are taking every time they meet around the negotiating table of bargaining in good faith and trusting each other.

Mr. Speaker, there is no failure to consult as is required under the land claims policy. No consultation was required as is set out in the land claims policy as it stands at the moment. No consultation is required as that land claims policy stands at this moment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me re-state something the Minister of Mines and Energy himself has said. On reflection, I think it would have been the right or appropriate thing to notify the LIA beforehand that this lease was going to be issued, to notify them. I think that that would have been a courteous thing to do, and I have no hesitation in saying, Mr. Speaker, that in all future instances, the Government would notify the LIA when any similar situation arises. But there is no breach of policy for failure to consult.

The third representation made is that the Government House Leader can take words -I would ask the other hon. Members opposite if they would stop yattering while I am trying to give them the information they have asked for.

MR. SIMMS:

They are not talking to you (inaudible).

PREMIER WELLS:

It is just a yattering noise which prevents it from being heard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the third statement they made was that it was interesting how the Government House Leader can take words and twist them to mean something different. Well anybody who knows the hon. the Government House Leader knows that he would never take or twist any words to mean anything. The Labrador Inuit Association have now said publicly that they feel betrayed by the actions of the Government, and in particular the Minister of Mines and Energy over the Strange Lake lease. Now would the Minister tell the House, what action does the Government intend to take now to correct this betrayal and get these negotiations back on track.

Mr. Speaker, the negotiations are on track, they have never been off track, there has never been a betrayal. Mr. Speaker, we will write a letter to the Labrador Inuit Association in response to the letter which they have sent to me. I would have given it to them first except for the fact that they appear to have made it public and advise it, so, all I am saying is that I am not being discourteous to them by not writing to them before I give the answer to the House. They have made it public and in those

circumstances, it necessitates my dealing with it at the first opportunity in the House, which I have done. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. The Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order. I would not raise the point while the Premier was answering questions, but I think really, we have to have a look at the rules or the guidelines respecting answers to questions, because, obviously if a Minister or the Premier is going to give an answer to a question, that is going to be quite lengthy, which this one was, it is beyond the bounds of the rules that we normally use in question period for providing an answer to a question. I think Your Honour has often ruled himself, that if they have a lengthy answer, they should do it under Statements by Ministers where at least, the Opposition Members would have a chance to comment or respond, so I just raise it at this point in time, for consideration by Your Honour, because I think we need to look at that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before addressing the point of order, the Chair is annoyed by constant interruptions, it does nothing to enhance what is going on in the House when somebody is constantly saying something after every statement that is echoed in the House, and I would ask hon. Members, please, to display some courtesy.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

It was addressed in the way in which it was, because the first question was asked and the hon. The House Leader answered it this way. If I remember correctly, the same issue has been raised a couple of times previously. What I will have to do, is to take the question under advisement, and then he says that he will take it under advisement and report back tomorrow. Now this did not satisfy the Leader of the Opposition, he persisted, so he asked another question and he asked the second question to which, the hon. The Government House Leader said, as I indicated, 'I would have to look into the situation, I am absolutely certain that what is being done, is being done properly.' So he sat down having advised that he would look into it and get back with it. This still did not satisfy the Leader of the Opposition, so he asked a third question, or he asked the same question a third time, so the hon. The House Leader reaffirmed his position. Now Mr. Speaker, three questions having been answered and three wrong foundations for the question having been put, it became necessary for me to deal with it thoroughly and in response, Mr. Speaker, I dealt with it thoroughly, having dealt with the wrong statements made and the three questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, it is a well established fact that in answering questions, be they questions on the order paper or be they questions in the oral questions period, or be they questions taken under advisement, that every effort should be made to keep them brief and if there is excessively long answers, then maybe, we should get into

Ministerial Statements, so that the Opposition might have their chance to reply as well. I am sure that we have had situations where answers to questions had been long and excessive but I would advise hon. Members, for the interest of giving Opposition Members a chance to respond, to look at these precedents and look at procedure, particularly with respect to oral questions, taking under advisement and also, in the matter that arose yesterday, I think, with respect to making statements under Ministerial Statements. We had a situation yesterday where a statement should have come under the item Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees, so hon. Ministers, particularly, should look closely at these things so that the Opposition is given a fair chance to reply.

Orders of the Day

MR. BAKER:
Order 2, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Committee of the Whole on a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Municipal And Provincial Affairs." (Bill No. 29).

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on said Bill, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

Bill No. 29.

Shall Clause 1, Clause 2?

MS VERGE:
No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Okay.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman, this is a Bill we debated at some length in the House, dealing with the now Department of Municipal And Provincial Affairs, and the point we made throughout the entire debate was that this Department was much, much too large and had too many responsibilities for any one individual to be able to administer properly and give service to.

AN HON. MEMBER:
What Bill is it?

MR. SIMMS:
The Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs Bill. We are in Committee stage now, and we want to propose some amendments. I will tell the Government House Leader now so that he can follow the amendments. There may be a requirement for a vote eventually, so he can alert his troops.

Clause 2 talks about the definitions of Department and Minister and so on. I would tell the Government House Leader that our intention is, after we get through all the Clauses, when we reach the title, to propose an amendment to the title which will read - essentially, the title is The Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. That is the title, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Municipal And Provincial Affairs." We will be moving an amendment to delete all the words after 'Department' in

the title and the words 'of amalgamation' be substituted therefore, so that the new title would be, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Amalgamation" as opposed to the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. Now that is an amendment we will be proposing when we get to the title.

In order to reach that stage, of course, there needs to be amendments to certain Clause by Clause stages which will accurately reflect the new definitions, therefore, under that new title of 'Minister of Amalgamation' - if I can have my colleague's attention, there.

My colleague, the critic for Municipal Affairs, understands that we are proposing an amendment to the title of this Bill and, therefore, we will have to propose amendments to some of the Clauses leading up to it to accurately reflect the new duties and responsibilities of the new Minister of Amalgamation. That is what I am saying to the Government House Leader.

We are on Clause 2, Mr. Chairman, and we would move the following amendment: That Clause 2, all through those subsections, (a), (b), (c), (d) and so on, where it refers to Municipal and Provincial Affairs, we move the appropriate amendments that would read, 'Department of Amalgamation' as Opposed to 'Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.'

MR. BAKER:

To that point, Mr. Chairman, this is kind of silly, simply because there is a Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. There is no such department as the department to which the Member

refers, therefore, there cannot be an act respecting that department. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this silliness on behalf of the Opposition House Leader is entirely out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, I do not quite understand what the Government House Leader is saying. He has a Bill here, legislation, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Municipal And Provincial Affairs." What is he talking about? Clause 2(a) says, "Department" means the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs constituted by this Act, and we are amending that clause to read, "Department" means the Department of Amalgamation constituted by this Act. What is he talking about?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Simply, Mr. Chairman, I think Clause 1 was already carried.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, it was not.

MR. SIMMS:

Clause 1 is the title.

MR. BAKER:

I think you could check the records. You could check with the Clerk. I am sure we have carried the Clause.

MR. SIMMS:

I was not recognized, you see, Mr. Chairman. I was standing.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

It is my understanding that Clause 1 is already carried.

MR. SIMMS:

No, Mr. Chairman, it is not. We did not vote.

I stood to be recognized, and by that time, I think, Your Honour had gone on to Clause 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

So we are still on Clause 1, then?

MR. SIMMS:

Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Okay.

MR. SIMMS:

I was making the point that we intended to amend the title at the end, when Your Honour runs through all the Clauses and then says, 'Shall the title carry', and so on, and leading up to that, of course, throughout this Bill all the appropriate Clauses have to be amended therefore to reflect that amendment of the title. The Clerk is nodding his Head. He understands it thoroughly, Your Honour understands it thoroughly, the Clerk of the House understands it thoroughly, and I cannot understand why the Government House Leader does not understand it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that you check Hansard and see what was carried. There was something carried before the hon. Member stood up. If such is the case, then that part has already been carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, the Government House Leader can do what he wishes. If you want to carry Clause 1 as it was, fine, then we will just spend the rest of the day on Clauses 2, 3, 4, and 5. I mean, you can have your way. It does not matter. It is not a big issue. The point we were making is we stood to speak to Clause 1. It does not really matter to us. We will amend all the other Clauses, we will amend the title; we will still do all that.

