



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

First Session

Number 28

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Tuesday

[Preliminary Transcript]

7 November 1989

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Lush):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, I rise today to table in the House a constitutional proposal for an alternative to the Meech Lake Accord which I intend to use as a working document at the First Minister's Conference. Honourable Members are aware of the Government's deep concerns with the Meech Lake Accord, concerns which have most recently been clearly described in reports of the Manitoba Task Force and the New Brunswick Select Committee, and by an extraordinary number of citizens and interest groups across Canada. The former Government of Newfoundland approved the Resolution adopting the Accord with the full knowledge of the many concerns raised. It stated, as did a number of other provincial Governments, that the concerns raised on the deficiencies of the Accord were not sufficiently serious to seek amendments. I do not agree. And the Government does not agree. It is my unwavering belief that implementation of the Accord in its present form would have disastrous consequences, not only for the Province of Newfoundland, but for the nation. Implementation of the Accord in its present form would prevent forever the achievement of a proper economic and political future for the Province. It would prevent forever the achievement of

equality of opportunity for the people of Newfoundland vis-à-vis other Canadians and keep them in an permanent state of economic disparity. It would as well prevent Newfoundland from ever becoming a full participating province of Canada. I should emphasize that we support the Accord's objective of accommodating the special concerns of the Quebec Government so that it will willingly support the 1982 Constitutional reforms. But as desirable as achieving that political approbation is, our Government cannot agree to achieving it at a price that will prevent Newfoundland and Labrador from ever becoming a full participating province of Canada and will keep our people in a permanent state of economic disparity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:
In our view the Meech Lake Accord goes far beyond what is necessary to accommodate the legitimate concerns of Quebec and would, at the very least, prevent forever the kind of Canada the vast majority of its people espouse and desire. At worst, it could result in the destruction of the nation in a relatively short time.

Newfoundland accepts fully the need to achieve an acceptable constitutional accommodation of Quebec's concerns and will participate constructively in all future negotiations toward that end. We believe that such negotiations can and must result in a compromise that will be fairly and properly responsive to Quebec's five original demands but will also be reasonably acceptable to the majority of the people of

Canada. Such a compromise must leave us with a unified Canada made up of ten provinces, equal in their status and rights as provinces, and territories with a realistic opportunity to become provinces at an appropriate time. It must also recognize the fundamental equality of all citizens of Canada. The reopening of constitutional negotiations should not, therefore, be regarded in a negative light.

The government recognizes that it is not sufficient to simply express objection to the Meech Lake Accord. For this reason it has developed an alternative to the Accord which, it believes, meets not only the concerns of the government, but also is sincerely responsive to the legitimate concerns of the government of Quebec and the equally legitimate concerns and aspirations of Canadians in the other provinces.

In arriving at a new compromise, however, I cannot overemphasize the urgent need to open up the constitutional reform process to allow for meaningful public debate and the full participation of the people of Canada in deciding these important issues. Constitutional change is not simply a matter for prime ministers and premiers; it must meet with the approval of a substantial majority of the people of the country. I believe that the worst flaw in the Meech Lake Accord is the process that resulted in the eleven first ministers telling the 26 million people of Canada how they will be governed in the future, instead of the 26 million people of Canada telling the eleven first ministers how they will govern.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

Newfoundland's primary concerns with the Accord are threefold.

First, the government is concerned with the creation of a special legislative status for one province. The government does not object to the recognition of Quebec as a distinct society in the Constitution. On the basis of language, culture and legal system, Quebec is distinctly different from any other society in Canada. That does not, however, make it distinctly different, in its status and rights as a province from any other province of Canada. But the recognition of Quebec as a distinct society in the constitution, must not impact on the Charter of Rights and Freedoms or affect the distribution of legislative powers between the federal and provincial legislatures. Clearly, it must not create a special legislative status for one province different from that of the other nine provinces.

Section 2 of the Meech Lake Accord, however, gives the Quebec legislature and government the special role "to preserve and promote the distinct identity of Quebec referred to" It therefore creates a special legislative status for one province. No federation is likely to survive for very long if one of its supposedly equal provinces has a legislative jurisdiction in excess of that of the other provinces.

Our great concern is that the special constitutional role accorded to the legislature and government of Quebec would be used to enact laws further restricting Quebec's linguistic minority, similar to Quebec's recently

passed Bill 178. Such actions then trigger resentment and negative reactions in other provinces. Those actions and reactions would serve only to increase prejudices and drive an even bigger wedge between French and English Canadians, and mutual resentment would inevitably build to the point where its divisive force could no longer be contained. With the rigid amending formula the Accord would impose there would be no way to reverse the situation. Canada would inevitably evolve into two linguistic enclaves and the end of the nation, as we know it, would not likely be far off.

In our view, the most effective way to ensure the survival of the French language and culture in North America is not through isolating Quebec but through cooperative efforts across the Canadian federation to strengthen our bilingual character and, over time, expand the level of bilingualism from coast to coast. This would also result in the promotion of the rights of francophone minorities outside Quebec instead of destruction of those rights that would be the most likely result of the special legislative status accorded Quebec under the Meech Lake Accord. At the same time it would protect the rights of English Canadians within Quebec.

Second, Mr. Speaker, the government is concerned that the restrictions on the federal spending power will prevent the achievement of equality of opportunity for the people of Newfoundland vis-à-vis other Canadians and keep them in a permanent state of economic disparity.

For a small province like Newfoundland, it is important to have a strong central government with the capacity to initiate and implement national social and economic programs designed to promote equal opportunity for all Canadians and to redress regional disparities. This includes national programs in areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction whereby the federal government, while not of course administering the program, establishes firm minimum national standards and ensures that all provinces have sufficient financial resources to implement the program and adhere to those standards. However, the government understands the Quebec government's concern that unilateral federal action in the exercise of its spending power could encroach on exclusive provincial jurisdiction. Nevertheless, the Meech Lake provisions would so restrict or inhibit the use of the spending power that it would gravely undermine the federal government's ability to establish national programs with minimum national standards.

The ability to opt out of national cost-shared programs (particularly in the case of the larger provinces) and receive compensation would create a tremendous disincentive for the federal government even to initiate new national programs. If, as is likely, Ontario and/or Quebec opt out and demand compensation, the federal government would be relegated to a sterile role as chief cashier. Inevitably, the result will be a patchwork of programs across the country with different standards, a reluctance to develop such programs and a steadily weakening commitment to reduce regional

disparities and promote equal opportunities for all Canadians especially in the poorer, disadvantaged regions. Equally inevitably, this will steadily weaken our sense, however fragile, of the national community.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the government is concerned with the extension of the constitutional veto to all provinces that will effectively destroy all hope of Senate reform and prevent Newfoundland and Labrador from ever becoming a full participating province of Canada.

The government is of the opinion that Newfoundland and Labrador and the smaller provinces have little or no hope of ever achieving their rightful place in the Canadian federation until Canada has a Triple-E Senate. The exercise of national legislative and spending power must not only be acceptable to the majority of the people of Canada, it must also be acceptable to a majority of the provinces. That acceptability can only be measured through a Senate which is elected, has equal representation from all provinces and has power to ensure that its vote will be effective.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:
Federal legislation and spending power must be exercised in a way that balances the interest of the majority of the people found in the two large provinces with the interest of the people of the other eight provinces. The future, therefore, of all of the less populous provinces of Canada is dependent upon having an amending formula that will not make Senate reform virtually

impossible.

In conclusion, it has been argued that to seek an alternative to the Accord will lead to a constitutional impasse. I do not agree. We have also heard much apocalyptic "Meech Lake or nothing" rhetoric that only serves to stir up divisions and intolerance. I find this irresponsible.

I believe that the Accord can be opened up and amended to address the concerns raised, and at the same time achieve a realistic accommodation for the Province of Quebec.

Constitutions, Mr. Speaker, are not made for months or years. These amendments will govern the working of Canada and federal-provincial relationships for many decades, indeed centuries, to come. I am firmly convinced that we must be satisfied that any amendment to our Constitution will benefit the whole of Canada and all of its citizens. The 1987 Constitutional Accord does not meet this purpose.

Consequently, I would ask the support of all Members of the House of Assembly to endorse the Government's position on this matter.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, under this Order of Business on an ordinary routine day of business in this House, my first words would be to compliment the Premier in this case, or a Minister, for having the courtesy of providing the document concerned, the Ministerial Statement and the attachments, to the Opposition for their consideration before the House met, well in advance.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important document, a very technical document, but yet the Premier who seeks consensus, who seeks the support of this House, who wants Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and Canadians to believe that he is the consensus seeker, makes all of this available to the Official Opposition to have a detailed comment on, at ten minutes to two this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame!

MR. RIDEOUT:

And I say shame on the Premier for that kind of action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame!

MR. RIDEOUT:

This particular press statement, Mr. Speaker, which the Premier has a press conference scheduled to deliver to the media of this Province, is in the hands of the press gallery at this very moment, and the Opposition gets it to look at at around ten minutes or five minutes to two this afternoon. So much, Mr. Speaker, for wanting the

support of the Opposition, and the people of this Province and the Legislature on this particular matter, I say to the Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right on! It shows his contempt.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say a few brief remarks in the brief time that I have had to analyze this particular document on the matter at hand. First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Premier that the Premier has no mandate from the people of this Province to propose changes to the Meech Lake Accord. The Premier had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

- seven months ago to say to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador unequivocally and beyond doubt that he had the gravest of difficulty with the Meech Lake Accord - and he choose not to do so, Mr. Speaker. The Premier sent a document to all parts of this Province talking about agriculture and education and electoral reform and another things that the Government planned to do, but there was not one iota of mention of constitutional reform or rescinding approval for Meech Lake, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Right on!

MR. RIDEOUT:

That Premier and this Government has no mandate from the people of this Province to tinker with the Meech Lake Accord.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the Members on this side of the House listened to the Premier in silence, with one exception. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the same courtesy.

Now Mr. Speaker, having said that, what the Premier is doing here today, having had the opportunity to do it in a public manner, and failing in the intestinal fortitude to do it, is an affront to democracy in this Province, Mr. Speaker. The Premier has made no effort, no effort in seven months in office, to seek the advice of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador on how they feel on the Meech Lake Accord.

Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, he has carried on a charade, a crusade from one end of Canada to the other talking about his objections to the Accord, but he did not have the intestinal fortitude of Premier McKenna or Premier Filmon to strike a legislative committee if he felt so strongly about it: make his proposals available for a change, to the people of the Province, and send a committee of this legislature hither and yon around this Province to hear what they have to say in Ming's Bight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

He did not have the intestinal fortitude to send a legislative committee of this Legislature to Ming's Bight to hear what they had to say, Mr. Speaker, he did not do it. The other Premiers, Mr. Speaker, who objected - we did not object - the other Premiers who objected at least had the leadership and the capacity and the courage to put forth their objections, to put forth their

alternate proposals, and to send it out to the people of their Province for their input - and ask for input.

Now Mr. Speaker, on the eve of a major constitutional conference, we have this Premier tabling today, in a not very good fashion in the Legislature, a new set of proposals to take to the Constitutional Table. The people of this Province have had no input into it, Mr. Speaker. And the Premier has the gall then, to stand in this House and say that one of the most flawed things about Meech Lake, is that eleven people gathered in a room in secrecy in Ottawa and redid the Constitution of Canada. Well I say to him, what is he doing today. He has gathered in his Cabinet room with his mandarins, Mr. Speaker, and drew up this document, that may or may not be flawed, but nobody in Newfoundland and Labrador has had an opportunity to have input into it. Nobody will have an opportunity to have input to it before he takes it to the Constitutional Table tomorrow. They may or may not have an opportunity to have input into it at some other point down the road, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the basis of the Premiers objection to this particular accord. Senate reform, for example, one of the greatest proponents of senate reform in Canada, Mr. Speaker, is the Premier of Alberta, Premier Getty. And he happens to be also one of the most staunch supporters of the Meech Lake Accord. Now is it possible that Premier Getty and a whole range of other Constitutional experts in Canada, and governments in Canada are

wrong, and we have the greatest wisdom ever to inherit the face of the earth in this Province. Is that possible, Mr. Speaker? They are all wrong? But Premier Getty is the fiercest proponent of the Triple-E Senate, but yet he believes it can be accommodated under the provisions of the Meech Lake Accord. And let me say to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, let me say unequivocally and clear today, that if we are going-

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:
- I did not have a degree in English, I will do the best that I can with the handicaps I have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have a Triple-E Senate in Canada, there has to be authority taken from somewhere to make that new Federal, and note I said Federal, legislative body function. The authority will have to come from either the Government of Canada, The House of Commons, or it would have to come from the Provinces. And I say Mr. Speaker that The House of Commons is not prepared and will not be prepared to give up one iota of power to an elective Senate. I say further Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Quebec and the Government of Ontario will not be prepared to give up one iota of legislative jurisdiction to an elected Senate. So an elected Senate can happen under Meech Lake, because it is part of the Accord if all of the Provinces agree, but it will never happen unless you have the support of Ontario and Quebec and the Parliament of Canada, and I

say very, very unlikely, indeed. So Mr. Speaker, the Premier is putting up straw men, that is what he is doing, putting up straw men, and I do not want to see the Premier - after his first Premier's conference - the only Premier in the history of Canada, as far as I know, to complain that Provinces have too much authority. So Mr. Speaker, I do not want to see the authority of this Legislature transferred from St. John's, Newfoundland, to Ottawa, Ontario, I do not want to see that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would be far happier to see authority transferred from Ottawa, Ontario to St. John's, Newfoundland, that is what I would like to see.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but as one Newfoundlander, my fundamental view of Canada differs fundamentally from the Premier, and I do not believe in the strong Trudeau type central Government that will be, that will try to control every aspect of life in this country. I existed in Government under it, we fought under it, we were the victims of that kind of Government, and I do not want to see that ever return to Canada again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
For once in our life Mr. Speaker, for once in the forty odd years that we have been a part of

Confederation, we had an opportunity, if Meech Lake is approved, to try to achieve some constitutional say, not jurisdiction, but some constitutional right to be consulted about the most important industry that we have in this Province, the Fishery, and the Premier is prepared to throw that possibility down the drain Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker we see today from this Government, a Government that was in power seven months, a major, major constitutional document. We did not see that same Government coming forth yesterday with a major, major program to address the failure of the Fishery. I say shame.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now Mr. Speaker, the energy, if there is any energy in this Government, has been misdirected into a constitutional crusade that is the Premier's personal crusade. Obsession, it is the Premier's personal obsession and he talks about breaking up the country in strident language. Mr. Speaker, the Premier has boxed himself into a corner over the last six or seven months using language like 'the country disintegrating' 'in an unswerving belief' and all this kind of thing, that he cannot get out of the box. How is he going to go to the constitutional table tomorrow and say I am prepared to compromise, I am prepared to listen. You are not prepared to do anything, if your proposal is not accepted, that is the bottom line coming from this Premier, Mr. Speaker. Now Mr. Speaker it would all be fine and dandy if the Premier were prepared, had the fortitude to be prepared to put

this information before the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. If the other eleven first Ministers, two or three years ago, were guilty Mr. Speaker, of building a constitution without consulting the Premier, without consulting the people, this Premier is equally as guilty, if not guiltier, Mr. Speaker. I say to the Premier tonight, go on to Ottawa, go with your personal hobbyhorse, go with your personal obsession, but be prepared at some point in time to be able to tell the people of Harbour Deep how this is going to improve their lives tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

You all supported Meech Lake last year. You all voted for it. You all supported it last year, when Leo Barry was Leader.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is right.

