



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY - FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 54

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

Before calling the routine Orders of the Day, on behalf of hon. members I would like to extend a cordial welcome to the Speaker's gallery today, Mrs. Rosemary Mersereau, the daughter of Helena Squires, the first woman member, and Sir Richard Squires, Prime Minister of this House, when we were a sovereign nation. Mrs. Mersereau grew up in St. John's, and lived with her parents all the time her father was Prime Minister. She is presently residing in Ottawa.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

0 0 0

Mr. Doyle: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main on a point of privilege.

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, I am quite reluctant to raise a point of privilege today because it is twenty-five minutes after two, and I do not want to unduly delay the proceedings of the House, but I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that my privileges as a member of this House have been breached over the last few hours in the Evening Telegram.

I want to raise the point of privilege with respect to a story that appeared today on page 3 of The Evening Telegram. The story - hon. members I am sure have read it - says, 'Tories to travel to Districts to gauge residents view'. Now I called The Evening

Telegram with respect to this particular story, and it has been incorrectly reported. I do not know who the reporter was. The Evening Telegram is trying to determine who the reporter was who did this story. But I was interviewed on this particular issue and it has been incorrectly stated today that I would be voting against the Meech Lake Accord.

Now I do not know, Mr. Speaker, who the reporter was, but I have called The Evening Telegram about this particular issue and quite possibly the reporter has me confused with some individual maybe on that side or this side of the House. But I want to make it clear, perfectly clear, that at no time did I indicate to any reporter how I would be voting on this most important issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important issues to face the people of the Province possibly since Confederation. I think it is vitally important that anyone who has the awesome responsibility of reporting upon the debates in this House with respect to this issue, take great pains to ensure that what is reported, accurately reflects the views of that particular individual.

So I hope the Evening Telegram will take it upon themselves to retract that particular story. I believe other members of the Legislature have indicated to me that they have been reported upon as well, and what has been said in that story is totally inaccurate.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. There really is no point of privilege. The hon. Member is taking the opportunity to point out an inaccuracy that has appeared from some of his comments, that he simply wants to straighten out. So, Mr. Speaker, there is no point of privilege, but he is taking advantage of the occasion.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Rather than raise another point of privilege or just to speak for a minute on the point of privilege that the hon. Member for Harbour Main has raised, Mr. Speaker. I want to say too, Mr. Speaker, that the quote in that same story attributed to me says, 'living in his District, Kilbride, MHA Robert Aylward said he has voted differently on Meech Lake in the past.' I have no idea where the reporter got such a statement, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is evident by reading this paper over the last period of time of their extremely anti-Meech Lake stance. If they are going to report what I say, I would expect that they would report it accurately. And, Mr. Speaker, if the editor or the Telegram cannot send reporters into this House to cover accurately the most important debate in the history of Newfoundland and Canada, they should keep their reporters out of it.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that this was not the Telegrams legislative reporter. It was not Pat Doyle who did this story. I do not know the young man's name, but he met me when I was going to the elevator. He said, 'are you a PC Member of this House?' Now, I

would expect that at least if you are going to have a reporter in here he might know what side of the House you sit on, Mr. Speaker. And then after he finished the interview he looked over at the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture and asked me, 'is he a PC Member of the House also?' Mr. Speaker, it was the most ridiculous thing I have ever seen in my life. If the Telegram wants to quote me, come and quote me properly. Do not misquote what I am saying in this House of Assembly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Very briefly, to the same point, because perhaps our privileges have been eroded by the Telegram, because in the same issue and under the same story headline it mentions that the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes said he had received about six constituent phone calls, and five of those were against Meech Lake. My statement was that I had received six phone calls and five were in favour of voting for the Accord, and that was made quite clear because it was documented.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Trinity North.

Mr. Hynes: (Inaudible) to just a few moments ago when it was pointed out to me it was not necessarily a quote. What the Telegram said in essence was that I had voted to rescind the Meech Lake Accord. Now, Hansard shows that my vote was not to rescind the Meech Lake, it was against the rescinding motion. Again, I do

not know where that information came from. It was not a quote, again, it was false information. I think the Telegram has to retract, or at least put in a correction somewhere along the line.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to the House that he carried what I said.

Mr. Speaker: After hearing the submissions by hon. Members the Chair rules that it is not a point of privilege but hon. Members took the opportunity to clarify what they determined to be inaccuracies. I do not think it qualifies for a point of privilege but hon. members took advantage of the opportunity to clarify their positions.