So we will be moving an amendment to the appropriate Clauses. The Clerk understands me?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. SIMMS:

Absolutely! I do not understand why the Government House Leader does not understand it. So whatever Clause we are on, 1 or 2, wherever we are, I move - perhaps Your Honour might want to clarify for me exactly where we are. I thought we were on Clause 1.

MR. BAKER:

That is right. That was my point.

MR. SIMMS:

But he just ruled that we are back on Clause 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Chair did not recognize the hon. the Opposition House Leader when he stood, not having seen him and I think maybe we should have, before we moved on to carry that Clause.

MR. SIMMS:

So we are on Clause 1?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We are on Clause 1.

MR. SIMMS:

In Clause 1, where it now says 'The act' -

AN HON. MEMBER:

How often do you beat him in -

MR. SIMMS:

No. I must say my friend, the Government House Leader, is not feeling too well today. Perhaps he is not able to perform as he normally would, and I respect that problem.

Clause 1 says, 'This Act may be cited as the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs Act.' That is what Clause 1 says, correct? The Clerk says, yes. Your Honour says, yes. We move the following amendment: That the words after 'Department' be deleted and the words 'of Amalgamations Act' be inserted therefore. I think that is the right way to put it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

It has been moved that Clause 1 be amended. Shall the amendment carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

All those in favour?

MS VERGE:

Of the amendment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

On the amendment?

MR. BAKER:

Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify what we are going through now. Are we debating the amendment the hon. Member has proposed? Is that what we are debating?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, we are debating the amendment as put forward by the hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, for the information of my friend, the Government House Leader, I moved an amendment and I sat down. Nobody stood to debate it, so the Chair did the right thing and asked, 'Shall the amendment carry?'

MR. BAKER:

And it was defeated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

It was carried.

MR. SIMMS:

In our view the amendment was carried.

MR. BAKER:

We said no.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, but you did not have enough Members in the House, you see.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Shall the amendment to Clause 1 carry?

All those in favor 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The amendment is defeated.

On motion, Clause 1, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall Clause 2 carry?

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, as I have already indicated clearly in my introductory remarks, my few brief preliminary remarks, in the Clause by Clause scrutiny of this Bill it is our intention to emphasize the fact that this Department which is being created by this Bill, this legislation, is really a department of amalgamation, nothing more, nothing less. We have stated our reasons for it in debating the principle of the Bill all throughout the debate on second reading. We have also made points about the Department being much, much too large, and too many Divisions in it, and that one individual is not able to properly handle the responsibilities. Therefore, it is our intention to propose amendments, which we have a right to do as the Opposition. The Minister can shake his head, but we have every right to do it

to reflect the views and opinions of the residents out there, the citizens of the Province who have communicated to us their dissatisfaction with this new Department and with what it is supposed to be doing, or mandated to do.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, under Clause 2(a) I move the following amendment: Where it says "Department" means the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs constituted by this Act, I move the amendment to delete after the word 'of' the words 'Municipal and Provincial Affairs' and substitute the word 'Amalgamation', so that Clause 2(a) will read "Department" means the Department of Amalgamation constituted by this Act. I so move that amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman, we have already passed Clause 1, which says: This Act may be cited as The Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs Act. We have already passed that. In Beauséjour, Clause 567, "The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original question," which I am assuming the hon. Member is attempting to do.

But in paragraph 568, Beauséjour says: "It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed. Every amendment proposed to be made, either to a question or to a

proposed amendment, should be so framed that, if agreed to by the House, the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself."

I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that after we have passed Clause 1, which says This Act may be cited as The Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs Act, it is entirely inconsistent that from then on the Act be referred to by a different name.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:
I did not hear the Paragraph the hon. the Government House Leader quoted. Could he repeat the paragraph for me, please?

MR. BAKER:
Paragraph 568 in Beauchesne.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman, he read Paragraph 568, convenient for his purposes, but, of course, he did not read Paragraph 567.

MR. BAKER:
Yes, I did.

MR. SIMMS:
No, you did not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:
Well, I just asked him which Paragraph he read and he said Paragraph 568.

MR. BAKER:

I read two of them.

MR. SIMMS:
Now he is saying he read Paragraphs 567 and 568. Is that correct?

MR. BAKER:
That is correct, yes.

MR. SIMMS:
So 567 and 568. Now, the Government House Leader did not read the other part of Paragraph 569 (2) which talks about amendments being irregular in one particular, but it does not mean that the whole of it is not admissible, or it means that the whole of it is not admissible and must be ruled out of order. He did not read that reference, as I understand it.

In Paragraph 569 (1) it also says motions can be amended by leaving out certain words; by leaving out certain words in order to insert other words; by inserting or adding other words, which is what we have done here, a perfectly acceptable practice, perfectly in order. Talking about form and content of amendments are Paragraphs 570, 571, and 572, Mr. Chairman. Under the section dealing with motions, Paragraphs 565, 566, all down through, do not make any particular reference to it either.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that it is in order to propose amendments in Clause by Clause debate in Committee of the Whole stage. We are not in the House. We are not debating Second Reading of a Bill, the principle of a Bill, we are talking about Clause by Clause scrutiny.

MR. GULLAGE:
Sit down.

MR. SIMMS:

I will not sit down, I say to the Minister of Amalgamation.

MR. GULLAGE:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Well, if the Minister does not like it he can leave the House. Obviously, he does not like it, and I am pleased to see it. Maybe we finally riled him up. It is about time we finally riled him up. It is the first time he has spoken on this issue in weeks and months, and the people out there want to know the answers. He might not like the fact that he is known all across the Province as the Minister who is forcing amalgamation on people out there, but that is a fact. We will stand up for the people's rights in this House, Mr. Chairman, as we are allowed to do. The Minister can get up afterwards, if he wants, and tear strips off us and do whatever he wants, but they need not cry, and sham and everything else.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore move that amendment and I submit that it is in order.

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

I wish to, once again, point out to the Chair Paragraph 568, and I would like the Chair to apply this to this particular amendment, because the amendment being suggested would be totally inconsistent with what has already been passed in Clause 1, which says This Act may be cited as The

Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs Act. I would also like to draw Your Honour's attention to Clause 579, which says that an amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which was foreign to the proposition involved in the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that a ruling is in order that this amendment cannot be moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Chair will recess for a few minutes to deal with this matter.

Recess

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The Chair is ready to rule on the amendment. It is ruled that the amendment put forward by the Opposition House Leader is out of order as pertaining to Paragraph 698 (1) and (2) of Beauchesne.

Paragraph 698 (1) says, "An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the bill, beyond its scope or governed by or dependent upon amendments already negatived."

Paragraph 698 (2): "An amendment must not be inconsistent with, or contradictory to, the bill as so far agreed to by the committee, nor must it be inconsistent with a decision which the committee has given upon a former amendment." The amendment in Clause 2 is identical to the one already defeated by the Committee in Clause 1.

On motion, Clauses 2 through 5, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall Clause 6 carry?