MR. TOBIN:

The Member for Gander supported it last year, and the Minister of Fisheries supported it last year.

Oral Questions

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. I had a quote from

the October 30 Hansard, but with all the rest of the documents I have here today, I seem to be missing it. Somebody just opened it to page R2.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier, in a statement to the House on October 30, regarding the allegations that had been made against the Minister of Social Services, the Member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), allegations that were not made by the Opposition, by the way, let it be known -

MR. SIMMS:
That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT:
- the Premier brought the information before the House in a Ministerial Statement, the allegations were made by other people. But, Mr. Speaker, the Premier, in speaking to the House on that matter that day, as recorded in his written statement, and on page R2 of Hansard for October 30, made the following statement in talking about the Member for Port de Grave, and I quote: 'Accordingly he has asked that I relieve him of responsibility as a Minister and as Minister for Social Services until the allegations have been thoroughly examined and a determination made as to whether or not there was any impropriety by the Member.'

The Premier goes on to say on page L3 of the same Hansard, that he had acceded to the Member's request to do that. And I point out again, Mr. Speaker, the request was that the Premier remove the Minister as a Minister, first of all -

PREMIER WELLS:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
That is what you said. It is in Hansard.

MR. RIDEOUT:
It is in Hansard, yes, and it is in the Premier's written statement.

- as a Minister and as Minister of Social Services.

MR. SIMMS:
Right on!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, this past weekend at the party convention in Gander, the Premier is quoted as saying he insisted, 'that he, Mr. Efford, is still the Minister of Social Services.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier the following question: How could he relieve the Member for Port de Grave from his responsibility as a Minister, as he said in his his statement and as is recorded in Hansard, and as a Minister of Social Services, as the Premier told this House, and yet insist at his party convention that he is still the Minister of Social Services?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
It is very simple, Mr. Speaker. It is made clear in the original statement, which the hon. the Leader of the Opposition just now equated with 'remove him'. I have not removed anybody. I have, at his request, relieved him of responsibility. He does not have to discharge -

MR. RIDEOUT:
As a Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER WELLS:

If hon. Members will allow me, I will answer; if not, I will sit down. If they want the answer, I will give it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Answer the question. And give us the truth this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

What a chicken! What a chicken!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. RIDEOUT:

When the Premier gets cornered, he gets sookie and wants to take his game and go home, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Silly and childish. Silly and stupid.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Silly and stupid and childish, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier knows well the precedent of Marcel Masse in the federal Parliament. When certain allegations were made against him, he was removed from Cabinet until the investigation was over and then he was put back in Cabinet again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier this: In view of the fact that the President of the Council told the House yesterday

that the Member for Port de Grave no longer attends Cabinet meetings - I assume that is correct - no longer occupies the Minister's office in the Department of Social Services, could the Premier tell the House on what basis the Member for Port de Grave has access to perks like a ministerial car, travel, entertainment I suppose, any of the things that are normally available to Ministers, including salary? On what basis does the Member for Port de Grave have access to the privileges of a Minister?

PREMIER WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to explain the basis.

The Minister asked to be - and those are the words that were in the statement and the words I said in the House - relieved of the responsibility of his duties as Minister of Social Services and as a Minister. Accordingly, I asked the Minister of Health (Mr. Decker) to discharge the responsibilities of Minister of Social Services, and the Minister of Social Services does no longer attend the Cabinet or does no longer work in his office, for the few days or week or two weeks or whatever it will take to complete this assessment. There is no reason for him to be removed or to resign as Minister unless the assessment that is being done by Mr. Justice Mahoney warrants it. We will make that decision when we receive the assessment and not before.

Therefore, he not having resigned, I not having asked him to remove himself as the Minister, he remains the Minister for Social Services being relieved of his duties and not attending Cabinet. It is very simple. So his pay

goes on, and whatever else is attendant upon it continues on, and it is very straightforward. That is exactly what is in Hansard.

MR. SIMMS:
Measly words.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I have quoted to the Premier what is in Hansard and what was in his own statement, and that is what is in Hansard. Mr. Speaker, how can the Premier have such a brass face on him as to tell this House one thing, i.e., that the Minister was relieved of his duties as a Minister and as Minister of Social Services, how can he do that, and use another forum to tell the people of the Province something else, that he is still my Minister of Social Services? How can the Premier, in other words, mislead the House, mislead the public and mislead the people of this Province into thinking that he fired that particular Minister? How can he do it?

MR. SIMMS:
Including the press.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Including the press.

PREMIER WELLS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, I will answer the question civilly, even though it

was not asked very civilly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:
Too bad!

PREMIER WELLS:
That is right! I am quite prepared to answer questions that are reasonably civil, but I am not prepared to take that kind of childishness from the Leader of the Opposition.

Now, it is fairly simple. I did not mislead anybody. I said in the House what I said everywhere, the Minister has been relieved. Now, if the Leader of the Opposition for his own crass political purposes wants to equate that with firing the Minister and say that I said the Minister was fired, he can be silly and do that and make a fool of himself all over the Province, if he wishes. But I stand by what I said in the House on the first day. The position is no different. The Minister of Social Services has been relieved of his duties as Minister of Social Services. He has been relieved of his responsibilities as a Minister. He remains the Minister and will remain until I hear the decision from Judge Mahoney.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I could not care less whether the Premier likes the way

I ask a question or not. What I am interested in is how the Premier answers the question. That is what the people of this Province are interested in. And, Mr. Speaker, if that is the constitutional logic according to Clyde, God help us when he gets to the constitutional table tomorrow on Meech Lake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Premier, can the Premier -

MR. MURPHY:
(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, is there anything in Beauchesne to silence the hon. landslide gentleman for St. John's South (Mr. Murphy)?

AN HON. MEMBER:
No.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, will the Premier tell the House -

MR. MURPHY:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
Now, boys, listen! Clyde is still here. You are not supposed to speak.

MR. RIDEOUT:
That is right, you can only do that tomorrow and the next day, while he is away.

MR. MURPHY:
I can do it anytime.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:
Oh! Revolt over there.

MR. SIMMS:
Away to go Murphy, boy! Away to go, Murphy! You will never get in the Cabinet that way, boy!

MR. MURPHY:
No, and you will not either.

MR. SIMMS:
I would not want to be in that Cabinet.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, having gone through the convoluted logic of saying you are in and you are out, you are not in and you are not out but yet you are still a minister, can the Premier tell the House who is going to make the final judgement? After the so-called investigation report comes to the Government, who is going to make the final judgement then on whether the hon. gentleman for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) is out or in, or is a Minister without portfolio, or a lay Minister, or an extraordinary Minister, or whatever kind of Minister he is going to be? Who is going to make that judgement, him or Mr. Justice Mahoney?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:
I am, Mr. Speaker. I will make the judgement.

MR. RIDEOUT:
So the judging is done. You do not need the Judge.

MR. WINDSOR:
The dictator speaks again.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Fisheries. In light of the very negative response from all regions of the Province to the Minister's statements in the House yesterday, and in the public media last night, regarding the provincial government's unwillingness to become involved in financially supporting the Fisheries Emergency Response Program, I would like to ask the minister if he or the Government has reconsidered becoming involved in this program to alleviate hardship for 3,500 fishermen and fish plant workers in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, on November 6 we received a copy of the press release that came from the minister announcing their program. Up until 3 o'clock yesterday, their own office here in Newfoundland was not even aware of the details of the program. We have been trying to get it all day, by the way, and have not received it. So, until we find out exactly what they are going to do and the types of programs they are going to initiate, we are certainly not going to jump in and do anything. We want to wait and find out what they are going to do first.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that everyone in Newfoundland and

Labrador knew of the crisis in the fishery this year, yet the minister stands in his place again today and says he does not know what he is going to do about it. This is the fifth year for an Emergency Response Program in the fishery, Mr. Speaker, and the first year that the provincial government has not financially supported this program in one way or the other. I would like to ask the Minister if this is part of the Government's plan to downsize the fishery in this Province and to force thousands of fishermen and fish plant workers out of the industry?

MR. W. CARTER:

No, Mr. Speaker, it is not.

MR. RIDEOUT:

According to what you were saying on TV last night, they have to get out.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, the statements over the past few weeks about the tightening up of loan guarantees that will force fish companies out of business, and the Premier's statement about the Province becoming less reliant on the fishery, and the reluctance of the Government to become involved in the Special Response Program will force thousands of our Newfoundlanders and Labradorians out of fishing industry. You are going to starve them this winter by not providing them with enough work to get unemployment insurance benefits, and you are going to starve them out of the industry, because they will not be able to afford to go back into the industry next year. My supplementary to the Minister is,

what is he going to do for those Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, thousands of them, who will not be able to afford to become involved in the fishing industry next year? Where will they make their living next year, in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I repeat my first answer: We are going to wait until we see what the federal government is doing; we are going to wait and see just how effective the \$5 million they have announced will be in responding to the program, and, after that, we will then make a decision.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, there will be thousands more Newfoundlanders left the Province by then. Maybe they are going to put a bid out on the Ambrose Shea to take them out of the Province. I would like to direct this supplementary to the Premier. I guess the Premier is very much aware that the real results of quota cuts will not be felt in this Province until next year. The fisheries crisis, by the calls that have come into our office over the last twenty-four hours, is perceived by the people from the Northern Peninsula to the South Coast of Labrador as being more important to their livelihoods than Meech Lake. I would like to ask the Premier, in light of the present fisheries crisis, is he going to appoint a fisheries specialist, like the one you have appointed as constitutional expert, from Osgoode Hall?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER WELLS:

It is hardly worthy of an answer, Mr. Speaker. That kind of nonsensical question is really unworthy of a member who is really concerned about the fishery. Let me tell the House of the level of our concern about the fishery. It was this Government and its concern about the fishery that prompted and got the Federal Government moving.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER WELLS:

Now, last summer we prepared a full assessment of the impact on the fisheries of what has happened. We met with the Federal Ministers responsible, and alerted them to it for the first time. They had not, at that time, done any real assessment of the problem. They were not prepared to discuss it in the terms that we were prepared to discuss it, because they had not yet done their homework.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was a bit upset. They did not want us and pleaded with us not to make this information public in August. They pleaded with us and we agreed. We gave them another three or four weeks. They were still not prepared. We allowed them another week or so, then we said we cannot wait any longer, we are going to make this concern public and let the people of Newfoundland and Labrador know what we are doing and what we have to do. So we did, Mr. Speaker.

Having been critical of the Federal Government, let me now give them the praise to which they

are entitled. Now that they have gotten on track, they have come on very strong and they are doing a very good job. I can say to the House and through the House to all citizens of the Province who are concerned about this, that the Federal Government Task Force, headed by Mr. Stein, working together with the Provincial Government Task Force, headed by David Vardy, the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, is doing a superb job. They are preparing a proper response to this crisis that we are going to face starting in January. I give the Federal Government the credit that it is due, and I am happy to commend Mr. Clarke and Mr. Crosbie for the Leadership they have shown in this, as well. Now that they have agreed to respond, I am very pleased with the manner in which they have responded, and I assure them of our fullest co-operation and willing participation in it, and I am confident that together we will address this problem in the best manner possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Wait until the people of Newfoundland see what you and the Federal Government have in store for them. You will probably be tarred and feathered.

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HEARN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier knows so little about the whole problem that he cannot

differentiate between the long-term problem and the problem that we are facing now. In light of the fact that we are having a disastrous season in the fishery and many communities in rural Newfoundland have now been hit with a double whammy because of the report of the Task Force on Tax Benefits for northern and isolated areas, where the benefits of many of these communities have now been practically wiped out because of the failure in the fishery and these same communities will be hit again if this report is accepted, let me ask the Minister of Finance, has he gone to his counterpart in Ottawa and objected strongly to the recommendations of the Task Force Report? Has he asked the Minister in Ottawa to ensure that all of Newfoundland, all of rural Newfoundland in particular, will come under the benefits, not have the benefits taken away from them?

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

DR. KITCHEN:
No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HEARN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the Minister then verify the fact that he has not gone to his counterpart in Ottawa simply because this Minister and this Government publicly expressed their disappointment with the Federal allowance and their objection to having it here in the first place?

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

DR. KITCHEN:
No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HEARN:
He did not do it?

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

MR. HEARN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, then, would the Minister explain why he publicly in the Budget Speech says, 'over the past few years, a number of federally instituted measures have served to diminish substantially our personal income tax revenues. The federal government, which administers our personal income tax system from the perspective of managing its national tax base, has shown the inclination to make us party to tax measures which, while maybe having some merit, are simply beyond our ability to afford. Further, the Northern and Isolated Posts deduction implemented in 1987 has cost the Provincial treasury an additional \$20 million... We cannot absorb a shortfall in personal income tax receipts.' In other words, publicly saying 'we are against it. You should not have instituted it.' And now you are sitting back idly. While many communities around the Province which have been wiped out completely financially because of the failure in the fishery are getting a double whammy, you sit back and do nothing about it. Will the Minister explain how he can sit there and say that?

AN HON. MEMBER:
We got two (inaudible) on them today, boys. Let us hear it for them!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MS DUFF:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for St. John's East.

MS DUFF:
Mr. Speaker, over a year ago the LSPU Hall, which is a small artist-run cultural facility in my District, made a request to the Government for funding. I would now like to ask the Minister responsible, the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs (Mr. Gullage), some questions related to this. This project had to do with replacing unsafe and very antiquated lighting and sound equipment, and providing an audio system for the hearing impaired. The total cost was approximately \$183,000. The Hall did not ask the Province for that amount, in fact, they did not even ask for 50 per cent of that amount. They asked for a modest \$45,000, or one-quarter of the total, because they made application to the Cultural Initiatives Program for close to \$100,000 of Federal money coming into a starved arts community in this Province.