Statements by Ministers

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: For some time now, Francophone parents in the St. John's area have been requesting French-first language classes under Section 23 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In 1987-88, this whole question was reviewed and the former Government concluded that the numbers of students, I think seventeen at that time, did not warrant such classes. Shortly after our election, however, we met with representatives of the Francophone community and the Roman Catholic School Board for St. John's and concluded that that decision should be reconsidered.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we conducted a survey to identify the number of Francophone parents having rights to education in French in the St. John's area. Then, the Roman Catholic School Board for St. John's held a registration to determine how many children would attend such classes.

That registration was held from May 11 to May 25. In this process, Mr. Speaker, thirty-three students were registered from Kindergarten to Grade VI.

After reviewing the situation, Mr. Speaker, the Government has concluded that there are sufficient numbers to warrant the provision of French-first language instruction, provided, of course, that federal funds are made available for this purpose. I am very pleased to make this announcement today, Mr. Speaker.

The cost of offering the program will be shared on a 75 per cent federal/ 25 per cent provincial basis. The funding for the classes will be negotiated with the Federal Government under the provisions of the Federal/Provincial Agreement on Official Languages in Education.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Education will be working with the School Board, in consultation with the parents, to determine the form of program to be offered, taking into account the number and ages of the children who have registered.

A final decision will be made shortly regarding the programming option selected.

I should add, Mr. Speaker, that a French-first language program is not the same as French Immersion.

French Immersion is designed for Anglophone children, while a French-first language program is designed for Francophone children.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Hearn: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Let me thank the Minister for giving me a copy of his statement well in advance. Then let me say that, 'Le Ministre ne sait pas ce qu'il dit' - the Minister does not know what he is talking about when he says that in 1987 - 1988 the former Government concluded that numbers of students did not warrant such classes, that is absolutely incorrect, Mr. Speaker.

The Francophone Association approached the Roman Catholic School Board in St. John's to establish French as a first language class. The Board in its study came up with seventeen people, or the Francophone Association presented seventeen names. Some of the names were questionable as to whether they would qualify or not. At that time, the Board determined that numbers were not sufficient. They appealed to Government and we upheld that at the time, but offered to the Board and to the Francophone Association the opportunity and help in any way to establish whether or not sufficient numbers existed to start the class, which has now been done. What the Minister has done, what his Department has done, is really continue to fulfill the process set up by the former Government. So it is very

incorrect to say that we turned down the request.

The former Government certainly was very supportive of the French school in Mainland, and as an example of that, French is the first language in classes in Labrador City and shows our working relationship with the Francophone Association. We congratulate the Minister on the continuation of the work that he has done, that we started, and we certainly wish the Francophone people well in the establishment of the class here in St. John's. I know it means a tremendous amount to them and undoubtedly, in light of what's happening, it will mean a lot more to them in the future. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

Mr. Kelland: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just before I start the statement, I had indication from the Opposition side that they had not received my statement in advance, as is my normal practice, so I checked on that and just for clarification purposes, should the criticism be there, it was delivered to the Opposition Office at 11:05 this morning, my staff tells me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the Members of the House of Assembly and the residents of our Province that the big game licence draw for the 1990 hunting season has been completed.

This year, the total number of applications received by the Wildlife Division of my Department was 33,729, an increase of 650 from last year.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to

tell the Members of this House that a total of 20,678 moose and caribou licences will be issued to the residents of our Province, 2,078 more than last year. While the decision to increase the number of licences issued this year is based on the continued improvement in the status of our moose and caribou populations, it is also an attempt to control the number of moose/vehicle collisions on our highways. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about these accidents involving big game, and the officials in the Wildlife Division of my Department are investigating all options available to Government to address this serious issue.

I would like to point out that there were 21,877 party applications and 11,852 individual applications in this year's draw.

Of the licences to be issued this year, 12,735 will be party licences and 7,852 will be to the individual applicants. 584 applications were either late or rejected due to insufficient information being provided on the application forms.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by saying that I feel most people in our Province are satisfied with the way our licence draw is working. I am pleased to announce the increase in the number of licences issued and I would like to give public recognition to the staff of our Wildlife Division for their excellent work.

The notices will be mailed to all successful applicants on Thursday, June 14.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, we on this side are pleased that the Minister has announced that the notices will be mailed to those successful applicants on June 14.

I am quite pleased also to see 650 extra licences issued this year which is again a continuation of the improvement from other years. At least the Minister is carrying on with the program that we instituted a number of years ago, and I want to say to the Minister he is leaving one very important element out of his statement, and that is those successful applicants would like to know from the Minister, a very important question, are they allowed to hunt on Sunday or not? And that is the question the Minister has to answer to those successful applicants before they receive their successful permits.