MR. SIMMS:

No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a few words on Clause 6, which deals with the powers, functions and duties of the Minister. In addition to making the point about forced amalgamation and the Minister being responsible for that, it appears we are going to have some difficulty proposing amendments to that that would be acceptable to the Government side. Perhaps the Government side might agree with an amendment that would divide the powers, functions and duties of the Minister under Clause 6, because there are umpteen powers, functions and duties of the Minister under that particular clause. I think it goes from 6(a) up to 17(j); I mean, there are all kinds of onerous responsibilities, much too comprehensive, creating too great a workload for any one individual, not able to respond to the needs and interests of the groups out there who would have to deal with the Minister. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose this amendment: that Clause 6 be amended by deleting Sections 6(a)(vii) to 6(a)(xvii) inclusive. I move that amendment.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Just to clarify the situation. The Opposition House Leader is suggesting we remove everything cultural, I suppose, is the intent. This is that Clause 6, sections (vii) to (xvii) be removed. So this removes, then, the encouragement of cultural activities, historic resources, provincial archives, the museums, everything related to the youth of the Province, metric standards, that kind of thing, everything to do with radio, television, telephone, telegraph and all that kind of thing, and the administration of the Acts set out in Schedule A, which would include The Archives Act, The Arts Council Act, The Assessment Act, The Building Standards Act, The Canada Games Park Commission Act, The City of Corner Brook Act, The City of Mount Pearl Act, The Condominium Act, The Emergency Measures Act, The Fire Prevention Act, The Housing Act, The Labrador Act, The Municipal Grants Act, The Municipalities Act, The Newfoundland Coat of Arms Act, The Newspapers and Books Act, The Provincial Flag Act, The St. John's Fire Department, The St. John's Municipal Elections Act, The Urban and Rural Planning Act, and so on.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose we could let it go to a vote, however, I would like to point out once again that this amendment removing the administration of all of the Acts, including the Municipalities Act, from the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs would be totally contrary to the whole intent of the Act; it is a suggestion that goes against the whole Act itself, and, as such, is out of order.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

I could have saved the Government House Leader a lot of time. It was my error, because of my eyes. I meant to go from 7 to 16. It is in Roman numerals, so I had some difficulty in seeing it with my eyesight. So, we are talking about deleting 6(a)(vii) to 6(a)(xvi). Let us leave it at that for now, so it does not get any more complex or confused.

Mr. Chairman, in speaking to the amendment I again want to emphasize the reason for proposing this amendment, and the reason for proposing the amendment is because this Minister, while he is acknowledged by the Premier as a super human being, and while he is acknowledged by the Premier as a super Minister - he has said that - this Minister is also acknowledged by the people out around the Province as Eric the Amalgamator, as he would know. And that soon will become evident for those who have an interest in the arts and intend to go see Review '89. That will become more and more evident. Eric the Amalgamator, Mr. Chairman, is what he is referred to.

In this amendment we are trying to do the Minister a favour. He does not acknowledge it. He laughs and says, You are wasting time. Sit down! We are trying to do the Minister a favour, and we are trying to do the people out there a favour, those groups who would have to deal with the Minister under all these categories: Library's boards that cannot get to see the Minister, Historic

Resource's groups who cannot get to have a chat with the Minister when they want to, the people who are interested in the public archives who cannot get to see the Minister because he is too bogged down with all these other very heavy and indepth responsibilities. So, we want to do him a favour. We are suggesting that we delete these responsibilities from the Minister to lessen his work load a little bit, and then, of course, the Premier will have to determine to which Minister he wants to give these new responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, we have a Member over there from Port de Grave who, some say, including himself, is still the Minister of Social Services. Yet, we have the Premier who says, No, he is not a Minister. He has resigned as Minister of Social Services, or he has given up his responsibilities and duties as Minister of Social Services. All those responsibilities and duties have now been assigned to another Minister of Social Services (acting), and that is the Minister of Health. Yet every second day or so we hear the Member from Port de Grave talking about the responsibilities the Minister of Social Services should have, even though he has said to the House that he has given up his responsibilities as Minister of Social Services. It is absolutely and totally confusing.

The Member for Port de Grave does not know what it is or what it is not he is supposed to be doing, he is not absolutely certain. He has opened about three Happy Trees, which is a fine project, by the way, and I think he has also opened one Christmas Gift Tree over the last two or three weeks,

and I think that has been the extent of his effort as Minister of Social Services, as he calls himself. But we understand he is the Member for Port de Grave and had given up his responsibilities as Minister of Social Services.

Since there is some confusion there, I bet you, Mr. Chairman, that if the Member for Port de Grave, who now we understand is still in the Cabinet - he is not out of Cabinet, he is in Cabinet but he has no responsibilities - I suppose he is a Minister without Portfolio almost.

MR. EFFORD:

I am just as confused as you are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Well, we are absolutely delighted to get a confession from the Member for Port de Grave who admits, and I hope the Press picked this up, the Member for Port de Grave has admitted here in the House that he is just as confused as we are, and the people of the Province are. But I am willing to bet, Mr. Chairman, that this Member for Port de Grave would make one superb -

MR. MATTHEWS:

Oh, come on now.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, one terrific -

MS VERGE:

Oh, no! Do not say it.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, I have to say it - one superb, one terrific Minister Responsible for Metric Conversion. I bet he would do a great job at that. At least he

would have some responsibility.

All we are saying here, Mr. Chairman, is lessen some of the work load of the poor Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, take away some of the heavy, heavy work load, give the groups out there who want to meet with the Minister a chance to meet with him, and give him a bit more time to talk to them. Give these responsibilities to some other Minister, like the Member for Port de Grave, or maybe even, Mr. Chairman, promote one of the Members from the back benches. There are many capable individuals over there, particularly in that corner. There are even some over here in this end, what we call the rump end of the Cabinet.

There are many stars in the back bench over there, Mr. Chairman: The Member for St. George's, who is constantly on his feet speaking out on behalf of his constituents; the Member for Eagle River, who is trying so hard to be in the Cabinet, my Son, you would not believe it; the Member for St. John's South, landslide Murphy, with a one vote margin in the election - two votes, sorry, on the recount - deserves an opportunity, and the Member for Mount Scio, whom the group down there do not like and do not want to see elevated to the Cabinet, but, most interestingly, the Member for Stephenville, who deserves it more than anybody else on that side.

MR. TOBIN:

If that group from Carbonear heard you talk about Cabinet (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

I say, the Member for Carbonear would make an excellent Minister.

Finally, of course, not to be forgotten, the man who sits at the rear of the Premier, behind the Premier in the Legislature, the man who carries the Premier's bags every where he goes, carries his suitcases, runs out and picks up the car and gets the car gassed, warms it up for him in the mornings -

MS DUFF:
Which car?

MR. SIMMS:
Not his car, he does not have a car himself. The man who does all of those things that the Premier needs to have done, because he does not have time. The Member for Exploits deserves an opportunity, as well, to sit in the Cabinet.

We are saying, Mr. Chairman, in a legitimate way that this creates a very heavy work load on that particular Minister and we should give him an opportunity to give up on that, and to take away some of those heavy responsibilities so that he can have a chance to get out around and meet groups who are having difficulty getting to meet him. That is the essence of our suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMMS:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I will return to this again, but you know the essence and the reasoning behind the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am not going to take very long. I just wanted to clear up a matter.

The Member, when he made his amendment, included Sections (vii) to (xvii) and very clearly said '(xvii) inclusive'. He admitted that he made a grievous error. I think it was an error that became more obvious when I pointed out to him that his inclusion of (xvii) would then make the amendment improper and not acceptable. I would like to point out that a change in the amendment as proposed by the Member would require unanimous consent of both sides. He indicated, I believe, that because of this grievous error he made he would like to change his amendment to be Clauses (vii) to (xvi) inclusive, and not (vii) to (xvii) inclusive.

MR. SIMMS:
No.

MR. BAKER:
You do not?

MR. SIMMS:
I said I simply made an error and it should be (vii) to (xvi), not (vii) to (xvii).

MR. BAKER:
In order to withdraw the amendment that was already made to Clauses (vii) to (xvii) would require unanimous consent.

MR. SIMMS:
I did not make an amendment to (vii) to (xvii).

MR. BAKER:
Hansard will show that your amendment was (vii) to (xvii) inclusive.

MR. SIMMS:

It will also show where I withdrew that.

MR. BAKER:

It cannot be withdrawn unless there is unanimous consent of the House.

MR. SIMMS:

If you want to argue that, we will go to (inaudible) on this matter.

MR. BAKER:

I would like to say to the Opposition House Leader that we are willing to help him out of the tough spot he was in, the mistake he made. I know members opposite are fairly concerned about this, and are not too happy with the Opposition Leader for making such a mistake. We are willing to agree that the amendment be withdrawn and instead substituted (vii) to (xvi) inclusive, if that will help the Opposition House Leader out of the mess he is in. In that case, it would make a perfectly acceptable amendment for discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few brief comments on this Bill as well, to follow through on a couple of things the Opposition House Leader had to say.