Unfortunately, this program requires matching from local sources, and unless they can raise the rest of the amount here, from the Province and other sources, they do not get that money. Now they have been committed money by the municipal and private sector up to 25 per cent, all that is lacking now is the Provincial 25 per cent. I would like to ask the Minister, a year after the request was made, why it has taken so long to respond? Will his Department, in fact, be answering this

request? What will the response be?

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have met with the group from the LSPU Hall, and we have discussed the application that they have made for work on the building, work needed mainly on equipment. In fact, the Federal funding has to be firstly put in place before Provincial funding can be considered. I told them that, and they are well aware of it. To this time, my Department has not had a response from the group as to whether the Federal funding has been put in place.

MS DUFF:
A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for St. John's East.

MS DUFF:
Mr. Speaker, that is in conflict with what the people from the Hall told me, which was, in fact, that they did meet with the Minister in early September and he promised them a response by mid-October, and that they made it very clear to him - and they are in a lovely Catch-22 situation - that they cannot leverage money from the Federal Government unless they have an indication of support from the Province.

Now, I told the Minister that personally on Wednesday. The jury is meeting this week, and if they have no response by the end of

this week, what this Province is doing is throwing away \$100,000 worth of funding for the arts, funding which the Province never seems to be able to find, simply because they are not willing to say, I will make this commitment contingent on Federal funding. If they do not get it it does not cost a cent. If they do get it, they get 300 per cent return on their investment.

In view of that, is the Minister prepared now to indicate that he will make that commitment contingent on their receiving a favourable response from the Province, or is he prepared to lose that money for the arts community in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, my officials and I are top of the situation. We have been talking with Ottawa. We are fully aware that the Federal funding has to be put in place first. LSPU people know the same thing. The Member will know that this is a cost-sharing arrangement between the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and the Municipal Government and private funding. All the funding is in place and ready to go, but we have not yet heard from the Federal Government. We have asked them whether or not they are willing to give us a commitment in writing. Once that is received, I am quite willing to go to the Province and see whether or not we can put our percentage in place.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Member for St. John's East.

MS DUFF:

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but that is a total misrepresentation of the facts. I spoke to officials in the Department of Communications last week and they said that they require a written letter of support from the Province, even saying that it is being favourably considered by Cabinet for funding next year, if you do not have it this year. Just write them a letter so that the jury can at least know that the Province cares enough about this project to support it. Otherwise, they do not have a chance of getting the money from the Federal Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is too much work to write a letter.

MS DUFF:

If it was Meech Lake, you would be writing a book.

MR. MURPHY:

If it was Meech Lake you would have (inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Environment Lands, the Minister responsible for Wildlife.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The Chair has recognized the Member for Torngat Mountains.

The Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Environment and Lands, the Minister responsible for Wildlife. In view of the public attention with respect to Sunday hunting, and particularly in view of the fact that last night some 250 people turned up to attend a public meeting on Sunday hunting, would the Minister tell this House precisely how he intends to address this issue? In other words, what is the Government's position on this very prominent matter?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was getting a little concerned about my critic's first question in this Session, worried to the level that I was considering sending over a few suggested questions that he could pose. But now that there is a question, the Government's position on the question of Sunday hunting, Mr. Speaker, for the information of all Members, is that currently there is a ban on Sunday hunting, and as Ministers of the Government, Ministers of the Crown, we have little choice but to enforce the regulations as they exist.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My second question is to the Minister of Environment and Lands, the Minister responsible for Wildlife. As we are aware, our moose population has increased immensely and last year, in fact, the former Government increased the number of licences issued. Is the Minister considering increasing the licences for the coming year? If so, by how many?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just recently the hon. Member who is posing the question asked for some statistics on accidents and so on, and we were quite happy to provide him with that information. We did increase the number of licences by, I believe, around 2,500 this year -

MR. WARREN:

You did not, we did.

MR. KELLAND:

- something in that area. That would be one of the options, Mr. Speaker, on how to control the moose problem. There are other options, I guess. The previous Administration took some steps in that regard, but it required some ratification on this side, once I judged whether or not their earlier decision had some value. One of the methods is, as I have said, to increase the licence quotas and we will consider that as one of the possible options. But there are others as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Torngat

Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, my final question to the Minister.

In view of the increased number of highway accidents resulting in property damage, in injury and in death, what initiatives other than those the Minister just mentioned does the Minister intend to take to reduce the number of accidents, that have increased over 400 per cent over the past three years, on our highways in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The question of personal injury and death is a very serious one, and one that we take very seriously. That is our prime consideration over and above any other consideration we have with respect to the management, control and harvesting of our wildlife, Mr. Speaker.

As I mentioned, increasing the licence quota is one of the options. There have been some other suggestions. I think there was a study done by Day and Ross on the moose whistle to try and deter animals from coming on the road, but that may or may not have met with some degree of success. There is some thought also, Mr. Speaker, of using channeling fences to try to concentrate wildlife populations that may cross highways into specific areas and therefore make them easier to control. There are possibly some other options that my officials are looking at.

Once that sort of a thing is looked at and assessed, we will make some sort of judgement on how we can control the problem. Other jurisdictions have a serious problem, as well. For example, Sweden, I believe, harvest something in the area of 40,000 moose as opposed to our 16,000, 17,000 or 18,000 a year, and they have as much as 100 times more accidents than we do. We will be checking with other jurisdictions to see what methods of control they use, and if there are some good methods, we will probably put them into effect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my old friend, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

The Minister would be aware that a lot of people depend on employment at the Wooddale Tree Nursery, out in the Central Newfoundland area, as a source of income from year to year, and that now they are going through a great deal of anxiety because of all the uncertainties that exist out there: they do not know who is going to be recalled next year, can the minister, first of all, confirm for the House that because of a new management plan being introduced at the Wooddale Nursery, there will be significant cutbacks in the number of jobs at that facility? And since the Minister himself has said publicly that 'One of the most important social obligations with respect to

this facility is to keep employment up', and since the nursery has employed upwards of 200 to 250 people at a time - 143 I think it was this year - can he tell us exactly the minimum number of employees that will be recalled next year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

I thank the hon. member for his question.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell with certainty the number of employees that will be recalled next year. I will tell the member that one of the great concerns expressed to me by employees of the Wooddale Nursery, back in mid-summer, was that this would have been the first year yet that the nursery operated in a way that all employees of the nursery would get enough work to qualify for UIC. They were concerned that they were not going to get the necessary time.

MR. SIMMS:

I am not talking about that.

MR. FLIGHT:

Of course the Member is not talking about that.

MR. SIMMS:

I will get to it, though.

MR. FLIGHT:

So the Department took steps to make sure that all employees at Wooddale, who would have been two, three or four weeks short, were called back and will indeed qualify. In November, we called back 119. I will simply say this to the Member, that, as he knows, there were some concerns at

Wooddale about the cost-effectiveness of the employees. What we are saying, and what the management knows, is that we intend to maximize the employment in Wooddale to make sure Wooddale production meets our requirements for seedlings. But, at the same time, we intend to run Wooddale on a cost-effective basis, with total consideration for the level of employment, in making sure that we can employ every person possible in Wooddale under those guidelines and with that concern, that Wooddale operates in a cost-efficient manner.

MR. SIMMS:
Good!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Question Period has expired.

MR. SIMMS:
I am very impressed, Mr. Speaker, with that response.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Question Period has expired.

MR. SIMMS:
Oh, Mr. Speaker. Well, I will have to return to it another day, I guess.

MR. SPEAKER:
I want to remind hon. Members that there were a couple of times during Question Period when the Chair should have possibly asserted itself to call for order. As hon. Members know, Members are discouraged from getting up on points of order during Question Period, and the Chair, itself, tries not to get up

in the interest of time and believing that self-discipline is the best discipline.

I should remind hon. Members that there were a couple of occasions today when Members called for silence - they want to be heard in silence - and this is very, very important to the democratic process. Hon. members will appreciate that there are certain Members with different styles, that they do not mind a little bantering back and forth, but there are Members who call for silence and when a Member calls for silence, then we ought to extend that courtesy. I want to remind hon. Members of that.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. DICKS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DICKS:
I would like to table the Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities on the operations carried out under the Automobile Insurance Act.

Section 45 of that Act stipulates that the Public Utilities Board has responsibility for the regulation of automobile insurance rates in the province. All insurance companies writing automobile insurance in the Province must file proposed rates with the Board. Such rates must normally fall within bench mark rates to be approved. These are developed by an independent actuarial consulting firm retained by the Board. Costs incurred by

the Board in carrying out its duties under the Act are assessed against insurers.

Under Section 53, subsection (1), of the Act the Board is required to forward to the Minister by the first day of March in each year an Annual Report on the operation of the Board under this Act for the preceding calendar year.

Pursuant to Section 53, subsection (2), I am fulfilling the requirement to lay the Report before this assembly within fifteen days of receipt. That report, Mr. Speaker, was received by my office on July 27, 1989. Thank you.

Orders of the Day

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I call the order, I wonder if I could move the establishment of the Privileges and Elections Committee. Under our Standing Orders this Committee is supposed to be appointed during a particular time limit after the opening of the House. It is one of several committees that are to be appointed by the House, so I would like to move that the following individuals be members of the Privileges and Elections Committee: the hon. the Member for Eagle River (Mr. Dumaresque); the hon. the Member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder); the hon. the Member for Ferryland (Mr. Power); the hon. the Member for Bonavista South (Mr. Gover); the hon. the Member for Pleasantville (Mr. Noel).

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, we have obviously consulted on this matter. We second the motion in supporting it, we have no problem with it, and ask that it be passed.

MR. SPEAKER:
You heard the motion.

Motion, that the above-mentioned Members make up the membership of the Privileges and Elections Committee, carried.

MR. BAKER:
Motion 3, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Department of Employment and Labour Relations", carried. (Bill No. 28).

On motion, Bill No. 28, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. BAKER:
Motion 2, Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that I have received a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

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

"I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the

Province of Newfoundland, transmit further supplementary estimates of sums required for the Public Service of the Province for the year ending the thirty-first day of March 1989 by way of further Supplementary Supply, and in accordance with the provisions of The Constitution Act of 1867 I recommend these estimates to the House of Assembly."

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the message together with the amount be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is that I do now leave the Chair.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Supplementary Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

MR. CHAIRMAN (Snow):

Order, please!

Resolution

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1989, the sum of eighty million seven hundred and four thousand six hundred dollars (\$80,704,600).

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

I wonder if we might establish the ground rules so as to refresh everybody's memory. I think in Committee of Supply basically it has been ten and ten.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, we are proceeding under Standing Order 118, Subsection 5. Fifteen minutes to introduce, responding would be fifteen minutes, and then ten minutes each.

MR. SIMMS:

There are no limitations on the number of times you speak or anything like that?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No.

MR. SIMMS:

Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Chairman, in Bill 17 we are asking for Supplementary Supply in the sum of \$80,704,600 which is to cover the Special Warrants that were tabled in this House this spring, Warrants that came from the previous Administration and which are outlined here in the schedule. There is \$17,147,000 for Consolidated Fund Services; \$960,000 for Executive Council; \$4,044,400 for Finance; Development and Tourism \$3,326,100; Fisheries \$13,910,000; Forestry \$300,000; Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development \$6,882,900; Career Development and Advanced Studies \$6 million; Culture, Recreation and Youth \$1,427,800; Education \$4,200,000; Health \$19,524,100; Justice \$2,458,100; Labour \$524,200. The details, Mr. Chairman, were tabled with the

Special Warrants this spring.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As the Minister has indicated, this Bill really covers expenditures that were undertaken in the previous fiscal year and by the previous Administration. Information has already been tabled in this House and the Opposition and Government are both well aware of the details of these expenditures. The question I have, Mr. Minister, is why is it just coming to the House now? Why was this Bill not introduced in the spring? This is information that was made available back in 1989 and these are special warrants that were issued during the year. This is not new information. It could have come up a long time ago. Has it taken this long to list down the special warrants that were tabled in the House last spring and to make a Bill out of it? To enact the thing. This is a routine piece of business at this point in time. These expenditures have long-gone. We can debate them all day but we cannot change them. There are many interesting things we can get into and discuss that would come out of looking at these details but we can do that in the Budget Debate, in the Throne Speech Debate, or any other one.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

Oh, yes, no doubt. The hon. gentleman is smiling. We also covered some guarantees for Sprung. It is interesting, Mr.

Chairman, that the Premier prior to his election said, we will not honour guarantees for Sprung but subsequently he did, and we are bringing in legislation to put them into effect. This is all very interesting stuff, Mr. Chairman. We have not heard much about Sprung lately now that it is a relatively great success story.

The point I want to make is how come this is just coming here now? And, secondly, as we look at the Order Paper, Mr. Chairman, there is not a great deal on the Order Paper that can get one excited. We have just had a raft of Bills circulated this afternoon creating Departments, which basically change the names of Departments because of the restructuring of Departments by this Government. This is really earth shattering stuff. As you look down the Order Paper, Mr. Chairman, there is not much legislation of any substance on the Order Paper. There is just a bunch of housekeeping Bills. Now, this Government was the same group, that when they were in Opposition screamed, why can we not have a fall session of the House? They have held through on that. That is one of the few promises that they followed through on.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Now, they wish they had not.

MR. WINDSOR:

Now, they wish they had not, after the burning we gave them in Question Period this afternoon and in Statements By Ministers, and that we are going to give them every single day.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The only thing we moved was a non-confidence motion amendment to

the Throne Speech, it is a good thing or they would not have anything else to speak on.

MR. WINDSOR:

That is true. We opened the House last week and there was not one thing on the Order Paper only for the Address in Reply. They did not have a piece of legislation. This is the same group, Mr. Chairman, who said that we will have all kinds of good legislation. We will have it to legislative committees well in advance so that they can review it, so that everybody will be familiar with it. Then we will have a good debate on it in the House of Assembly.

There is still not a piece of legislation here with any tremendous amount of substance to it. They are all housekeeping Bills, when is the Government going to come forward with something substantial, that is what we would like to know? Certainly, this is a routine piece of business, Mr. Chairman, it is a routine piece of business, I guess the only question I have is, why is it taking so long to get such a routine Bill on the Order Paper and out here, along with the rest of these routine Bills? They are spending so much time renaming Departments I suppose, that we have not had time to do routine homework. He is getting his rebuttle ready, this could be exciting.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. The Government House Leader.

MR. WINDSOR:

He is not allowed to speak for himself, is he?