So I say to the Minister that we welcome this news that there was an increase in applicants, and hopefully we will see the vehicle/moose collisions reduced by some other measures that the Minister will consider over the months. And also I would hope the Minister will definitely advise the hunters if they can hunt on Sunday or not?

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Health.

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, in view of recent comments with respect to the redevelopment of hospital facilities in St. John's, I wish to review this matter for the information of hon. Members.

As my colleagues are aware, the St. John's Hospital Council was given the mandate in 1984 to plan for the redevelopment of necessary hospital facilities in St. John's. It should be recognized that these hospitals, although serving the residents of St. John's and surrounding areas, are also provincial health care facilities in that some 35-40 per cent of admissions to these hospitals are from outside of the Eastern Avalon area.

The St. John's Hospital Council have reviewed a number of options over the years. This culminated in a presentation to Government in May of 1989, recommending redevelopment of the Grace General Hospital contiguous to St. Clare's Mercy Hospital and future relocation of the Janeway Child Health Centre and the Children's Rehabilitation Centre to the same site. This option provided for sharing of certain programs and facilities between all institutions on this site. The cost was estimated to be some \$225 million for the total project in fourth quarter 1988 dollars. Given historical trends in construction costs and the time frame of some five to ten years to complete the full magnitude of this option, it is not unrealistic to predict that the cost could exceed \$300 million.

In pursuing a health care project of this magnitude in terms of implications for the Newfoundland health care system and capital construction costs, Government must be sure that this is the most cost efficient way of providing the people of Newfoundland and Labrador with high quality health care services.

Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the

proposal of the St. John's Hospital Council, Government has asked that a further option be assessed which would see the relocation of the Janeway Child Health Centre and the Children's Rehabilitation Centre to the Health Sciences site on Prince Philip Parkway and provide for redevelopment of the obstetrical and gynaecological facilities for the Province on that site with additional redevelopment of the adult acute care beds on the St. Clare's Hospital site. This option will be pursued over the next six to nine month time frame and, currently, Government is considering, with the St. John's Hospital Council, the most appropriate way for planning to proceed on reviewing this and other proposals that have merit before a final decision by Government is made.

I wish to stress that any decision by Government will not be made until after these other options are fully pursued, and any development that takes place would see the current situation with respect to hospitals prevail in St. John's for a minimum of the next five to six year period, given the construction that would be necessary whatever option is eventually adopted by Government.

Detailed planning, as well, will need to consider the three Schools of Nursing presently operating under the direction of the General Hospital, St. Clare's Mercy Hospital and the Grace General Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, during the planning process, full consideration will be given to the staffing implications of this option as was the case with the other options considered to date. In my view,

there is no need for staff of any institution to be unduly concerned about their future employment status, particularly given the fact that this is only an option for evaluation at the present time and, furthermore, it is likely to take at least ten years for full implementation of any of the options if they happen to be chosen.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, this option should only be considered at this time as an option, as I have said on previous occasions time after time, it is merely an option to be explored for future consideration by Government. In view of the large amount of public funds involved and the implications for the health care of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, Government has a responsibility, at the very least, to examine the feasibility of all options, including this one. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for St. John's East.

Ms Duff: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you Mr. Minister for a copy of your statement. I am pleased that Government has at least put in writing in the form of a statement some clarification of some of the issues raised in this question.

I would like just in relation to the first few paragraphs to say that I am pleased that Government is overtly recognizing that the hospitals in St. John's do serve the entire surrounding area, and to a large measure provide tertiary care for the entire Province, because I was disturbed to hear from some Members opposite

the business of it being a question of St. John's verses Burgeo and other areas, and I would not want the politics of the overpass to get involved in this very important issue.

In relation to the role of the St. John's Hospital Council, I would just like to say that nowhere there does this paper recognize the fact that this body, operating for seven years with all major players involved in the operation of health care, became a model of co-operation and collaboration and developed an unprecedented level of expertise in the whole area of the rationalization of health care in this region. They are fully cognizant of all the larger issues involved in the provision of health care services and that point is relevant to the decision Government is about to make in terms of its future consultative process.

I would also like to refer to the statement of the Minister regarding costs and I am glad now that the Minister has, in fact, put on paper that the estimated costs were \$225 million, his estimates of inflation, I suppose are an extrapolation to \$300 million, it is possible, depending on the time frame in which Government operates and how far it goes with that option. But the Minister made statements which were publicly carried and one of them was, that the cost would be a \$1 million a bed to replace the Grace Hospital. These statements were misleading, gave a false impression of the costs involved, and were very disturbing to the Grace Hospital Administration and to the Hospital Council.