I want to say very sincerely that the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs is too large for one person to handle. I want to say, as well, that the Minister, who is doing his best under the circumstances to deal with the Department of Social Services, is, in my opinion, a very competent Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

No, I had a council in this morning and the Minister met with them for an hour and a half. He only had an hour to meet with them, but he stretched it to an hour and a half.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

The Minister was in, and he gave his full thoughts and his co-operation to the council who had the meeting with him, and I certainly commend and thank him for that. He was very genuine and sincere in his dealings with the council, and I want to say that. At the same time, let me say that while I believe that, I also believe that it is impossible for one man to be able to administer the Department. For one person to be able to administer it is very, very, difficult. No other Cabinet Minister over there has the responsibility the present Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs has. He is a very dedicated Minister, in my opinion, but I think, Mr. Premier, the responsibility he has, with the amalgamation of other Departments that have gone into that one in terms of Provincial Affairs, Youth Services, the Arts, and everything else that is there, is absolutely impossible. Right now the Minister is not able to do justice to his Department; he is trying hard and there is nobody over there more capable of doing better. He is trying hard to do the job that has to be done but, at the same time, the Department is too large, it is by far too large, and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are not

getting what they deserve from the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

The Executive staff in the Department over there, I would suspect, if you look at your Minister and your three Assistant Deputy Ministers, they too would be overworked, particularly with amalgamation that is now coming into play. The amalgamation issue is something that is going to take up their time as it relates to -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:
Is the Premier giving out stars this evening?

AN HON. MEMBER:
He is hearing confessions.

MR. TOBIN:
It is a long time since I was to confession. I did not know that was the way you used to go. But anyway I want to make the point again that the Premier is not doing justice to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. He is denying them the basic representation that the Department should provide as it relates to a Minister, a Deputy Minister and an Assistant Deputy Minister being able to do the work. I think that all of us who have been elected, have to realize the pressures that the various councils put on us from time to time; and justifiably so. That is what we have been elected to do. They want us to make efforts on their behalf to set up meetings with the Minister. Trying to set up meetings with the Minister is very difficult and you have to call them back and say "I am sorry, I have tried to meet with the Minister but to no avail."

AN HON. MEMBER:
Tell us something new.

MR. TOBIN:
Okay, Mr. Chairman, I will say something new, but I am not sure the Member for Placentia would want to hear about the calls I got from his District over the last few days.

MR. HOGAN:
Name them.

MR. TOBIN:
Yes, I did so get calls from your District. I could name four from Southern Harbour, people do not qualify for anything and they cannot get hold of you, you will not even answer the phone. That is right The Member for Placentia will not answer the phone. They phoned me to know if I saw him around anywhere, and I said you know I can he is sitting across from me. But, Mr. Chairman, I tried to resolve their problems.

MR. HOGAN:
Who were they?

MR. TOBIN:
Very prominent Liberals, very prominent Liberals. Mr. Chairman, I think he is talking about the issue that elected Joe Price, is that right? The night that the Liberals had a plan and it back-fired, Mr. Chairman, and Joe Price got elected and the Member, the Minister of Forestry's old buddy, went down to defeat. Do you remember that, Mr. Chairman? I am not going to say too much to the Minister of Forestry, he was pretty good to me today. Now, Mr. Chairman, that Member up there looks familiar - the Government House Leader - I do not know who he looks like, but he looks familiar. Now, Mr. Chairman, I stood up here today to participate

in this debate and to give credit to the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. I think the man is trying hard, I do not think he stops for a minute, I believe that he works hard, but at the same time, the man has too much responsibility. It makes no sense whatsoever, for the Premier to try to keep his Cabinet down, by not providing the services to the residents of Newfoundland and Labrador. Sure, if one of the pages is available, the Member for Placentia is trying to get a jug of water. I just want to make that comment today, that I honestly believe the Minister is trying hard, but he is overworked.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Amendments have already been moved, I say for the benefit of the Minister of Forestry, Mr. Chairman. I want to take a few minutes to speak to the particular Amendment on Clause 6, subclauses (vii) through (xvii), just to make a point. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are under no illusions on this side of the House that the Amendment will be defeated, we know the Government has the majority and the Government will carry the day. But the fact of the matter is, there are two things that need to be said here. First of all, it is quite proper, in the parliamentary sense to debate, clause by clause, any Bill before third reading. The major debate on the principle of the Bill is behind us, so what we are doing here today in Committee is going through each of the particular clauses that make up the whole of Bill No. 29. So there is no point in the Minister

getting huffy or gruffy or grumpy or anything of that nature, crooked or contrary or nasty or sookie, the longer he stays like that, the more difficulty he will have, and he had better not provoke us. There are forty-three Clauses in this Bill, we are at No.6, so there are thirty-six or thirty-seven Clauses left and if we wish, Members on either side of the House, if they wish, can debate each one of those Clauses, and under the rules must debate just the clause that we are discussing. So the Minister need not get on any high horses, Mr. Speaker, and try to persuade us not to do what is our right to do if we wish to do it.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the point that needs to be made to the Minister of Amalgamation is that this clause points out the very weakness in this Department. The very weakness of this Department is pointed out in this clause. The Department is too large, Mr. Speaker. It is a catch-all for everything. The Minister is the Minister of Miscellaneous. If you could not find a way to dump something into some other Department, if it did not fit in some other Department when they were going through this amalgamation process internally within Government, the idea must have been to dump it into the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. If it did not fit anywhere else, Mr. Speaker, dump it in here. Just look at some of the things that are in this particular Department that the Minister is responsible for. We fully acknowledge that the Minister ought to be responsible for Municipal Affairs, and there is nothing wrong with the Minister being responsible for Housing so that the Department would be the

Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing. But just look at every thing else, Mr. Speaker, that is in this Department. There is everything in here but the Kitchen sink. It is just as well to take the kitchen sink, and make the Minister responsible for kitchen sinks as anything else, because he has got everything that you could mention under the sun. That is the only thing he could handle.

You know, in this particular clause, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is responsible for the encouragement of cultural activities in the Province, including the supervision of Arts and Culture Centers, the Arts and Letters Committee, Public Libraries, The Historic resources of the Province, the Provincial Archives, Mr. Speaker. By the time he gets around to reading the Act, Mr. Speaker, the Minister will be a candidate for the Provincial Archives. By the time he gets around to figuring out what his responsibilities are, Mr. Speaker, the Minister will be archival material himself. He is also responsible, Mr. Speaker, for all museums established and operated by the Province. He has to go out to Bonavista now and look at the museum out on Cape Bonavista, he has to go out and check the Mary March Museum in Grand Falls, the Seaman's Museum down in Grand Bank, he has to go all over the Province, Mr. Speaker. In addition to dealing with three hundred thirty something Municipalities, he has also got to find time to do this activity. He is responsible for archeology, ethonology, fauna and flora, Mr. Speaker, he has to go down to the streams now, and in on the bogs and the marshes, not with a four wheeler, Mr. Speaker, but

he has to go in by hoof, he has to hoof it in. He has to hoof in over the barrens and the bogs now and check on the flora and the fauna, and see if that is prospering, Mr. Speaker. About the only thing that will prosper under this Government is something that does not need any help, and can survive on its own. You will not do it in rural Newfoundland with the help of the Minister of Employment, Mr. Speaker.

So, he has to put a bag of fertilizer on his back now, Mr. Speaker, and trounce in over the bogs and the marshes and make sure that the flora and the fauna is growing and prospering. That is ludicrous, Mr. Speaker, and that is how ludicrous the responsibility that has been given to this Minister is, Mr. Speaker. He is also responsible for the encouragement, the promotion, the establishment, the development, the coordination and implementation of amateur sport, fitness and recreational activities for the benefit of all citizens of the Province, and those other services and programs that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may by order prescribe. So, Mr. Speaker, after the Minister goes through his regular workday of dealing with three hundred thirty something Municipalities, after he goes through his regular workday of supervising whether we are going to bring in the Irish Rovers for the Arts and Culture Center next week, or whether we are going to bring in Raveen, whether he is going to allow Review '89 to proceed. By the time the Minister gets back from walking over the bogs and the marshes, by the time he gets back from supervising the artifacts in the Seaman's museum in Grand Bank, and by the time he

goes down to the Colonial Building and checks out all the archival material that accumulated during his absences out on the bogs, when he gets all that done, Mr. Chairman, he then has to go down to the Y and play basketball. He then has to go and meet the people involved in recreation, amateur sports, and fitness. He then has to go lobbying to try to get a senior hockey team into St. John's. He has to meet with the Broomball Association. He has to find time to get down to Twillingate and present trophies at the Dart Banquet. Those are all the things that these various parts of the community expect their Minister to do.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We will have to clone him.