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I always enjoy listening to my cherubic friend from Mount Pearl. He raised a couple of interesting points. I thought that was very pleasant. Yes, he raised a couple of very interesting points, first of all why was not this Bill here before? As the hon. Member knows, I suppose there are a number of Bills that could have been brought in, in the spring sitting. Unfortunately, there was no spring sitting and it was really a summer session of the House of Assembly. Members opposite who were very liberal in their use of special warrants, who tended to use special warrants for every possible occasion that could be conceived, and many times I should point out, were rejected by the Controller General in terms of special warrants they wanted to issue that he indicated were not proper, they went ahead and issued them anyway, so, they went through these processes in the spring. There was a change in Leadership and the present Leader of the Opposition became Premier of the Province. At that point, the new Premier of the Province, as well as his Cabinet, most of whom are sitting opposite now, including the Member for Mount Pearl, who wanted to be the new Premier, but unfortunately did not quite make it. They could have then opened the House and brought in these Bills and brought in this Supplementary Supply Bill, they could have handled a lot of situations that were then important to the Province, but this particular one could have been brought in at that time, however, for some reason they were afraid to face the House, and decided instead to make the fatal mistake of facing the election. Now then, by the time, by the time we got around to quite properly

assuming the positions we now hold, by the time we got around to quite properly assuming our positions, summer was upon us, the House of Assembly was opened very quickly, as quickly as possible, and a decision was made, Mr. Chairman, a very sensible, logical, reasonable decision that we would deal with the Budget, the Budget Process and a Budget, and get that thing through the House, and once the Budget was through the House, then we would adjourn until the fall when we would deal with a lot of this legislation that we now see before us. So, the explanation for this Bill appearing now is very simple. Members opposite did not want to open the House, instead, they delayed the opening of the House by calling an election, by the time we got around to doing it, the normal time for opening the House was long past, we were into summer and therefore we decided that legislation that was not absolutely essential would be put off till the fall, it is put off till the fall, so that is the very simple explanation. The Member also raises some interesting points about the new process. He says that there is nothing here of any importance. I am sure that the people of the Province would be really interested in the fact that he considers some of these Bills as Bills having no importance. I mean An Act respecting Department of Forestry and Agriculture as having no importance, that is rather interesting. It is probably an indication Mr. Chairman, that Members opposite really, really have nothing to say. They really have nothing of criticism to say, maybe that is what they mean when they say there is nothing of importance. Really, they have nothing of criticism to say.

However, I would like to point out to the House and to the Member for Mount Pearl that the Committee process has been started. It is a new process and we are feeling our way in terms of this particular committee structure.

We have submitted a number of bills to the Committee and all of these bills you see, that are now listed here, have been through the Committee. The Committees have also been given now, or will soon be given in the next few days, some very important, more important pieces of legislation that I am sure will satisfy the Member for Mount Pearl.

But I should point out a problem with the system to the Member. The problem is essentially this, that the bills that will generate a lot of public interest are of necessity going to take much, much longer to get to the House of Assembly. When the Committees decide to do a more in-depth examination of a particular bill, then I suspect that bill will not be ready for the House in this Session at all. This is an effect that could have been foreseen. It initially will slow down the legislative process a little bit, but I believe that the advantages to be gained from this process far outweigh the delays that it may cost. Because it does give the Opposition Members a chance to see the legislation well in advance. We are very concerned about the Opposition Members. We are very concerned that they get the legislation well in advance, so that they have a lot of time to do their research and to fulfill their parliamentary function, which is the constructive criticism of the pieces of legislation. We are making it much easier for Members of the

Opposition to do their job. We feel that they should have this opportunity. And Members opposite should be very happy to have the opportunity, very, very happy, instead of going on with the political stuff that the Member for Mount Pearl is getting on with, "Ah, there is nothing here. Why can you not get it in fast." and so on, well I say to the Member for Mount Pearl that we are looking out for his interest and for the interest of democracy in this Province. The legislation will be forthcoming and there will be substantial legislation forthcoming.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say that I did not say that any of this legislation is not important. I said that it is routine. I did not say that any of these Departments are not important. I said changing the name of the Department is not important, and that is quite routine, and that is essentially what most of these bills are doing.

The hon. gentleman made a statement to the effect that the previous Administration freely and liberally used the system of special warrants. It is interesting. The hon. Minister has already tabled special warrants I think \$1.8 million, yes \$1.8 million, four actually I think there were. One point eight million dollars at this stage of the year, two or three months after the Budget was introduced into the House of Assembly. I think before the Budget was finished they were looking for some extra money. I mean, there

is good budgeting, Mr. Chairman. Before the Budget was completed, before the Budget Debate was over, we were talking about special warrants, extra funding for particular items. So the hon. House Leader should not talk about special warrants issued by the previous Administration, his record to this stage is not very good either. And I suspect that he is starting to learn, in spite of all his protests in previous years against special warrants that our Administration brought in, he is going to find you cannot run this Province without those special warrants.

What we will be looking at in future, Mr. Chairman, is where those special warrants are. We will see where the \$5 million surplus has gone because I am sure it is already gone, or is it because programs in other areas have been cancelled and replaced by items that are now covered by these special warrants? You are not able to transfer from one subhead to the other, so you are cancelling good Departments like the employment strategy program. Those types of programs are being cancelled so that we can come up with some of the harebrained schemes the hon. Members opposite are bringing in. We will be looking at those in more detail later on, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

Mr. Chairman, I really must respond to that. The hon. Member mentioned that we brought in a few special warrants totalling a couple of million dollars.

We have been in power now for six months, and in six months we have

brought in Special Warrants for about \$2 million. What we have before us now is \$80 million. There is some difference in scale here. There is another difference too, Mr. Chairman, and the other difference is this: Our Special Warrants were brought in and tabled in the House of Assembly immediately. This opposite crowd here,

MR. SIMMS:
They had to be.

DR. KITCHEN:
Yes, but you did not table your Warrants. You spent without tabling them. We had to table your Special Warrants after we were elected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:
We are not about to take lectures, Mr. Chairman, from that crowd opposite as to how to run this Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:
They would not know how to run a government. And they were defeated because they ignored the House of Assembly. They did not table their Special Warrants, they spent \$80 million in Special Warrants in a very short period of time, and then he has the gall to get up and ask us, what about your \$2 million in Special Warrants?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Chairman, there is something very strange about that.

Mr Chairman, there is one more point I have to make in this debate and that concerns what he calls the routine undramatic legislation. This Government that we have here is an efficient, effective Government. We do not need twenty-odd departments of Government, with press secretaries, and special assistants and secretaries going all over the place for each little minister popping around. What we have is a very streamlined, efficient Government, and these bills that are setting up the departments are part of that efficient, effective process.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. KITCHEN:
This is the mark of the Wells Administration. We are saving money. It is effective, it is efficient. As Minister of Finance, I am quite proud of the way we are operating with our money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Chairman, we will see how efficient and how effective these departments are when we start debating some of these bills, and when we tell you about some of the phone calls we are getting from people in this Province who cannot get hold of ministers, who cannot get any decisions because those ministers are running around with fifteen hats on their heads and

cannot be contacted, cannot respond, cannot come to meetings, cannot show up at public functions because they have too heavy a burden. We will get into that, Mr. Chairman, a little later.

Let me tell the hon. the Minister of Finance that The Financial Administration Act dictates when Special Warrants are tabled. Our Special Warrants were tabled within two weeks of the opening of the House of Assembly, in accordance with that Act, and he cannot deny that fact. And if there were Special Warrants issued while the House was in session, those were always tabled immediately, as is required by Act. In fact, if he knew different, you cannot issue Special Warrants while the House is in session. So, he has to go read his Act and find out what he can and what he cannot do before he starts throwing things over this way.

DR. KITCHEN:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
What are you talking about?

DR. KITCHEN:
You closed the House for nine months.

MR. SIMMS:
You closed it for four months, and you have only been here six.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Is the House ready for the question?

On motion, Clauses 1 through 2 carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed a resolution and recommends that a bill be

introduced to give effect to same, carried.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, while they are trying to figure it out, perhaps I can take the time to have a little chat with the Government House Leader.

I wonder if the Government House Leader has had an opportunity to run by his colleagues - I realize the Government House Leader has all kinds of power and authority and perhaps does not need to run anything by his colleagues, and can make these very difficult decisions of his own accord, such as the request I made last week for consideration of the House when it adjourns on Friday not opening until Wednesday instead of Tuesday.

MR. BAKER:

I will let you know later on today.

MR. SIMMS:

Later on today? That would be perfectly acceptable.

MR. DECKER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

I did not ask the Minister of Health, who told me this morning, by the way, that he was totally against a distinct society. But he certainly changed his mind this afternoon.

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. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report that they have adopted a certain resolution and recommend that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion, report received and adopted, resolution ordered read a first and second time, Bill ordered read a first, second and third time, presently, by leave.

On motion, resolution read a first and second time.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Nine And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service", read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 17)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Order 6, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Economic Council Act." (Bill No. 27)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

On behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Development, I take some pleasure in introducing this Bill. This Bill would change the date by which the Economic Council of Newfoundland must submit its

annual budget to the Minister of Development. Section 14 (1) now reads, "The Council shall not later than the thirtieth day of September in each year, prepare, adopt and submit to the Minister a budget containing estimates of all sums required during the next financial year for the purposes of the Council, and in each budget there shall be set out the detailed revenue and expenditure in such detail and in such form as the Minister may prescribe." Mr. Speaker, that essentially sums up what this Bill is doing.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, again, an earth-shattering piece of legislation. As I see it, it goes from September, which it now is, to December - from September until December, and one has to question why it is necessary to defer the budget preparation to December. I know from my own experience that all other departments have their budget submitted well in advance of December, and that was the purpose for which September was put into the original legislation which I had the honour and pleasure of introducing into this House. I wonder why we now cannot get our budgets prepared at the Economic Council until December? Maybe the Minister will address that when he gets up. I appreciate the fact that the Minister is introducing -

AN HON. MEMBER:

No (inaudible).

MR. WINDSOR:

Yes, I can imagine.

The other question, Mr. Speaker,

is what will be happening to the Budget this year? Who is the Economic Council now answering to? Is it now the Minister of Development, as it was originally established, since there is no motion in this legislation to change that provision in The Economic Council Act? Or is it to the Economic Recovery Team? What is the correlation now between the \$3 million budget of the Economic Recovery Team and the Economic Council?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Five million.

MR. WINDSOR:
A five million dollar budget for the Economic Recovery Team? It has gone up \$2 million from when the Minister introduced his budget. He told us \$3 million, and now it has gone to \$5 million. It has gone to \$5 million for the Economic Recovery Team! The big question to be asked, Mr. Speaker, is why we do now need an Economic Council, why do we now need a Minister of Development and a Department of Development, now that we have this Economic Recovery Team that seems to be directing the Premier? Since that team answers to the Premier and not to the Minister of Development, what now is the role of the Minister of Development? What is the role of the Economic Council? How do they fit in, and how all of these budgets mesh together? Why do we need any budget for the Economic Council if we have this great Economic Recovery Team?

We have all of these pieces of legislation I talked about a few moments ago, this restructuring of the Government, where we eliminated five or six ministers and five or six deputies. There

was a great purge of highly qualified senior civil servants, and we have replaced them now with a \$5 million Economic Recovery Team that costs a heck of a lot more. What we have left are fifteen or sixteen inefficient ministers, because some of them are overloaded. It is not that they are not qualified, but some of them are seriously overloaded. And some of them know who I am talking about, because I have spoken to them personally to make the point to them that the Premier has not done them any favours by giving them such a work load that they cannot effectively and efficiently discharge the obligations of the various responsibilities that have been put on them. Where does this Economic Recovery Team fit into the Economic Council? How do the Budgets intertwine? Who answers to whom and who is the real Minister of Development now? Is it Dr. House, is it the Chairman of the Economic Council, or is it the Minister of Development and where is he? Are there any answers coming from over there?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Fisheries. If the Minister speaks now, he will close the debate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member asked some very important questions, some very thought-provoking questions, I should add. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, would establish the new Department of Development within the Public Service of the Province; the Bill would repeal and re-enact the Minister's responsibility.

AN HON. MEMBER:
No, you have the wrong Act.

MR. W. CARTER:

Oh, I am sorry! Mr. Speaker, I cannot add much to what I said when I introduced the Bill, except that it is a mere housekeeping Bill, no doubt. I am sure some of the questions raised by my colleague will be answered by the Minister upon his return, and that is about all I can say about it, Mr. Speaker, at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Economic Council Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, on tomorrow. (Bill No. 27)

MR. BAKER:

Order 7.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Development". (Bill No 24)

MR. SPEAKER:

The Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, again on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Development, I take great pleasure in introducing this Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Development". I should inform the House that this Bill would establish the new Department of Development within the Public Service of the Province. The Bill would repeal and re-enact the Minister's responsibilities relating to development, tourism, rural and northern development that presently exist in the Department of Development and Tourism Act and The Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development Act.

The restructuring of Government Departments resulted in the Rural Development Branch and the Northern Development Branch of the former Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development being placed under the mandate of the Department of Development. On the advice of Legislative Counsel, it was decided to prepare a new Act rather than amending the Development and Tourism Act, as it was felt that this would result in a clearer and more concise document. The proposed new Act for The Department Of Development incorporates the old Act of The Department Of Development And Tourism and Sections of The Rural Development Act pertaining to duties and responsibilities of the Rural and Northern Development Divisions.

The Sections pertaining to Agriculture were, therefore, omitted from The New Act and these responsibilities have been transferred to the Department of Forestry and Agriculture. No major changes have been made except for some wording changed for clarification only. Important program descriptions under the powers, functions and duties of The Rural Development Act, including Rural Development Authority, Business Development, Regional Development, Regional Development Association Programs, Co-operatives, Native People's Programs and Labrador Stores Operations, were transferred to the new Act. The Legislative Review Committee has reviewed this new Act and considered it a housekeeping function only.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, once again I accept the Minister as saying that there is no change in the Act as it relates to the various Sections in the Act, as I understand it. The Bill does not get much of an explanation. We have just received the Bill. It was circulated in the House this afternoon. The Legislative Committee may have seen it, but I personally had not seen it. The explanatory note simply indicates that it was just a change of name.

I understand none of the clauses in the bill are any different from previous legislation. So from that point of view it is very routine. Where it is not routine, Mr. Speaker, is a moment ago I indicated that there are Departments of this Government that I feel are much too broad, and this is one of them. Now I know what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker. I was the first Minister of Development. I helped, with the Premier and the other Members of Cabinet at that time, to structure that Department and develop its mandate, and put together a very fine team of individuals. Some extremely capable individuals are in that Department, the Department of Development.