MR. RIDEOUT:

He will have to join that Clone Clyde Club that they started just outside of Toronto recently.

MR. SIMMS:

We can get the Member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) to give him a hand because he is not doing all that much. He opened a few Happy Trees and things like that.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I say to the Minister he could invite the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Walsh) to go on his behalf. Please take him to every speaking engagement you can find an opportunity to take him too around Newfoundland and Labrador. As long as he speaks on Meech Lake.

MR. EFFORD:

Your time is up.

MR. SIMMS:

No, by leave. Yes, come on.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Chairman, I say to my friend for Port de Grave that the Chairman will send a note, I am sure, to the Speaker advising me when I have a minute, or thirty seconds left.

Then, once the Minister has done all that he has to also be part of the encouragement, the promotion, the establishment, the development, the co-ordination and implementation, subject to the regulations of services and activities relating to the youth of the Province. Now, Mr. Chairman, after he has the museums, the arts and cultures, the municipalities, and the flora and the fauna and the archives, if he has any time left after fitness and recreation, he is then responsible for youth. He is responsible for employment opportunities for youth. I remember the Member for Stephenville (Mr. Aylward), when he was the youth critic, asking me when I was Culture, Recreation and Youth Minister, the programs that we were bringing in for youth unemployment, and all of that in the Province, so the Minister has to do all of that. He has so many things, all of which are important. The point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that each of those activities are important and they deserve to have Ministerial time made available to the various groups. They deserve Ministerial leadership and they deserve to have their concerns listened to by a Minister. I am not particularly concerned who it is. The Minister is a fine Minister but the problem is he has too much activity. He has too many responsibilities.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I could not resist rising to my feet and making a few comments, especially since the second in command and the first in command rose to their feet and made some comments about our Minister. A Government of the past that was so ineffective in its own management, in its own Administration in the Province, has the audacity to stand up and try to tell us that this Minister does not have the capabilities of administering his own Department. Now, what give you the right, when you cannot even manage an effective Question Period? You do not even have the ability to come in here and stand up and be able to ask a decent question that would give some enthusiasm to the gallery. In fact we just had some students in from Carbonear, I think it was, the Democracy Class, and the only concern they had was, how come the Leader of the Opposition has to be so petty as to be shouting back and forth those slurs across the House of Assembly, and we had to sit down, and then he spoke about all the Members of the Opposition and how they really could not effectively ask one question. You have the right to stand up here this afternoon and talk about the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs and say that he does not have the capability of administering his own Department.

Now far be it from ten years of

downward trod in this Province for you people to be able to stand up and tell this new Administration how they are going to manage and how they are going to run the affairs of their own Department. We are witnessing now a crisis in this Province that somebody has to take the responsibility of doing. Now we are blamed, six months in Administration we have the total blame on our shoulders. Eight months?

AN HON. MEMBER:

The 5th of May.

MR. EFFORD:

Eights months. The 5th of May, probably I cannot count. But I do not think you can take May 5 to November 28 and make eight months out of it. Now if you can you have changed around the calendar and that is another thing you have not done very affectively. You cannot even count. Now here is how you do it, one, two, three, four, five, six and then comes seven. You cannot make eight out of that. Six and a little bit.

But seriously, ten years and six months you have been in Administration and you have the audacity to stand over there and tell this Government that first of all, you have messed up the the fishery; secondly, you have messed up the whole provincial affairs, the whole municipalities in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. And then you have a former Minister, I do not know what he was the former Minister of because I spent a few months in his Department trying to figure out what he was doing. I believe at least four times he has stood to his feet since this Bill came before the House, and he kept repeating over and over again.

MR. TOBIN:
A quorum call.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

There are fourteen Members in the House.

There is a quorum in the House.

The hon. the Member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is quite obvious, if they cannot count to eight then they cannot count to fourteen. We will excuse the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Chairman, there were eleven Members in the House when the quorum call was called.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

There is a quorum in the House.

The hon. the Member for Port de Grave may continue.

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we on this side have absolutely no doubt in our minds where the future of Newfoundland and Labrador lies and especially, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. The youth, the recreation and the culture and the municipalities of this Province are not going to do

without, with the Minister in his position. They did without for ten years and let me assure you it is not hard to go around the Province and find out where the people of this Province are lacking in direction.

Now we can say there were a few Districts under the former Administration who did not do without, but most of the areas in the Province, Mr. Chairman, for ten years, the Port de Grave District for one right in the center of a Tory District did without for fifteen years, and especially in the last ten years. In fact the community of Bay Roberts, which has one of the better town councils in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador as far as administration from the mayor's level and the council's level is concerned, literally had to come in here on their hands and knees and beg for years and years for assistance. What did they get, Mr. Chairman? 'You are from a Liberal District and you cannot get any money.'

AN HON. MEMBER:
From where?

MR. EFFORD:
From the former Government and you know full well what we are talking about.

But under the new Minister and the new Department and the new Government that does not happen any more. That is the problem with the Leader of the Opposition and all you people over there because you cannot accept the fact that there is some fairness and balance going across this Province and you know it is going to pay off in the long run.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) the Liberals.

MR. EFFORD:

No, no. Make all the false accusations you like.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about recreation grants?

MR. EFFORD:

Recreation grants. When you spend approximately \$4 million - I do not know the exact figure, but let us say over the last ten years at about \$400,000 per year - about \$4 million in the last ten years being spent on recreation grants in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and 90 per cent of that goes to your own Districts. How in the world can you say now it is unfair, that some of the Districts that have done without for ten years, at least even try to get the catch-up amounts. It would take us another ten years to catch up for the mismanagement of the past. Now, if that is not fairness and balance, you explain to me what it is about. At least, this year, Progressive Conservative Districts and Liberal Districts got money. In the past, it was one-sided, P.C. only.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is that so?

MR. EFFORD:

Very much so. In fact, Ministers on this side of the House told it publicly. The Minister of Public Works at the time; the former Minister of Public Works, and Consumer Affairs, told it publicly. He was speaking for the Government he was representing. He told it in public meetings and to the news media; he told the Mayor of Upper Island Cove, 'If you do not vote Tory, do not even talk to us, you do not get anything.' And that was the

policy. Nobody on that side can deny that. Now, you see a policy where both sides of the House are treated on a fairly equal balance. The only difference is, you have communities on this Island that have not seen any recreation money for the last ten years. Now, what are you supposed to do?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is that so?

MR. EFFORD:

That is so! That is a fact.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

Your District.

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) when you were in there.

MR. EFFORD:

If I had my way, your District would get nothing for the next twenty years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:

Millions and millions of dollars went in there when everyone else did without, and you still want more and more and more. Give us a chance to catch up. Fairness and balance gives us a chance to catch up.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How much did Fogo District get?

MR. EFFORD:

When did I hear Fogo district got \$2 million? Was that not last year?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. EFFORD:
Was that not right, \$2 million?

MR. SIMMS:
(Inaudible) recreation (inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:
We are talking about the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, we are not talking only about one particular thing.

This spring, did you not get \$2 million, when an adjoining Liberal district got \$135,000.

AN HON. MEMBER:
I cannot remember that.

MR. EFFORD:
So, Mr. Speaker, if that is not treating the Opposition fairly, what is it?

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West, on a point of order.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up the Member's time, but I am sure he did not realize what he just said, that Burin - Placentia West should not get a cent for the next twenty years. I wonder would he like to apologize, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
There is no point of order.

The hon. the Member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it is lucky he is not going to have the purse strings, that is all I have to say.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, we are talking about a District - the Member for Fogo just said he was not being treated equally and fairly, when he got \$2 million, and there were two or three surrounding Liberal districts that, altogether, did not have that amount. What do you call fairness and balance?

MR. SIMMS:
From the same Department?