I was also responsible for piloting through Cabinet into to the House of Assembly a bill which changed the name of the Department from the Department of Development to the Department of Development and Tourism. And here the hon. Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Walsh) shakes his head, as well he should, because he was there at the time, very involved, and subsequently he was

President of Hospitality Newfoundland and Labrador. And he knows, he must know, and he shakes his head, and I know he will agree with me, he cannot help but agree, how important it was to the tourism industry, the hospitality industry in this Province, to have the word 'Tourism' in the name Department of Development and Tourism. And they fought for years, and I finally was able to convince my colleagues in Cabinet of the importance of that, because people coming in out-of-Province are looking for tourism information. They look in the phone book and they say, where is Tourism? There is no Department of Tourism. Now it may seem like a small point. But it is important from a perceptual point of view. It is important from the point of view of emphasizing the importance of the tourism industry in this Province. And I have been waiting for an opportunity to get back at what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Kitchen) said the other day. Because the attitude that the Minister of Finance displayed in this House the other day when he spoke about tourism, has been one of the greatest reasons why tourism has not advanced any further in this Province today than it has. The Minister of Finance said 'Tourism is a seasonal industry.' I disagree with him violently. It is a seasonal industry in the minds of people like the Minister of Finance. But it can be a full year industry. And that is one of the problems that we have been struggling to overcome for so many years, the attitude towards tourism. That it was a recreational pursuit, not industry. It is the third or fourth largest revenue -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Third.

MR. WINDSOR:

Third, thank you. It is the third largest industry in this Province, in terms of bringing economic revenue into our Province, into our economy. And we have to overcome this attitude of looking at it all as a little seasonal industry, a few fellows out in rural Newfoundland rent out a few cabins in the summertime, or you get a few kids running down water slides or renting a few canoes. It is more than that. It is a full industry. If you want to question that, have a look to see what is happening at Marble Mountain, and the economy of Corner Brook since Marble Mountain is finally starting to receive the recognition that it deserves, and since some funds have been put in there.

Have a look at Clarendville and see what is happening there. Have a look at many areas of this Province when we see snowmobiling development. And that is very close to my heart because I am a very avid snowmobiler, as many hon. gentlemen know. And I wish the Minister of Development (Mr. Furey) and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Gilbert) were here, because I want to ask a question of them, and I will do it at another time unless somebody opposite would like to answer for them. I want to know if the recreation corridor that we have, the natural recreation corridor presented by the abandoned railway line is going to be protected for all times? Because if it is not protected it will be lost and we will never again get that kind of a corridor across this Province, because the cost of expropriating that kind of a right-of-way would be phenomenal and would be

prohibitive. I would like to know what this Government's position is, Mr. Speaker, on retaining that corridor for recreational purposes or for whatever? Perhaps some day we will need to put a pipeline across this Province, or whatever we may want to use that particular corridor for.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A transmission line?

MR. WINDSOR:

You would not use it for a transmission line because there is more economical routes, we do not follow the - I have forgotten my engineering term.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The lay of the land.

MR. WINDSOR:

The lay of the land, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The contours.

MR. WINDSOR:

The contours. You do not follow the contours building transmission lines as you would for the railway, and that railway was built as it was, very much follows the contours, and that is one of the problems with it. And I would like to know what the Government's position is on that?

The important thing in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is taking away that name 'Tourism' in the title. And it shows a complete lack of respect for the tourism industry, the lack of emphasis on the tourism industry, the lack of emphasis on any industry, because there is not a bill on this legislative program, Mr. Speaker, dealing with developing industry or creating jobs in this Province,

other than changing the name of the Department of Development and Tourism, to the Department of Development, and putting a workload on that Minister, and I sympathize with him. Putting a work load on him which is absolutely unreasonable, and I know of where I speak because I held it. And time and time again I have said to the Premier at the time: Premier this is a tremendous work load. There is so much more that can be done in many of these areas that it is physically impossible for one individual to do, and I really think we should look at spreading some of this out, and that was done.

I see this as a great mistake, Mr. Speaker, in combining these Departments together, and I say that with the greatest respect for the Minister. He is a very capable individual. But I think it is a great disservice to the tourism industry in removing the name. It may seem like a small thing. I hope the Member from Mount Scio stands up and speaks on this particular issue, because he is so involved in it. And I hope he stands up and represents the tourism industry, and tells his colleagues in Cabinet what a mistake it is to take the name of tourism from the name of the Department of Development and Tourism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. WALSH:

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand up and respond to some of the comments that were made by the Member for Mount Pearl, who I must

say served the tourism industry well in that portfolio, I cannot take that away from him. My only real regret, Mr. Speaker, probably is that he did not end up as leader of that particular party because he may have protected Tourism from being placed in an obscure Ministry. And I may be wrong with the name, but I believe tourism went from Development and Tourism down to Heritage, Historic Sources, or something. Anyway, I believe it was referred to by some of my friends in the industry as an obscure Ministry.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order. The Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Minister it went under the capable hands of my colleague from Port au Port into the Department of Tourism.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order, a point of clarification.

The hon. the Member from Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. WALSH:

The letters that I received from the then leader told me it was going to be Historic Sources, Historic Resources and Tourism and something else and something else. An obscure Ministry, Mr. Speaker. And this Government had the sense to bring it back up and place it where it did belong, in Development.

Now, one of the most important things that I think has happened within this restructuring is that the thrust of tourism, Mr. Speaker, is in rural Newfoundland. Without a doubt,

areas like St. John's and Corner Brook, and other major metropolitan areas will survive and grow on their own. The major thrust for tourism is in rural Newfoundland, and under this restructuring we are seeing tourism being drawn closer and closer to rural development, with an Assistant Deputy Minister responsible for both those functions in this restructuring, allowing us to look even stronger or with a greater degree of interest in rural Newfoundland, so we can put some emphasize there.

With reference to Marble Mountain, it was a pleasure for me to see 1.2 million dollars come from this Government less than 14 days ago. Probably the first real dollars put in from the Province. Up until that the majority of the dollars came from the Tourism Development Subsidiary Agreement which the Members on the opposite side were so disinterested in, they let it lapse and did not even fight to have a new one put in place.

So, Mr. Speaker, tourism is not being neglected by the mere fact that its name is not attached to the Department. Tourism has been rescued - rescued from a Department that - I understand whose Minister was on no major committee of Cabinet even. I am not sure of that, but I could stand to be corrected by my colleagues on the other side. So, tourism is in good shape, Mr. Speaker, and tourism in the future will have its opportunity to grow under the Department of Development and in particular, being associated with rural Newfoundland and the streamlining that will take place, we will see tourism prosper even more in years to come under this Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries. If the Minister speaks now, he will close the debate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the comments from the Member opposite and, of course, from my friend and colleague from Mount Scio - Bell Island, and, I must say, I am not too concerned about the fact that the word 'tourism' is now being removed from the Department of Development. There was a time, of course, when we had a Department of Tourism, and if only by having a Department with the designation of Tourism is what it takes to perform well and to provide some of the amenities that people need in this Province, then I am sure the Minister's case is very weak. Because you only have to drive around this Province to see to what extent the tourist industry has been neglected over the years in many, many areas.

MR. WINDSOR:

Now, that is not true. That is not true!

MR. W. CARTER:

Anybody, Mr. Speaker, who has occasion to drive around the Province and stop in to restaurants and certain hotels and other spots, realize full well just how much is lacking in terms of proper training and proper service on behalf of the people who are charged with the responsibility of catering to the public.

Now, I am not condemning all establishments. Of course, we have some very good tourist

establishments in the Province. We have some very good people working in the tourist industry, but that does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have other establishments that are not up to scratch.

I would expect my colleague, the Minister of Development, notwithstanding the fact that he does not include the designation of Tourism in his Department, I am sure that is not going to lessen at all his interest in Tourism or his determination to make some of the changes necessary to make Tourism the important industry that it could be and give it the chance to make the big contribution that it can make in the economic life of our Province.

A lot of things need to be done. I am not suggesting that nothing has been done. Obviously, there has been a lot of work done but, from my point of view, we have only scratched the surface. As the Minister said, Tourism can be, in fact, probably the number two industry in the Province if it were properly developed, properly guided and given the right kind of attention.

Even though we might have had a full-fledged Minister of Tourism in the past, I am not so sure that the tourist industry has been getting the kind of attention and help it needs. Consequently, the results are there to be seen.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say. My colleague, the Minister of Development, I am sure, will be tackling the job that is out there to be tackled in terms of developing our tourist industry, and I believe that within a very short time now, with a young, aggressive and imaginative

Minister, we are going to see some of the changes taking place in the tourist industry that have been overdue for a long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, A Bill "An Act Respecting The Department Of Development," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole, on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. DECKER:

Order 9, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Forestry And Agriculture". (Bill No. 19)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of pride and accomplishment and achievement that I stand to introduce this Bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Most hon. Members in this House, Mr. Speaker, including Your Honour, the Member for Port au Port, who is not presently in his seat, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and myself, came here, as you know, in 1975. We were elected first in 1975. And I remember well, Mr. Speaker, the people who were here before we came, Ex-Premier, Mr. Smallwood, Premier Moores, the hon.

Mr. Murphy, the hon. Mr. Hickey, and we deferred to those people because they were senior, Mr. Speaker, their experience in the House was something that one respected. And I would remind the hon. House if the four hon. gentlemen that I just mentioned were the senior people in this House today, and I do not sense, Mr. Speaker, the same sense of deference from the hon. Members Opposite as we, when we were all in the Opposition, the whole four were in the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, accorded to the hon. people who had been here before us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the Members will know, particularly the hon. the Member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), when one toils in the Opposition for years and years and years, and one's ambition and one's hope and one's prayer is that one day he will be in the Government and, of course, then having made it to the Government side of the House he will hope to be a Cabinet Minister. Little did I know, Mr. Speaker, when I was thinking and dreaming of those dreams in those years, that a special Department would be created for me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:
Not only would I become a Member of Cabinet, but a special Department. In the Premier's wisdom, Mr. Speaker, of creating fifteen portfolios out of twenty-three and cutting out the waste which was his prime objective, cutting out the waste, Mr. Speaker, of having twenty-three Cabinet Ministers flitting around the world, he went to fifteen. One of the Departments, Mr. Speaker, was

Forestry and Agriculture. And, Mr. Speaker, in those years when I sat on the other side, one of the cliches for years was 'one day the sun will shine and have not will be no more.' Does the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Kitchen) remember that? 'One day the sun will shine and have not will be no more.'

MR. SIMMS:
I heard that.

MR. FLIGHT:
Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, as a result of the creation of this great Department, the cliché is true, the sun is now shining on all the people involved in agriculture in Newfoundland, all the farmers, all the employees - shining on the various Divisions of Forestry, all the employees, all the loggers, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:
You are right.

MR. FLIGHT:
And, Mr. Speaker, one thing that this bill does is make sure that the Divisions of those various Departments will never be the private employment agents or the private employment agencies of the Ministry, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of pride that I introduce the bill. And, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture has now been given some profile, instead of been hidden away down in RAND, Rural Agriculture and Northern Development, Mr. Speaker, this Province, this Government recognizes the important contribution that agriculture has to make in this Province. This Government recognizes the economic benefit that a fully developed

agriculture industry in this Province can make to it. We recognize the potential. And, Mr. Speaker, by the very act of creating the Department of Forestry and Agriculture the Government has served notice on this House, and on the people, that we intend to exploit the potential, and we intend to raise the profile of agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, as the Act says this Bill will establish the Department of Forestry and Agriculture within the public service of the Province. The bill will repeal and replace the present Department of Forestry Act and transfer the responsibility for agricultural matters to a new Department. And under that new Department, Mr. Speaker, the agricultural industry in Newfoundland will get the prominence and get the attention that it deserves, and, Mr. Speaker, we will see to it that agriculture, that industry and all that agriculture envelops will, Mr. Speaker, finally get a chance to make the kind of a contribution that agriculture is capable of making to the economy of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:
So having said that, having introduced the bill, having announced the Department of Forestry and Agriculture, I can sit, and I know the Member for Grand Falls will be complimenting the Government for creating such a Department. It confirms the Government's position. It recognizes the importance of agriculture. It confirms, Mr. Speaker, that our belief in

forestry that we recognize forestry as an invaluable resource, as a renewable resource, and we recognize the economic contribution it makes, and the forest industry will always be administered and represented by a line Department, the Department, Mr. Speaker, of Forestry and Agriculture.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The Member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a few short comments on the bill. With reference to the bill itself, it is self-explanatory I suppose, under explanatory notes there is only one paragraph there that says it is mainly housekeeping, and the amalgamation of the two Departments. But if the Minister, in his few short comments, keeps on talking about the sun, if the sun keeps on shining we are going to have a drought before he starts.

With regards to the amalgamation of Agriculture with Forestry and the comments he made, and the importance that he is going to place on agriculture in the Province, I was always a firm believer that agriculture could have played a bigger role in the industrial base of the Province. I am sure that time will bear me out and see the fruition of that in the Province itself with regard to agriculture.

But one of the problems I had with it was because of the fact that it was in with Rural, Agriculture and

Northern Development before, but Northern Development, as you know was taken out for a few short months last year, and then what was left, the Rural Agricultural part of it and the Co-operatives came under it, and the Rural Development Association certainly. All those cross and intertwine in every municipality in every rural area of the Province, there is no doubt about it. The rural aspect of the Department in conjunction with agriculture and a lot of the communities, the same as the fishery, it all worked well. And would have worked well, as far as I am concerned. The Minister said his ambition in Opposition was always to get into Government and when you did get into Government your ambition was always to become a Minister.

Well, I sat four years in Opposition as a backbencher. I mean it would be rather hypocritical for me to say I did not have my sights set on the front benches. I always did. I have ambition like every other Member here. If not we would not be in the House of Assembly. So when I did get in there I only had a short stint of three months, three and a half months. At least I can say I was there and I had three and half to four months at it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You were a good man, while you were there.

MR. WOODFORD:

Well, history will be the judge of that I suppose.

In any case, with Agriculture going into Forestry there are some connections there as well. The main thing here is, there is

always a misconception in this Province that any so-called farmer that is given a so-called farm is really given a piece of wilderness. It is not like in any other Province in Canada where you have third, fourth, fifth, and sixth generation farmers. You are given a piece of wilderness out of which you have to cut a farm, and cultivate a farm, so that is one of the good things with regard to the forestry aspect of it. There is some interconnection there. I will be interested in seeing the new Forestry Act that is coming up, if there is some meat on the bones of that Act, because that is going to be very important in connection with this Bill as well, because one is not going to work without the other.

Agriculture was always on the bottom of the totem pole as far as I am concerned, maybe because of ignorance. And I mean ignorance in the sense of not knowing and not spending any time in seeing and trying to develop what a potential that industry could have for this Province.

The Minister has said here this evening, and I will be watching him over the next few months and seeing what is going to happen with regards to his emphasis on Agriculture. I commend him for his comments and the jury will be still out. I mean we cannot jump up on him too quick, we have to give him a chance.

With regard to the sawmillers in the Province. It was only last week that they met in Deer Lake, the Newfoundland Lumber Producers Association, they are very interested in some of the things with regards to The Forestry Act. I know this is only housekeeping and integration but again it comes

into The Forestry Act, which I hope the Minister will bring in later on in this Session. I hope we get it tabled this fall.

See The Timber Scalers Act, The Sawmillers Act all the Acts that come under this schedule. One of the things I found in the Committees, when the Acts were coming before the Committees, is that some of the items in the schedule, some of the Acts that came in under a certain Act, for instance the Forestry and Agriculture Act, were covered by another Department, like the Department of Finance, the Department of Development, or something like that, so that is one of the things that we have addressed and made quite clear. When the Bill came in from now on, all the schedules in the Act will be double checked to make sure that they are covered under the Act in which the Bill was called, whether it be Bill 17, 18, or 19. It is very important because I ran across one the other day in the Department of Development that had to do with animal feeds in the Province, and far as I am concerned that was no place for it. It should have been under the Forestry and Agricultural Act.

So, without anything further on that, Mr. Speaker, these are just a few short comments. Like I said it is mainly a housekeeping Bill in any case.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to say a few words at least under this Bill. Not

necessarily so much about what the Bill implies, or intends to do, because as my colleague has pointed out and which the Minister has neglected to emphasize, all this merely does is change in all of those other Acts that are affected the word, whatever was there before, Forestry, Rural Development, Transportation, Forestry and Agriculture. That is all this particular piece of legislation does. However, in doing so it also puts forth then the new Act as it would read with these changes made, and refers to a number of other Acts in the schedule, Schedule B, and therefore it is quite appropriate, of course, to comment on any item contained in this legislation. I want to talk just briefly about some items and I would like the Minister to take notes, and when he gets up to close the debate he will be able to elaborate and answer these questions for me, and for other Members of the House, and for the public generally, which after all is the purpose of debating legislation. He did mention in passing, or I think my colleague the Member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) said he looked forward to the new Forestry Act coming in. I noticed with a certain degree of humour, that the Minister responded by saying, 'I have worked hard on that. I am looking forward to it.' Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is the new Forestry Act was an Act that was prepared by me, as far back as 1985, when I was Minister of Forestry at the time, and then followed on by my colleague the Member for Kilbride who became the Minister of Forestry for awhile, and then the Member for Torngat Mountains, in fact, went in there for a while.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Well, he did. He had a very important interest in Forestry with respect to the development of a new forest industry for Labrador, which I have heard nothing about from this Government in the House.

Let me just ask the Minister a few questions. In the new legislation there are certain powers afforded to the Minister dealing with staff, for example, and I am wondering if the Minister can tell us whether or not the officials in his Department, the Forestry section of his Department, still have an interest, or have talked to the Minister about the possibility of creating the position of a Forestry Commissioner?

MR. EFFORD:

Looking for a job, are you?

MR. SIMMS:

No, but the Member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) might be looking for one.

MR. EFFORD:

I am.

MR. SIMMS:

I thought you had one. The Premier told us you had one.

Anyway, the Province of Nova Scotia, for example, has an independent commission, an independent operation. The Minister may know this and may have had a chance to go to Nova Scotia and talk to his colleague or counterpart in Nova Scotia. I do not know. They do have an interesting set-up there with respect to a Forestry Commissioner and indeed his own officials, at

least when I was there and many of them are still around, senior executive officials had a great interest in pursuing this idea of a Forestry Commissioner. So, I would like the Minister to tell me if he has had any discussions with his officials on this particular matter, what his own views are or has he in fact had enough time to develop any view on this particular matter, because he has only been there seven months. That is one matter that I would like him to address. Secondly, in the legislation there is a section, Clause 12, dealing with surveys, and I remember when I was there as Minister, the officials in the Department, particularly the lands people at that particular time, because lands was also in with Forestry at the time, but the Forestry personnel were anxious to get more money from the Provincial treasury to assist them in undertaking more surveys, so that they could have a more accurate reflection of the timber resources and other resources, and always required more funding for maps, statistics and things of that nature.

I would like to know if the Minister is going to be trying to access more funding from his colleagues in Cabinet for that purpose? I would also like for him to tell us about the new agreement? What is the status of the forestry agreement now at this stage? The last one, the Federal/Provincial Forestry Agreement, has it now expired or is it about to expire? And if so, is the Minister pursuing actively, the signing of a new Federal/Provincial Agreement for Forestry?

I think I heard not too long ago one of the other Provinces, New

Brunswick just recently signed one on a 60/40 cost-shared basis. I think our last one might have been 70/30, I am not quite certain of the accuracy of that statement. But I would like to know is he going like a bull dog, as my friend for Green Bay (Mr. Hewlett) asked today or yesterday? Is he working very hard to get a new agreement?

Then another matter I would like for him to address is a matter that Members on that side, particularly the Member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert), who used to constantly get up and harass us as a Government, and ask us if we were going to re-implement the FESP Program, the Forest Economic Stimulation Program? He used to drive us nuts about it. And we tried to explain that had been replaced by further Provincial funding and a better cost-sharing arrangement and more money in the last agreement, the largest one we ever signed. So now that the Liberals are in power are they going to re-introduce the FESP Program? As his colleague the Member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and many others on that side used to ask us over here?

MR. FLIGHT:
What do the four letters mean?

MR. SIMMS:
Forest Economic Stimulation Program. The Minister has only been there for seven months, eventually he will know that. But I would like for him to tell me if they are going to reintroduce the FESP Program? A very important program in Forest Economic Stimulation that created a lot of jobs.

Then I would like for him to briefly address the boards under

his wing.

MR. FLIGHT:
Which?

MR. SIMMS:
The boards, you have boards under your wings. I am not thinking about who you are going to appoint to it. I know you are going to appoint some of your Liberal friends, I know that. I have no real problem with that. But I would like for the Minister to tell me and tell the House a little about the Geographical Names Board.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
A Geographical Names Board, a Board that had been in existence for year, and year, and years, that nobody knew anything about.

MR. HEWLETT:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
Exactly. A few years ago the members of the Board came to me when I was Minister and said, we would like to do something to let Newfoundlanders know exactly what we do. So, of course, the first thing I said was, "What do you do?" And they told me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:
But surprisingly enough they do a lot of work and, in fact, they are the group, for example, that went out to Twillingate and made a change out in Twillingate with Whale's Gulch, I believe. Do you remember there was a fair bit of coverage on it from the press?

MR. HEWLETT:
Gayside.

MR. SIMMS:
Gayside to Baytona or whatever it was. So they do some interesting work and unfortunately they used to do it before but there was never anything heard about it. So I empowered them to do a little travelling around the Province, gave them a few extra dollars to fly overhead to look at some of these sights so they knew what they were talking about when the request came, and we had some public press conferences out in the areas, so that the people in the area knew that this is how you got a name change to a community. This is how you did it. Most people did not even know how. And there were a few people appointed to the Board, we put some new people on the Board at the time.

MR. FLIGHT:
Liberals?

MR. SIMMS:
Oh, we had all kinds of Liberals on the Board. All kinds. And there were two or three others on the Board, I am not sure what their political allegiance were.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:
Well now it was irrelevant. It really was irrelevant because it did not matter what their political allegiances were. But I would like the Minister to tell the House a bit about the geographical names board. Does he have the same enthusiasm for that Board that I had as a Minister? And that my successors had? Because it does do some good work. I can assure him he does and I can assure some other

Members of the House.

Just a couple of other points and then I will conclude. I would like for him to tell us, since one of the references in the legislation is to The Transportation Of Timber Over Streams And Lakes Act, 1904, 1971 as amended, could he tell us what that act does? I am not too familiar with it. The Transportation of Timber Over Streams And Lakes Act, 1904 - 1971: I would like to know a little bit about that. I never heard of it before.

MR. DECKER:
I have never heard of that Act.

MR. SIMMS:
It is not an Act under Forestry, it is an Act under Transportation. We would not expect the Minister of Health to know that, he is fairly narrowly focused in on Health issues.

I would like him to tell us, as well, how he feels about his colleague, the Minister of Environment (Mr. Kelland), who is now going to attack all the sawmillers in the Province, I understand, from a public statement he made the other day. And he will find himself in conflict frequently with the Minister of Environment, I do not mind telling him. But I hope he stands up to him and that he supports the sawmillers, for whom he has the ultimate responsibility, according to this legislation, in fact, it makes it very clear. Tell us what you are going to do to support and defend the sawmillers.

Finally, I want to ask him this question, and then I will sit down. We can get up again for

more discussion. I want to ask him what he thinks of the proposal that had been advocated, put forth in the past, on many occasions, particularly by Members on this side, but I think I heard some support for it on that side, about a provincial ranger force? The idea there was to combine all forces at the provincial level, such as wildlife officers, forest rangers, fisheries officers and so on, and also try to work out a co-operative deal with the Federal Government with respect to protection in particular, and establish a provincial ranger force. There is a lot of support for the idea, I can tell the hon. Minister. I am not sure if the Minister has any views or feelings on it. I would like to know if he does and, if he does, is he going to try to hammer it through Cabinet, beat on the heads of his Cabinet colleagues to get these things done.

MR. EFFORD:

Do you believe in amalgamation?

MR. SIMMS:

No, I do not believe in amalgamation, necessarily.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

I said, necessarily. I am not talking about amalgamation.

MR. EFFORD:

Wardens from fisheries and forestry and wildlife (inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

No, that is joint forming of forces, boy. It is a big difference.

Anyway, for surveillance purposes and protection purposes. The

Minister knows what I am talking about, I am sure.

Tied in with that, then, is this question of the lack of support for his protection officers, his forest rangers out there in the field. It is a question I raised in this House in June, the lack of support for security and protection of your forest rangers, the ones who are out there now, those who have to walk in on a campfire where there might be ten or fifteen guys half-crooked and everything else, and you have to tell them to put out a fire during the forest fire season, and they are liable to get up and take a swipe at you. Some of the forest rangers in this Province are very, very concerned about that. We have seen that kind of incident occurring in other parts of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What would you do?

MR. SIMMS:

Well, that is what I am asking the Minister. He is the Government, I am not the Government now.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Well, what would you do?

MR. SIMMS:

First of all, I would sit down and consult with the forest rangers and ask them what their problems are, which he has not done. I know he has not done it, because I have talked to some forest rangers. I would like to see him do that, talk to the forest rangers and see what might be able to be done in terms of helping them, assisting them. One thing they want is -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

No, not necessarily referring to that, but I will mention it. What they want, I think, is more personnel. If the Member for St. John's South could just hear what I am saying for a second. One of the big things they want, I think, is more personnel; or to be able to go in to this campfire I just described, with a partner. Right now, in most cases, they have to go in alone, because there is only one for this region or one for that area.

The same thing applies to wildlife officers. If they could even travel in pairs, it might make a bit of a difference. I am not suggesting that they be armed, at all. That is another issue. Maybe the Minister might want to respond and comment on it, that is up to himself. I am not going to raise it here, to any great extent.

With those few brief preliminary remarks and questions on this Bill, I will sit down and let the Minister, perhaps, respond, unless there are others who want to comment. I think some colleagues on this side of the House still have some comments and questions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few brief comments on this Act.

My colleague from Grand Falls dealt with The Forest Ranger Act, which we thought would be included in this today, because the forest ranger subject is one that I believe has a great deal of merit, despite what the Member for Port de Grave says. I think you would

find that most people would want to see something like that pursued.

As well, I would like for the Minister, when he responds to the questions, I would certainly like, if he wishes, to respond to the question posed by the - if the Minister would Mr. Speaker, when he is addressing this, he would probably like to respond to the question that was posed by his colleague from St. John's South - that would be up to the Minister obviously. The Minister for St. John's South has raised something that may warrant discussion by the Cabinet or may warrant comment by the Minister. Remember your colleague from St. John's South raised the point about arming these people and I am sure that you will want to respond to your colleague when you address this. Mr. Speaker the other thing as we debate this-

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, The hon. the member for St. John's South.

MR. MURPHY:

I did not raise, I did not raise army, I did not say one word about army arrangements.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

Mr. Simms.

MR. SIMMS:

To defend the hon. Member for St. John's South, he did not raise the word army, all he did was like that, to me when I was talking. That is a fair statement so all he was doing was asking if that is what I was talking about. I think that (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is

no point of order. Indeed the Chair is baffled, I do not know what (inaudible). The hon. the member for Burin Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker I certainly hope that the Member for St. John's South is not making these types of gestures at other Members across the House, because, the comments from my colleague from Grand Falls certainly did not warrant that type of gesture towards him, and I think the Member for St. John's South should probably apologize to the Minister. Mr. Speaker I am sure that the Member for St. John's South did not mean anything by it, he is not that type of an individual. He is going to fool us all. Mr. Speaker I would like to also in addressing this, say to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture that in my district there is a community that survives on the farming business, and there is not too many Mr. Speaker aware of it. I have been preaching it to my own colleagues for the last five or six years and I now want to remind the Minister of it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You got through to them?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes I did, yes I did. The former Minister, the Member for Kilbride, was down and met with the farmers and my colleague, and there are others, so we were getting there. Now Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware of the community that is the farming centre in my District? It is Winterland in case he is not aware of it Mr. Speaker, it is Winterland, it is inland, it is a very active farming community. People work there full time in the farming business and I am sure that the Minister will include them because for some reason, for

some reason Mr. Speaker--

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do they not have a big root crop there?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes they do, yes very big in root crop. Yes, well you know I am sure the Minister of Environment, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Environment is pretty familiar with the root crop business. As a matter of fact if my memory serves me correctly, probably I am wrong but I think that you were in the fertilizer business one time. Mr. Speaker I just wanted to bring back to the Minister's attention about Winterland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry. If the Minister speaks now he will close the debate.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had intended Mr. Speaker to close the debate simply by saying that I am pleased to introduce the Bill as a Housekeeping Bill, however, I have been provoked by the Member for Grand Falls, and I have now Mr. Speaker to deal with the various issues he raised. But at first Mr. Speaker I want, and this is the other thing I would have done, if I can have the Member for Humber Valley's attention Mr. Speaker, I want to pay him what I consider a very serious compliment. In the three months, or three to four months that he was Minister, he developed a very credible reputation for himself, he gained the confidence and the trust of the farming community

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Nobody knows, Mr. Speaker, how good a Minister that hon. Member would have been had he not been charged with putting out and putting underground the fiasco known as Sprung. He had to spend his three months, Mr. Speaker, defending the previous Government and as a result he was sidetracked constantly. But even having that overous responsibility to try to make the best of a bad \$22 million job, that Minister still shone, he still found time to gain the trust and the confidence, and I say that seriously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Grand Falls mentioned the new Forestry Act. I reiterate again what I said off the record, I say on the record, I have worked long and hard on that Act this summer with my officials. One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, we worked so hard and so long, is that I had some concerns with some of the things that the previous Ministers were prepared to perpetrate on the people of Newfoundland, and particularly the forest industry, by various clauses in the Act. So, Mr. Speaker, we will be bringing in an Act that will be acceptable to this House of Assembly and acceptable to the forest industry.