MR. EFFORD:
We are talking about the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, where we have a super Minister who is quite capable of doing that job. We know you are very envious because you know you could not run your Department.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:
I cannot believe, Mr. Chairman, what I just heard from the Member for Port de Grave, the things he said and how personal he became towards certain Members in the House.

Those of us who are trying to arrange meetings and so on, between the Minister and groups

from our Districts, councils and sports groups, recreation groups, arts groups and so on.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Come clean.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is exactly what I am doing. Now if the Member for Exploits over there should finish his lunch that he was having in the House there about ten minutes ago, perhaps he should get his dessert now and a little liqueur and then settle back and listen because a lot of the town managers, for instance, from my area of the Province have had difficulty with communication with the Department of Municipal Affairs, and -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

We did. We even had a cheque printed, we even had the cheque printed. At that time it was a Liberal District, by the way, a Liberal district. Fogo, Fortune-Hermitage, were Liberal district at the time. Bonavista north was and still is a Liberal District. And the cheques and the commitment was made to those Districts who were then Liberal. But that is beside the point. The problem is now the election is over, the election is over, and we have a Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs that has more responsibilities than the rest of the Cabinet put together. That is the point.

AN HON. MEMBER:
He is more capable.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I am not saying the man is not more capable. I will be the first to say he is very capable, but

capable of what, Mr. Chairman, is the question, capable of what.

Now my point was, before I was so rudely interrupted by those armchair speakers over there who never get up from their seats to speak in this House, is that a lot of the town managers, and mayors and so on from around the Province are having difficulty communicating with the Department of Municipal Affairs. It is difficult enough if a Minister only has responsibilities for Municipal affairs some 310 or 320 Municipalities from around the Province who are almost on a daily weekly basis after somebody in Municipal Affairs about something. I mean that is the realities of life, and we all know that. And to try and slough that off and say it is not so, it is not true. And then the Minister has got sport and youth and any others who have served in the portfolio of culture, recreation and youth, I can tell you something. It was often looked upon as being a junior portfolio in Government, but my honest belief is that if you could survive in culture, recreation and youth, then you would survive in any Department of Government. The demands were horrendous, and having spent three years in that particular Department, I know that the demands were horrendous. The groups that were lined up on your door, the invitations to go to all kinds of groups and association meetings, and annual meetings, were unbelievable. Arts banquets, Dart banquets and everything else, it was unbelievable. The Minister of Municipal Affairs has got all that thrown in on top of his Municipal Affairs responsibilities as well as housing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Soccer banquets.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Lots of soccer banquets. I never used to go to any of them, I used to send someone else, because I did not enjoy soccer very much as you all know.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You were a dirty soccer player.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, I was not dirty. I was very fair and clean, a very effective soccer player, very effective. Almost as effective as I am a politician, but not quite, I have had more successes in politics. A shut-out as a matter of fact in politics. Almost a shut-out in the last election, and I expect that this time there will be a shut-out in the District of Grand Bank in the next election. A shut-out.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How much did you win by?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Not quite as much as you. That was the last time though, we have to look forward to the next time now.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I am not running next time.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, I understand you are not running again, I understand that and I am sure there are very good reasons for that which we will probably know, I guess, before too long, but I can understand you saying that. But I am looking forward to the Member sitting over in the corner, to be very honest with you, as he threatened to do in the last few weeks, because we are expecting that we are soon going to get the report card on

the Member. I understand that it is going to be a good report, so that is why he is so chipper today. He is anticipating a good report, and I would say watch out then when he gets the good report, I would say the Premier better not tell him to be quiet, as he did today, and he got very annoyed with that, but the question of course -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is right. I know you got annoyed, and so you should you know. I gave up junior red cross in grade seven when you used to wear your junior red cross pin and pass the cap. That is what we are getting into here now, Junior Red Cross.

But anyway, getting back to the question of what happened to Fogo, is the big question, with recreation? What happened to Fogo? What happened to Harbour Breton with recreation? They were supposed to have a stadium and an arena which you cancelled, and you went on to say that you are not at the purse strings. And I said thank God he is not at the purse strings.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How much were you going to spend on the arena?

MR. MATTHEWS:

I do not know how much money went in the arena boy. That was all in the program, the major recreation program. It was a commitment over a four or five year period. We brought in the new program, I am not sure, I think it was something like a million, a million something a year, a million and a half a year for five years, I

believe was the intent of the program.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Was it thirty arenas?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Not thirty arenas, an arena costs 1.5 million dollars each pretty well. We could make commitments to three, that is right, make commitments to three that would be carried out and legally done, by the way, no order in council, that is right, just the studies were done, feasibility studies. We brought in, for the first time in this Province, the requirements for a feasibility study to be done, and that was the crux and the thrust of the new program. If the feasibility study did not show a particular kind of a facility was feasible in the area, then it did not go, if you did not have the written cooperation and documentation and commitment from a number of communities so that it was a regional approach, it did not go. And you people went in and destroyed it, you destroyed it. A swimming pool without water is very hard to dive into as the hon. Member knows, we have seen the results of a person diving into a dry swimming pool, when we look at the hon. Member, right there. That is exactly what happens. I saw something the other day about that, someone said something, if we could only get the swimming pool because we have got the diving board, and that reminds me of what the hon. gentleman said. Whether he used a diving board when he dove into the dry pool, I do not know, but he certainly landed with a lot of impact, there is no question. The Member for Port de Grave, yes, no water service. I do not know where that was, by the way, but there is one thing I do know, that

there will not be any swimming pools built in Newfoundland and Labrador as a part of this Government's Employment Programs, I will tell you that. There will not be any swimming pools built or any other recreational facilities built as a result of this Government's employment programs. I suppose the dear Minister is on her way to Ottawa now, with the Minister of Fisheries, winging her way up, and I would say that if the caucus over there and the Cabinet want to do something meaningful for Newfoundland and Labrador, they should rent an apartment for the Minister in Ottawa and ask her to stay up there. Ask her to stay in Ottawa because she will make just as big a contribution to the Province and to employment in this Province if she stayed in Ottawa. Absolutely nothing, it is an abysmal failure, I cannot speak for the Minister of Fisheries, so I do not know how he feels about things like that, whether he would want one apartment or two, I would rather not go on the record as trying to second guess the Minister of Fisheries on that, but there is one thing I do know about the Minister of Fisheries, that he is adamant about down-sizing the fishery in this Province, and putting people out of work. But getting back to the Minister of Cultural and Municipal Affairs. In all fairness to the man, under the circumstances, I am not surprised that he has slipped; he has slipped a little bit and that he has not handled the amalgamation question as properly as it should be handled, because with all those responsibilities he has in his lap, he had to slip on something, he had to slip, something had to go wrong. It just so happens it was amalgamation, if it was not, he

probably would have announced he was cancelling all the sports grants and recreation grants in the Province, but it had to be amalgamation. But sincerely, I want to go on record in this House as saying that the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs is too diverse, the Minister has too many responsibilities. It is no reflection on the Minister, no I want every thing to work for this Province, and as I said a little earlier, the Premier could give some of his responsibilities to some of the capable back benchers over there.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What capable backbenchers.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Hold on, there are some over there, and he could drop the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations and the Minister of Fisheries, he would still downsize his Cabinet by one and have a more effective Cabinet. That is exactly what he should do, and the Member for Port de Grave is turning around the Minister of Fisheries' seat, so I do not know what that says.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Member for Exploits.

MR. GRIMES:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure again, Mr. Chairman to rise in the House to speak to this proposed Amendment. I recognize the difficulties that Members opposite have in dealing with any of this substantial legislation in its present form, because there are a number of things that the current Government on this side of the House has embarked upon that they really have difficulty wrapping their minds about and understanding. One of them, of

course, is the very necessary, essential and proper restructuring of this Department.

I guess it fits in, Mr. Chairman, with the whole idea and notion that there are certain things every Member on this side of the House stands for and represents. They try to mimic and so on and poke fun at us, they even have difficulty saying the words. I just go back briefly away from the topic at hand to talk about a phrase that they tried to use relative to fairness and balance. They have talked about fairness and balance, Mr. Chairman, in relation to this Department and the Recreation Capital Grant Program announced by the Minister some time ago.