Forestry commissioner, no, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have spent very long talking to my officials about a forestry commissioner. We have been talking about trying to get the forest industry on a firm basis so that they know where they are

going. So that they know what the line of responsibility is, making sure there is a wood supply that maintains the production of the three paper mills, making sure that the logging, the sawmilling industry can work with some sense of confidence in the future, that is the kind of thing that I have been talking to my officials about. Whether it is necessary to create a forestry commissioner is something, Mr. Speaker, that I will consider. And as a matter of fact, I may even mention to my officials to what extent the previous Minister wanted to create a forestry commissioner.

Surveys and inventories, Mr. Speaker, the Member knows that we have one of the most up-to-date inventories in Newfoundland, he raised questions in the House in the spring Sitting about when was I going to come clean on the wood supply, which is inventory.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the excellent job done by this Department, in inventory, we know what the woodsupply situation is. And we know how to deal with the woodsupply situation, and the paper companies are confident and satisfied with the approach we are talking with regards to guaranteeing them a wood supply forever.

The Forestry Agreement, Mr. Speaker, I burn when I hear that Member talking about the Forestry Agreement. We are just coming off a Forestry Agreement that was funded 70/30, 70 per cent Federal Government, 30 per cent Provincial Government. The previous Forestry Agreeemnt, Mr. Speaker, that was funded by a Liberal Administration in Ottawa was 90/10. Under this Member, Mr. Speaker, with his cohorts in Ottawa, agreed to

reduce the federal spending down to 70 per cent.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are now in the process and all the mechanisms are in place to renegotiate a Federal-Provincial forestry agreement. The present Agreement expires on March 30 and if the Federal Government is dealing with us in good faith, Mr. Speaker, and recognizing the dire needs of forestry in Newfoundland, there is no doubt that we will have a forestry agreement in place before the old Agreement expires.

FESP, I do not know, Mr. Speaker, FESP was an agreement that was in place to do the various things that were done under the FESP Program. If the people in Ottawa again, are considering our requests and our demands, and our negotiations, we may again one day put in place a FESP program. But at this point in time, there is no FESP agreement in the offing.

Geographical Names Board. No, Mr. Speaker, I have not spent too much time to-date on the geographical names Board. I have not put a great deal of thought into that. I may well though. I know some people who are out there waiting, competent people who are waiting their turn to be on Boards and that might give me a reason to. I may now consider the Geographical Names Board.

Transportation of Timber over Streams and Rivers Act. No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of all the details and clauses under that particular Act, but I suspect it is with regards to the environment. I expect it is an Act that protects the river banks and the streams from the damage caused. I would suspect that. I do not know. I look the Member in

the face and say, however, it is being incorporated now into this Act. So maybe one day I will have the Member explain to me exactly what The Transportation of Timber over Streams and Rivers Act and exactly in whose interest that Act existed in this Province, and I suspect it is probably fisheries.

I can tell the Minister this though, he should not have needed a Transportation of Timber over Streams and Rivers Act to stop the kind of -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

I would ask the Minister to stop referring to me as the Minister, please. I know old habits are hard to die, but it is seven months. So please, please -

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forestry.

MR. FLIGHT:

I may always refer to the Member as a Minister, Mr. Speaker, a former Minister. But, Mr. Speaker, he should not have needed, Mr. Speaker, Transportation of Timber Over Streams and Rivers Act to stop the kind of destruction that happened to rivers and streams in Newfoundland under his stewardship as Minister, when the paper companies tore up banks of rivers -

MR. SIMMS:

That is not true.

MR. FLIGHT:

Oh yes it is true. I will take the Minister on a helicopter trip on Lloyds River, Lloyds Lake, Exploits River, all the major

rivers that were used to transport wood. The banks of the Lloyds River is down in Exploits Bay.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, it has got nothing to do with this.

MR. FLIGHT:

Well, maybe it did, I do not know.

MR. SIMMS:

It does not.

MR. FLIGHT:

Yes, I think it might have.

MR. SIMMS:

It does not.

MR. FLIGHT:

The Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker, no two Ministers ever cooperated better than the hon. Minister of Environment and the present Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. I have total praise, Mr. Speaker. The Minister discusses things relative to forestry with me, likewise, I with him. So, do not worry, Mr. Speaker, I will not have to knock any heads in order to make sure that forestry and environment dove-tails and works the way it was designed to work.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about sawmillers?

MR. FLIGHT:

Sawmillers by all means I will defend them.

The Minister did not raise the spray program, and the Newfoundland forestry ranger, support for the Newfoundland forest ranger. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Member that I have considered, and we have talked about it in the Estimates, the possibility of establishing

such a force. But he knows that I have established a junior forest wardens program and that I have implemented and is funding the junior forest rangers, Mr. Speaker, that is doing a great job in this Province now, and we have up to twelve units. Well it is not the same thing exactly, but it is an effort to instill in young people a respect for forestry and wild life. And that is working well. And Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, the Member raised and talked about the concerns of the forest rangers, our enforcement people. The last meeting I had today before coming to the House of Assembly was with representatives of the forest people from Paddys Pond in my office, and we talked about their concerns, and their being addressed, and the level of moral is high, that is the second meeting with the Paddys Pond people.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you this little story. I arrived unexpected at a regional office and walked in and the individual on duty did not particularly recognize me. He treated me as a member of the general public and I realized this. So, eventually it came about and he said "Who are you? You cannot go in here unless- " and I said this is who I am and I got flustered. And he said, "You know Mr. Minister, I have worked here for fifteen years, and you are the first Forestry Minister that ever visited yet."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Now Mr. Speaker. So, I came back to St. John's, and I told my officials, the Deputy Minister,

and I remember he said "You are the first Forestry Minister that ever visited. No, no that cannot be true. Myself and the hon. Minister of Forestry, the Member for Torngat Mountains stopped into this office a month ago." I thought about it for a while and I said, "Mr. Deputy Minister, the man is still right." The first Forestry Minister that ever visited. The hon. Member for Torngat Mountains can figure out the regional office?

AN HON. MEMBER:
He did find it.

MR. FLIGHT:
Where?

AN HON. MEMBER:
He did find it.

MR. FLIGHT:
That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER:
No, are you telling the truth?

MR. FLIGHT:
A little humour does not hurt, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:
That was not humorous.

MR. FLIGHT:
What?

AN HON. MEMBER:
It was not humorous.

MR. FLIGHT:
Oh, was it not?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Member for Grand Falls will have to make his own decision on what is or what is not humorous.

MR. SIMMS:
Very poor taste.

MR. FLIGHT:
Winterland, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT:
Where Winterland?

AN HON. MEMBER:
That is not the one he is talking about.

MR. FLIGHT:
Winterland, Mr. Speaker. I have had meetings with the people in the farming industry from Winterland since I have been the Minister of Agriculture. I have met people from the farming community of Winterland, not officially, but I have met people over the five months that I have been the Minister, and I can tell you that the officials are aware of the agricultural industry in Winterton, and I can tell you that the farmers in Winterton will get the same level of support and the same co-operation that-

AN HON. MEMBER:
Winterland -

MR. FLIGHT:
Winterland - the same level of co-operation and the same encouragement as the other farmers and other people in the industry in Newfoundland. That will be to the extent that I can deliver a level of co-operation where they will have some confidence in their ability to make a living in Newfoundland in the Agriculture industry.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Is that all?

MR. FLIGHT:

That is all. Let us talk about the spray program. Mr. Speaker, the Member did not question me about the spray program so I am not going to get into it now. I know he does not want to get into it. I will say this though, the Member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) was talking to me a few days ago and he advised me that I was late, and where were the results of my spray program. I was told that he had said in various places that the Minister was late in announcing the results of the spray program this year and what did he have to hide and what did he have to cover up. Was it or was it not successful?

MR. SIMMS:

When did I say that?

MR. FLIGHT:

I do not know.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, if you do not know how can you talk about it?

MR. FLIGHT:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, what I want to make a point about is this. I read my statement. I announced the results of the spray program on the 3 November, I think. Yesterday I was looking through my files and I picked out a statement made by the hon. Len Simms, Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. It was dated February 8, 1986 and the first sentence was, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the results of the 1985 spray program, and that Member criticizes me for being tardy and being late.

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and for clarification.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

He said the statement was dated February 1988 and referred-

MR. FLIGHT:

I said 1986.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, February of 1986. Well, the hon. Minister, I can tell him right now, may be laughing now but I can assure him come January or February of 1990 he may not be laughing when the actual results of the spray program comes out.

MR. FLIGHT:

The actual results of that great 6000 hectare spray program using Bt, Mr. Speaker. When he criticized the spray program he asked me why I did not follow New Brunswick's example and not spray with Bt. I checked and found out that I sprayed approximately 5000 acres, or my people, 5000 acres in Newfoundland with Bt. He asked me to follow New Brunswick's example. New Brunswick sprayed 100,000 hectares, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Hectares?

MR. FLIGHT:

Hectares. So, Mr. Speaker, the Member should give up on the spray program. You know, it has been successful. I know he wanted to be the minister who implemented a chemical free spray program, but he did not have the intestinal fortitude to do it; he did not have the consideration for the people to do it. Now, Mr. Speaker, he should be magnanimous, he should be glad.

MR. SIMMS:

I love to hear it. The more you say for the record the better.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, having addressed that

MR. WARREN:
What about the forest resource centre under the federal agreement?

MR. FLIGHT:
Ah, that is a good issue. The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains is on to a good issue there. His constituents are going to be very proud of him, when he stands up.

MR. SIMMS:
Where is it going anyway?

MR. FLIGHT:
Well, I am going to reserve the right to answer the Member for Torngat Mountains. The Member for Torngat Mountains will get his chance one day, and I want to make sure that he is the Minister -

MR. SIMMS:
Tell all of us.

MR. FLIGHT:
No, no! I will tell the Member for Torngat Mountains. The Member for Torngat Mountains has a very great interest in the Forest Resource Centre that is funded under the Federal Agreement and is about to go to Labrador. The Member has indicated a great interest in making sure that that forest resource centre is placed where it serves the greatest need. And I am going to see to it, Mr. Speaker, when the time comes, that the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains will have the -

MR. TOBIN:
(Inaudible) the letter I got from

Red Bay.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, having made those few remarks, and hopefully having answered my hon. friend for Grand Falls and set his concerns to the rest, I adjourn the debate.

MR. SIMMS:
No, you move second reading.

MR. FLIGHT:
I move second reading, and I thank the hon. the former Minister.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department of Forestry and Agriculture", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, on tomorrow.

MR. BAKER:
Order 10, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Department of Finance." (Bill No. 21).

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

DR. KITCHEN:
Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce Bill No. 21, The Department of Finance Act, 1989, which is to replace The Department of Finance Act. This is basically a routine matter, but perhaps we should take this opportunity to highlight some of the features of the Department of Finance and some of the responsibilities thereof. Members will note, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister serves during pleasure, and also that there are two people who have the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Order, Mr. Speaker! Order!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! We are having great difficulty hearing the Minister of Finance.

The Minister of Finance.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, we are having great difficulty listening to him.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Minister of Finance.

DR. KITCHEN:

You will note that there are, in effect, two Deputy Ministers in the Department of Finance, one of whom has the title of Deputy Minister and one of whom has the title of Comptroller General, and they both have deputy minister rank. The Comptroller General basically looks after the accounts and the tax collection; and the Deputy Minister looks after most everything else.

I should like to look at some of the powers and duties of the Minister of the Department, as contained in clause 6. "The supervision, control and the direction of all matters relating to (i) the financial affairs and public accounts, revenue and expenditure of the Province, and (ii) the administration of the Acts set out in the Schedule to this Act and of all orders and regulations passed or made under those Acts."

And if you look at the Schedule, Mr. Speaker, just to recall to Members of the House, you will notice the fifty-two Acts that are the responsibility falling within the Department of Finance, starting off with such acts as The Bay Verte Mines Act; The Civil

Service Act; The Civil Service Transferred Employees Act; The Crown Guarantee And Loan Act, 1973; The Death Duties Act; The Deferred Pensions Act; The Financial Administration Act, 1973. Mr. Speaker, this is perhaps the most significant of the Acts that are administered by the Department of Finance, The Financial Administration Act, 1973. Then comes The Financial Corporations Capital Tax Act; The Gasoline Tax Act, 1978; and something interesting, The Horse Racing (Regulation and Tax) Act; The Income Tax Act; and all these Acts referring to pensions: The Increase Of Pensions Act; The Increase Of Pensions Act; The Insurance Companies Tax Act; The Labrador (Tax Exemption) Act; The Liquor Control Act, 1973; The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973; The Loan Acts; The Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957; The Loan (Canada Pension Plan Investment Fund) Act, 1966; The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957; The Members Of The House Of Assembly (Retiring Allowances) Act.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of reading this is to give an education to Members Opposite so that they know what type of questions they should be asking the Minister of Finance, and to sort of improve the tone of the questions from the side opposite. And then when the questions get up to par, we will answer some of them. The Members Of The House of Assembly (Retiring Allowances) Act is of very great interest to Members opposite, I am sure.

The Mineral Holdings Impost Act; The Minerals And Options Tax Act; The Mining And Mineral Rights Tax Act, 1975; The Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation Act; The Newfoundland Municipal

Financing Corporation Act; The Pension (Auditor General) Act, 1968; The Pension Benefits Act; The Pensions (Broadcasting Corporation Employees) Act, 1969, which covers very few people, but it is there. The Pensions Funding Act; The Pensions (Gander Airport Employees) Act, 1966-67; The Pensions (Public Officers) Act, 1966; The Portability Of Pensions Act; The Public Officials Garnishee Act; The Public Service (Pensions) Act; The Railway Settlement Act, 1923 c.2.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, tell us about that one.

DR. KITCHEN:

I will have to take that under advisement, I am afraid.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They may ask you a penetrating question.

DR. KITCHEN:

Once a good penetrating question comes up on it, we will answer it.

The Reciprocal Taxation Agreement Act, 1987; The Retail Sales Tax Act, 1978 - a major Act - The Savings Certificates Act; The Social Security Assessment (Exemption) Acts; The Stamp Act; The Stock Savings Tax Credit Act; The Subsidized Institutions Act; The Supply Acts; The Taxation Agreement Act; The Taxation Of State Enterprises Act; The Tobacco Tax Act, 1986; The Transferred Employees Increase Of Pensions Act, 1981, 1982 and 1983; The Uniformed Services Pensions Act; The Venture Capital Act; and The War Service (Pension) Act.

Mr. Speaker, these basically indicate the types of activity that is carried on by the -

MR. SIMMS:

Excuse me! I wonder if the Minister could repeat that?

DR. KITCHEN:

Yes, and say them backwards. This is just by way of education for myself and for Members opposite, as to what the responsibilities are of the Department of Finance.

Mr. Speaker, if there are some interesting points to be made, I will be happy to respond to them.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Pearl.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You are muzzled 'John', you are muzzled.

MR. EFFORD:

(Inaudible) now.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, when the former Minister of Social Services is finished, I would like to ask some questions of the Minister of Finance, and I would hope the answers I get this afternoon are better than the ones the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes got. He asked three questions and he got two words, 'No. No.' and then dead silence to the third question. So if the answers are anyway as good as the questions, we might get somewhere.

The Minister has quite correctly pointed out all the things the Department is responsible for, and I am delighted he did it, because now, at least, I know he has some concept of what the Minister of Finance is supposed to be doing, and this is probably the first notion of his responsibilities that he has had.

We are quite capable, Mr. Speaker, of reading the Act for ourselves. I am not sure what this does. It replaces an Act with an Act. It does not change any sections of the Act, it replaces an Act of 1970 with an Act of 1989. Hallelujah! There are lots of jobs created this afternoon by this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. This is really a revolutionary piece of legislation. Maybe the Minister would like to tell us what his position has been, and what he has done.

First of all, he has now been Minister for five months. It was our practice that every three months we provided a quarterly report on the state of the finances of the Province and the Public Accounts. When is the Minister going to produce in this House a quarterly report? It is now five months since the date he brought down his budget, five months and one day - June 6 was Budget Day. Where is the performance of the Government now? How is that Budget coming? Do we still have a \$5 million surplus, Mr. Speaker, or is that reduced by the \$1.8 million in Special Warrants that the Minister has tabled thus far? What other expenditures have we had that we do not know about yet? When is he going to tell us about that? Maybe the Minister would tell us what his Government's position is on the new Federal Goods and Services Tax. What has the Government done? What representations have been made to the Government of Canada? What further studies have been done? I am aware of studies that were done in the Department when I was there, and the implications that that tax has on the provincial revenues, on the provincial Budget

and on the requirements to raise taxes in this Province.

Will the Minister tell us what studies have been done by the Department in that regard? Do we now know what the implications are of The Goods And Services Tax? What representation has the Minister made to the Government of Canada in that regard on behalf of Newfoundland and Labrador? Because, it was my opinion, based on information I had, that it was detrimental to the financial situation of this Province.

Can the Minister also tell us, Mr. Speaker, what is his Government's position on the proposed pension reform legislation being introduced by the Government of Canada, specifically as it relates to Uniformed Services in this Province and the implication it will have on pensions that people in Uniformed Services in this Province have been paying into, and teachers and others who have been paying into for many, many years? What has the position been? What has he done to deal with the Government in Ottawa in that regard? What representation has he made on behalf of the people of this Province who are going to be very adversely affected? I see an hon. gentleman standing right behind him, in uniform, and his head is up now. He is very concerned about what is happening to his pension, because it will affect it, and it can very drastically affect it.

Has the Government, Mr. Speaker, said to the Government in Ottawa you must at least grandfather the people who are now covered by these pensions, you must ensure that they will not lose benefits that they have been paying into? This is not a gift of the

Government, Mr. Speaker, it is something that has been purchased; it is an insurance policy that has been purchased by people. People entered into a policy, into a program, and said 'I will contribute a certain amount of money in return for which I expect to get certain benefits.' Has the Minister made any representation to Ottawa to ensure that those benefits have not been decreased? If not, has the Minister had any negotiations with the Government of Ottawa relative to the Provincial Government cost-sharing in any loss of benefits that may be so that those people do not, indeed, lose those benefits? Maybe the Minister will give us some of those answers, for once, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I almost should apologize. In fact, I was thinking about doing that. As I was listening to the Minister tell about how busy he was and the number of Acts he has to look after, I said to myself, Oh, the poor Minister is so overworked, he forgot to contact his federal counterpart about the northern allowance. Then in reading the Act I noticed one part, on the bottom of page 5, which says one of the Minister's duties is 'liaison and co-operation with the Government of Canada or a department, agency or body under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada,' and I suddenly realized that in one area, at least, the Minister was extremely lax because he did not liaise with his federal counterpart when his federal

counterpart is, undoubtedly, soon going to react to the report on the northern allowance tax benefits and eliminate them for the residents of numerous communities, in fact the whole Island part of the province. The tax benefits have been eliminated for poor, hard-working people who obtained them just a couple of years ago. We have in many of these areas this year, as I mentioned earlier, a complete and utter disaster in the fishery. Now, when these people go to file income tax this year, where they had a few extra dollars they could pick up because of the provisions made under the tax benefits, these now have been taken away, or will be taken away, and the Minister of Finance should be the leader front and foremost, representing the Province, going to Ottawa saying, do not take them away, certainly this year. Do not take them away from people who need it.

On the other hand, because of the extra costs of goods and services without the nine per cent that will be tacked on down the line, with the present costs the people of this Island, surely all of us, should be considered in relation to extra benefits. But, instead, he sat there, he did not do anything and said that he did not intend to do anything. In fact, publicly, as we pointed out today, publicly here in the House, he said they should not be interfering with our tax system. They are interfering. Well, let me say to the Minister that the present government certainly is not interfering in helping the poor people out there. Not only was there a massive tax grab by this Minister in the Budget, not only was there a massive tax grab on every man, woman, and child throughout the Province, but now

they take away benefits that the Federal Government passes out.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things: My colleague from Mount Pearl asked, where does the Minister stand in relation to the pensions that are coming up for review? Where is he when the teachers are wondering about their 2.2 accrual. What is his stand on that? Was he up to Ottawa looking for clarification as we were with them, or is he going to wipe the benefits that we gave teachers off the map? Hopefully the two former Presidents of the Teachers Association who are over there are not going to let that happen. They know where we stood in relation to benefits for teachers, and I presume they are not going to let the present Minister take any less a stand, seeing that they are sitting by him, than we took.

And maybe the Minister can tell us something about Loan guarantees. We heard the Minister of Fisheries, just last week, basically spell out the fact that loan guarantees are going to be hard to come by, that, in a year when the Fishery, again, has been a complete disaster; when fish plants and fishermen need help, we are going to tighten the screws.

I notice it is almost five o'clock, Mr. Speaker, so I adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As promised earlier today, I would

comment on a request made by the Opposition House Leader. With regard to closing the House of Assembly, Monday is a natural holiday next week anyway, the 11th of November holiday. Instead of on Saturday it is on Monday, and the request was made that we consider closing the House on Tuesday because that is the day on which the Municipal elections are to be held. I have to inform, through you, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition House Leader that we desire that the House be open on Tuesday. It may be a fairly significant day in the Legislature of this Province, and we want to have the House open on Tuesday.

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

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

I wonder if I might have the opportunity to respond? We were talking about Tuesday the 14th, I understand. Whether or not the Premier introduces his Meech Lake Resolution on Tuesday the 14th or Thursday the 16th really will not be relevant, because once the Resolution is presented it is obviously going to be debated for several weeks. Everybody in this House knows that.

I mean, it was on behalf of Members who had an extreme interest in being able to spend some time in their own constituencies on a very important day, because not only is it Municipal election day, it is

School Board election day and Members would want to encourage people to get out and participate in the democratic process. Also, because many Members here are from outside St. John's, they would like to have the opportunity of voting in their own respective communities. I do not know if the Government House Leader might want to reconsider that.

I know they have an agenda, they have a strategy and they want to introduce the Meech Lake Resolution, but whether it is introduced on the Tuesday or the Thursday really does not make one bit of difference. As a matter of fact, perhaps as a compromise may I suggest this for further consideration, Mr. Speaker, to the Government House Leader, that perhaps we might be prepared to consider changing Wednesday from a Private Member's Day, that happens to be ours, to a Government Day just to be able to co-operate and help those Members who want to participate in the democratic process. So it only means, then, that your Meech Lake Resolution can be introduced on the Wednesday, if we can make an agreement, instead of on the Tuesday, and at least Members will have that opportunity. I think it is a very reasonable request and I ask the Government House Leader to perhaps reconsider the request and the matter and perhaps get back to us tomorrow. I wonder would he take it under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. BAKER:

I just want to assure the Opposition House Leader that I originally fully understood all the implications of the closing on

Tuesday. I will take his new consideration under advisement.

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

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

November 6, 1989

Tabled by Hon. Minister
of Mines & Energy
Answer to Question
C no. '87

New Board Members Of The Hydro
Group Of Companies
Effective Nov. 3rd., 1989

Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro

1. Ed Hearn, LL.B.
 - Previously served on the Board from January 10, 1980 - February 13, 1989.
 - Lawyer
 - 1 year term
2. Moses Morgan, Ph.D.
 - Previously served on the Board from January 10, 1980 - February 13, 1989.
 - Former President, M.U.N.
 - 1 year term
3. Roland Martin
 - Previously served on the Board from October 13, 1978 - February 13, 1989.
 - Chairman and Chief Operating Officer, Keltic Inc.
 - 1 year term
4. Janet Gardner, C.A.
 - Previously served on the Board from October 13, 1978 - February 13, 1989.
 - Treasurer, Chester Dawe Limited
 - 2 year term
5. William Case
 - President, Commerce Atlantic
 - 2 year term
6. Gordon Gosse, P.Eng.
 - Deputy Minister of Mines & Energy
 - 2 year term

7. Trudy Pound-Curtis, C.A.
 - Comptroller, M.U.N.
 - 3 year term

8. John Gale, Ph.D.
 - Professor, Department of Earth Sciences.
(Specialist in hydrogeological engineering and nuclear waste disposal.)
 - 3 year term

9. Shirley P. Frost
 - Owner/Operator, Uniglobe Phoenix Travel
 - 3 year term.

Churchill Falls (Labrador) Corporation Limited

1. Victor Young, MBA
 - President and CEO, FPI. Previously served on the Board as former Chairman and CEO of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and CF(L)Co.
 - 2 year term

2. David Templeton
 - Re-appointment (Previous term February 27, 1986 - January 17, 1989).
 - Former President, Newfoundland Light and Power
 - 2 year term

3. James Chalker, Q.C.
 - Counsel for the Government of Newfoundland in the Recall Case
 - Lawyer
 - 3 year term

4. John Henderson
 - Previously served on the Board as the former President, CF(L)Co.
 - Retired
 - 3 year term

5. David Mercer
 - Previously served on the Board from October 25, 1978 - January 17, 1989.
 - President, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro
 - 3 year term.

Lower Churchill Development Corporation Limited

1. John Henderson
 - Former President, CF(L)Co.
 - 3 year term
2. David Templeton
 - Former President, Newfoundland Light & Power
 - 2 year term
3. Edward Hearn, LL.B.
 - Lawyer
 - 1 year term

Previous Board Members Of The Hydro
Group Of Companies
Until Nov. 3Rd., 1989

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR HYDRO ELECTRIC CORPORATION

Appointed pursuant to Section 6 of The Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro-Electric Corporation Act, Chapter 3 - 1975. Board of Directors to comprise not less than five and no more than ten persons appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. A President of the Board and a Chairman of the Board to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council from among the Directors.

<u>M.C.'s</u>	<u>MEMBERS</u>	<u>APPOINTMENT DATE</u>
51-89	Chairman & Chief Executive Officer: Mr. C.J. Abery	February 15, 1989
51-89	Mr. David Mercer (ex-officio)	February 15, 1989
51-89	Directors: Mr. Gilbert Gill	February 15, 1989
51-89	Mr. Andrew Crosbie	February 15, 1989
51-89	Mr. Harold Duffett	February 15, 1989
51-89	Ms. Moira O'Dea	February 15, 1989
51-89	Mr. William Earle	February 15, 1989
51-89	Mr. Fred Noel	February 15, 1989
51-89	Mr. Ben Alexander	February 15, 1989
51-89	Ms. Lois Burton	February 15, 1989

NOTES

- (i) Members hold office during pleasure. Chairman and President hold office for period of agreed contract.
- (ii) Remuneration to be prescribed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

LOWER CHURCHILL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Twelve Member Board of Directors appointed in accordance with an agreement entered into between the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Government of Canada.

<u>M.C.'s</u>	<u>MEMBERS</u>	<u>APPOINTMENT DATE</u>
53-89	Chairman: Cyril J. Abery	January 18, 1989
53-89	Directors: David W. Mercer (Ex-officio)	January 18, 1989
53-89	Tom Kendall	January 18, 1989
53-89	Herbert M. Clarke	January 18, 1989
53-89	Clarice Rudkowski	January 18, 1989

NOTES

(1) Appointment for one year. Subject to re-election

March, 1989

CHURCHILL FALLS (LABRADOR) CORPORATION

Incorporated under the Companies Act.

<u>M.C.'s</u>	<u>MEMBERS</u>	<u>APPOINTMENT DATE</u>
52-89	Chairman: Cyril J. Abery	January 18, 1989
52-89	Ex-Officio: John P. Henderson	January 18, 1989
52-89	Directors: Jean Bernier	January 18, 1989
52-89	Jean Claude Roy	January 18, 1989
52-89	Margot Reid	January 18, 1989
52-89	Ed Grant	January 18, 1989
52-89	John Weger	January 18, 1989
52-89	Dwight Hewlett	January 18, 1989
52-89	Frank Smith	January 18, 1989

NOTES

- (i) No specific term of appointment.
- (ii) The Board of Directors consists of six members.

January, 1989