One of the things that we all recognize on this side of the House, is that when they try to talk about fairness and balance, most of them sort of stumble over the words and find it difficult to say because it is a concept that they certainly had no experience with. A concept that they find very difficult to understand and, therefore, translate into the the fact that a number of them even have difficulty saying it without tangling up the words and so on when they get up in the House because it does not come naturally to them. It is a forced expression that they have to try and use.

In the same breath, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out however that there is another word that they do use regularly when some of our Ministers stand and answer questions, that leaps quite readily to their lips and that is the word, arrogance. I have heard that one thrown out in the House on a number of occasions. Of

course, that is to be expected because that does come so naturally to the lips of the Members opposite because they practiced it and were so good at it for a long period of time. But when they get around to fairness and balance I guess their total lack of understanding of the concept makes it difficult for them to relate to it in any meaningful fashion.

One of the Members opposite, Mr. Chairman, in speaking to this amendment talked about people being upset at the large size of this newly organized and rearranged Department. I think there is a very big difference, Mr. Chairman, that should be noted in this House in terms of people being upset legitimately and registering that. And Members opposite standing in the House and saying that people are upset because they are going around telling them regularly that you should be upset, and are trying to create some kind of air of discontent about some of the things that are happening, particularly as it relates to this particular rearranged Department.

I get a completely different reaction, Mr. Chairman, when I go around and speak about this Department. We have people asking me about the rearrangement, particularly as it relates to Municipal and Provincial Affairs. They say, what about the Minister, is he overworked? Because, of course, they have been put up to asking that question by Members opposite, who would try to make them all believe that "Oh, yes, there is a Minister in there totally overworked and cannot cope with the new task in the Department, too many responsibilities and so on." But

in fact, by and large, most of them, as I mentioned in my comments a few days ago in the House, do in fact state, Mr. Chairman, that they find it very convenient, right, proper and fitting that this Government responds to them in the same way that they deal with things at their own level. Where they can come in with the same range of affairs that they would deal with on behalf of municipalities, they can deal with by going to one Ministry of Government instead of going to five or six. Far from being upset and critical, they even compliment this Government, the Minister, and the Premier for the rearrangement because it makes so much total sense.

Some people in this House have tried to lead us to believe the only thing that people in Newfoundland and Labrador have been complimenting the Premier on, is his stand on Meech Lake. Not true. The Premier and his Cabinet Ministers and in particular the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, have been complimented on the reorganization and the rearrangement of the Departments of Government. And they commend us for this one in particular.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GRIMES:
I would just mention in passing, the Meech Lake thing. I was somewhat surprised on Monday, yesterday, that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would introduce a motion again that somewhere in the preamble mentions, Meech Lake. I thought he would have taken on last Wednesday enough of a beating on that issue and would be hesitant

to stand in the House and take another beating. But I guess some people go home and lick their wounds and try to heal, others come in and ask for more punishment. I guess that is what will happen in the debate tomorrow. It will give Members on this side great pleasure to stand again and in a debate on a Private Member's Day and talk about Meech Lake.

So we have a couple of other things that have been mentioned in this debate in the last little while on this proposed amendment. One being, what about what happened to the money promised and the cheques that were made up for these recreation facilities and things like that? I guess, in fact, part of the review being conducted by this Minister and his Department is to make sure that when something is committed that the full commitment for the whole project will be there, and not just a couple of hundred thousand dollars that might turn a sod, put part of a basement in the ground and then leave it for five or six years, or at least four, before another election comes along before anything else is done with it. When it is announced by this Minister, the projects that do get approved, the full package will be in place and not some convenient granting of a couple of hundred thousand dollars to appease people, because that kind of an approach is one of the things that the populous of Newfoundland, and the constituents in at least thirty-one of the districts voted against in the last election on April 20. They had enough of those little one step at a time projects and they are looking forward to the fully planned, properly implemented programs that will come out of this Minister,

this Premier, and this Government on this side of the House. One of the things that did happen, unfortunately, during the past election, was a growing list of promises from Members of the Opposition who were in Government at the time, I guess one of the approaches taken was that, yes, when we get back in and when we re-form the Government, which was the conclusion that they had jumped to and never gave a thought to the fact that they might lose, and, I guess, you have to show that kind of confidence when you go to the polls and it is to be commended, but the preparation was lacking in terms of what you do afterwards. The kind of thing that when Members running for the opposite party in the election needed something to make a speech to a large group of people some promise was dreamed up, convenient and appropriate, and announced at the meeting. In my own District, for example, they were going to pave Kinsmen Drive for a few hundred thousand dollars or so, or a little less. Just before that meeting it was decided to announce that because that is what the people in Bishops Falls want to hear. Then after we re-form the Government we will go back and figure out when we will do it, either this year, the year after, or the year after, but announce it tonight. That kind of stuff, as well, was rejected at the polls by the people in the election on April 20.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude my few remarks by saying that far from people being upset, people are complimenting this Government and this Minister on the most appropriate and proper rearranging of this Department, to reflect the needs and concerns that are addressed by the

municipalities on a regular basis, and that they can deal with in a single Minister instead of several.

Thank you, very much.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We had indicated earlier that we were not going to unduly delay this particular section. There are thirty-odd sections left of this particular Bill yet, Mr. Chairman. But, of course, the Government cannot keep their House in order.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They cannot keep Doug in order.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No pun intended. We have been provoked by a couple of Members from the other side into having further comment on this particular section.

Mr. Chairman, the depth of the intellectual argument justifying making a mockery of all the activities that come under the Minister's Department, is just baffling. The hon. gentleman for Exploits (Mr. Grimes) said nothing to defend the amalgamation of all of those activities under one particular Department. The Member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) who spoke before him on behalf of the Government said nothing to defend bringing all those activities together under a particular Ministry. The Member for Port de Grave had a lot to say about first in command, and second in command on this side of the House, at least, Mr. Chairman, we are in command of something. The hon. gentleman is in command of nothing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. gentleman has been rising on a number of occasions over the last several days, Mr. Chairman, to do what, I do not know. I suppose it is to rally support in the back benches, you know, in case there has to be a last-ditch lobby effort to keep the hon. gentleman employed. I suppose he wants to ensure that he has plenty of friends in the back benches. Since he cannot get in on the 8th Floor he will have to have friends who can get in and lobby for him. That is the only reason I can find for his jumping to the front these last few days.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) all around the Province.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, that might very well be so, Mr. Chairman. I do not know if there are all kinds of letters, telegrams and petitions and so on, coming in.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Send the Premier on to Meech Lake.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I might consider that if the hon. gentleman would consider coming down with me. I tell you, if he wants his clock cleaned, come on! So let not his arrogance run away with him, Mr. Chairman. He is not invincible.

That is the only thing I can figure, Mr. Chairman, he is just trying to beef up a bit of support in the back benches in case he might need it.

MR. MATTHEWS:

He has had to go to the Premier three times now, you know.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I know, Mr. Chairman. The word is out, Mr. Chairman. The Premier had the Member for Port de Grave in his office three times - not once, not twice, Mr. Chairman - three times before he finally agreed to ask to be relieved of his duties.

MR. TOBIN:

Before he signed it.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Before he finally signed it. There were three visits. It was not the first visit to the 8th Floor that the letter was signed, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EFFORD:

You have got it all wrong.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No, I have not got it all wrong. We have heard, Mr. Chairman, from very reliable sources that there were three visits made.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And he was devastated.

MR. RIDEOUT:

He was devastated, Mr. Chairman, totally devastated, and I do not blame him, to tell you the truth. I do not blame him. Because, to act on the information that was in that particular document without other information - I do not know if the Premier had other information or not - I think it was pretty insensitive. So I do not blame the Member for being totally disgruntled.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

I heard about the five o'clock caucus. Yes, I heard about it.

Mr. Chairman, the other functions

in this particular Section. The Minister has some heavy responsibilities under this particular Section. I mentioned some of them the first opportunity I had. There are still others. The Minister is responsible for the state correspondence, the keeping of all state records and papers not especially transferred to other Departments. So the Minister has responsibility for every state document; he is the registrar; I think you would call it, in Government terms. He is the official registrar for the Province. The Minister also has the onerous responsibility of being responsible for standards and for metric conversion.

Mr. Chairman, where is the Minister going to get time to figure out how many inches are in a centimeter, and all that kind of stuff? He has to go around now and promote inches and centimeters and centimeters and inches; he has to go around to the schools and give lectures on this new metric system.

The point we are making, Mr. Chairman, has been made before and we are making it again under this particular Section, and it is that there is just too much crammed into that Department, absolutely too much. You do not necessarily have to set up another Department to manage some of those affairs, they could be shared with other Departments that have very little. There is a Minister without Portfolio for the last months who has been doing nothing but going around to Christmas tree lightings.

MR. EFFORD:

I am very proud of that.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Sure, there is nothing wrong with it.

But for the Premier to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has been relieved of his responsibilities and for the Member - I do not know if he is a Minister or is not a Minister - to be saying that he is Minister of Social Services at those particular functions is wrong. Either the Member is wrong or the Premier is wrong; both of them cannot be right.

MR. EFFORD:

What do you want me to be, an old scrooge?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, you are an old scrooge. We know that, Mr. Chairman. We know the hon. Member is a scrooge. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. Chairman, on top of that, the Minister also has the responsibility for communications. As if he did not have enough work to do with municipalities, and with recreation, and with culture, he now has communications as part of his responsibility. I mean, the hon. gentleman is not going to be able to see over the top of his desk, if he ever goes in there. He has to be buried with the administrative functions that are contained in this particular Section. He has to be. There is no way around it.

MR. SIMMS:

He is not loosing any weight over it, though, I can tell you that.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I do not know if the Minister has taken as his personal motto or not, Mr. Chairman, that everything he signs he must read before he

signs it, because if that is the case, which is certainly what ministerial responsibility is all about, the Minister will not even have time, in the run of a day, to sign letters that go out, let alone Cabinet papers and policy papers and briefs from the various organizations, and so on, from all around the Province.

Mr. Chairman, as we said, we know the Government majority will defeat this particular amendment. We are not under any allusions, but we do want to take the opportunity, once again, to point out in this Committee what people in the Province are telling us, which is simply this, that the Minister has too much to do. It is not that he is not a competent Minister, not that he is not a good Minister, but the Minister has just been given too much responsibility. He cannot perform it, no one individual can perform it, and as a result not only municipal affairs will suffer, but sport and recreation is suffering, cultural affairs is suffering, everything from the fauna to the bogs are suffering, and the Minister does not have the time in the run of a day to carry out the responsibility that has been given to him. That is unfair to the Minister, it is unfair to the Government, and it is definitely unfair to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Do you want to carry the Bill?

The amendment, as put forward by the Opposition Leader, is that Clause 6, Section 6(a)(vi) to (xvi) be deleted.

On motion, the amendment was defeated.

On motion, Clauses 6 through 11, carried.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Chairman, I just want to make this point. The point we were trying to make throughout the debate this afternoon is clear, I hope, to members opposite, and I hope it is clear to the press, in particular, who may report this. The point is we have a responsibility as an Opposition to bring forth the views and concerns of the people we represent as an Opposition, and I can assure you that the points we raised during this debate, and in the debate on second reading, were not folly points or foolish points, they were serious points. People have a lot of concerns about amalgamation. Even the staunchest Liberal Members of the Government opposite would have to confess that amalgamation has created quite a stir in the community at large, the Province.

The other point we have -

AN HON. MEMBER:
What are you on now?

MR. SIMMS:
I am speaking to Clause 11. Is the Minister following the Bill? And I am making a couple of points.

The other point we have been trying to emphasize is the size of the Department. For those Members opposite who think that perhaps

the arguments we have put forth with respect to that point are not very strong, they are living in a dream world. Because I can assure you there are groups out there, recreation groups, cultural groups, youth groups and other groups, who now come under this large umbrella Department, who have expressed concerns to each and every one of us over on this side because they are losing their identity. They have concerns about that, and they have concerns about the fact that the Minister -

MR. GRIMES:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
If the Member for Exploits would close his yap, I might be able to get my words out.

AN HON. MEMBER:
And he is not in his seat.

MR. SIMMS:
He is not even in his own seat, Mr. Chairman. You should name him and kick him out of the Legislature. And the Government House Leader should perhaps control his Members.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please! Order, please!
Order, please!

Is the hon. Member speaking to Clause 11?

MR. SIMMS:
Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Okay.

MR. SIMMS:
I have just indicated that, as soon as I can get -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

It is not hard to tell the Premier is gone, I will tell you that. A bunch of crackies over there! A bunch of crackies!

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, the second point I was trying to make - if Members could control themselves, we could get through this fairly quickly. If they had the sense to follow the lead of the Government House Leader, maybe we could get through this.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

I am trying to make this second point, that there are concerns out there being expressed by the people of the Province because -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!
Order!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, I shall try again to make the point that we have been expressing concerns on behalf of the people we represent as an Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Somehow or other, that is wrong according to Members over there.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, because concerns have been passed on to us. People cannot get to see the Minister. It is too large a Department. It is too difficult for him to carry out the administrative responsibilities associated with such a large Department.

So those are the two points. But, Mr. Chairman, we also recognize and realize that the business of the House must go on. We must get on with the business of the House. We recognize that.

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Forestry starts to interrupt. If he wants to continue, we can certainly keep it going. We have the right to do so. There are forty-three Clauses in this Bill. We can debate each Clause by Clause; we can have a Division vote on each Clause, which takes ten minutes to handle. So, if Members do not want to get into all that, please let Members of the Opposition have their say. If you have nothing to say in the debate - I notice the Minister of Forestry did not open his gob, but he is here now to interrupt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Do not go 'oh-ing' after the words in that Hansard of yesterday!

MR. SIMMS:

I make this point, Mr. Chairman. Since we recognize that the Government will have its way, then we are willing to take our lumps on the Bill. We have made our points, I think, and I think we have made our points well. All the speakers on this side have made their points.

MR. BAKER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

If the Government House Leader will just be patient, I am about

to get to that suggestion. I wanted to make the points that I made, and I want to tell him we are prepared to take our lumps. We know we cannot win the vote, although we almost caught the Government earlier today. So, we are prepared, in the interest of time, to suggest that we deal with Clauses 11, which we are now debating, to 43 inclusive, if that is acceptable, and we will get on with whatever other item of business the Government might want to deal with today or next Thursday. We will have many more opportunities, Mr. Chairman, many more, including third reading, by the way, I might add. I tell my colleagues on this side, if anybody has concerns, there are precedence in this House for debate on third reading. And if we are forced to, and if there are provocations across the way, we will certainly use our rights.

MR. EFFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

The hon. the Member for Port de Grave on a point of order.

MR. EFFORD:

I do not want to take up the time of the House, but I am sure the hon. Member did not realize, when he was using the words yap and gob, that there were people in the galleries. I would like to apologize to the House and to the people sitting in the galleries for the uncharacteristic manner in which that language was used across the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order. The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

That is a typical effort by the Member for Port de Grave to try to play to the galleries, Mr. Chairman. I was provoked, and if the people in the galleries were here, they would certainly have seen that I was provoked. And if I said a word that was unparliamentary, which I did not - gob and yap are not unparliamentary. He should not be interrupting the House with such foolish and spurious points of order, and trying to play to the galleries.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, we suggest that we go from 11 to 43 inclusive.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I move that we stop the clock for a couple of minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed to stop the clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. BAKER:

The Opposition House Leader was talking in terms of precedents for debating third reading and so on, and I would like to say that if we were to look back through the record we could find precedents in this House for just about anything. So, I agree that we can probably find precedents for that. But I do think it is a good idea, Mr. Chairman, if we do Clauses 11 to 43 and then the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is there a consensus on that? Do we have concurrence on clauses 11 to 43.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Carried.

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Municipal And Provincial Affairs." (Bill No. 29).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment, carried.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. A. SNOW:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matter to them referred and have asked me to report having passed Bill 29 without amendment, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Bill No. 29 ordered read a third time, on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind Members that the Private Member's debate tomorrow is on the Motion by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition presented to the House yesterday.

I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow, and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 2:00 p.m.