The statement goes on to deal with the option that Government now

wishes to have considered, and I would only comment here that it is certainly the opinion of the hospital council and others in the system, that while this body had a mandate, which was carried out with thorough professionalism to rationalize the health care services in the region, Government, appeared to be operating secretly and on a parallel track to develop a totally different option without consultation with this body. An option that is a radical departure from either the status quo or from the option identified by the hospital council as the most cost effective, efficient and least disruptive option.

I would agree that Government, where costs of this magnitude are concerned, has, not only a right but a responsibility to do a very careful review, but I would hope that reading between the lines here, Government is back tracking on its stated objective to take this matter out of the hands of the hospital council and set up another committee with representation from the council but certainly not this same body who worked so hard to meld together something, the sum of which was greater than its parts.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time has elapsed.

Ms Duff: Is there a time frame on responses to statements?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Oral Questions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question today for the President of Treasury Board. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that under the Essential Workers' Agreement, reached between Treasury Board and the Lab and X-Ray Union, benefits such as workers' compensation were to be kept in place for workers who were to be called in to do emergency essential services work, and that employees on sick leave and annual leave before the strike would be able to keep their benefits in place because the union agreed to provide these essential services. Can he confirm that was the understanding and the agreement with respect to essential services?

An Hon. Member: You should have been listening.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: I am asking the Minister if he could confirm that under the Essential Workers' Agreement, reached between Treasury Board and the Lab and X-Ray Union, benefits such as workers' compensation were to be kept in place for workers who were called in to do emergency work and, also, that employees on sick leave and annual leave would be able to keep those benefits intact because the Union had agreed to provide essential emergency services. Can he confirm that was the understanding of the Essential Services Agreement?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Off the top of my head I

would say, yes, I believe that is correct. But I have to go back now and check the detail of the Agreement that was actually signed to see if, in fact, that was in there. My understanding is that is a normal thing for the Union and Treasury Board to agree to.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a supplementary, the Minister has confirmed that his understanding is that that was the agreement. Can he also confirm, or is he aware of any reports that these benefits are now, in fact, in some areas, being denied the workers and, as a result, there is considerable trouble brewing with respect to the understanding and agreement of essential services because of the withdrawal of these earlier-agreed-upon benefits?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not aware of any difficulties that have arisen in that regard. I will certainly check into the situation and report back.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While the President of Treasury Board is checking, perhaps he could check into this matter, as well. Maybe the Minister may be aware of it, and he can tell us if so. Is he aware that an employee, for example, in Goose Bay, who had been off on sick leave, had undertaken and faced some pretty serious and major surgery before the strike, who had the understanding that her

sick leave benefits would remain in place is now being told that she is no longer entitled to that sick leave, despite the fact that was part of the agreement?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the President of Treasury Board is aware of this. Is he aware of the situation in Corner Brook where the agreement on essential services was to provide that supervisors and technologists had agreed to do only emergency work, but now the hospitals, apparently, have broken that agreement and say that the supervisors will now do any kind of work? Is he aware of that particular problem? If he is, is it accurate, then, to say that the agreement is in danger of collapsing?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I should point out to hon. members that by me saying I am not aware of these situations is in no way agreeing that the situations actually exist. I know we are going through a new phase in terms of Essential Workers' Agreements, providing essential services. I think it is the first time such an agreement has been negotiated and there may, indeed, be instances of dispute. In some instances, a union member may say this is not an essential service and management might say it is an essential service. There is a

mechanism in place to look at each individual situation as it arises, because no one individual at any point in time, in the hospital, is aware of all the circumstances of any particular situation. So we do expect that in the application of the Essential Services Agreement there will be points of contention. The mechanism is in place to handle these complaints.

At this point in time they have not reached me, so I cannot say whether what the hon. member is saying is accurate or not - I cannot say that. Within the mechanism, there is a procedure so that these things are settled without me ever knowing they exist. If they do not get settled at a certain point in time, I will become aware that they exist. That is the procedure which has been agreed to by both union and management, and that is the procedure I intend to stick by.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, surely the President of Treasury Board would have a considerable interest in ensuring that nothing serious happens with respect to the Essential Services Agreement. I would expect him to at least make an undertaking to check into the matter immediately, because I can assure him these reports are accurate.

Perhaps I can ask him another question, which I am sure he would be quite familiar with. Can he confirm that an agreement has now been made to pay radiologists and anaesthetists, who usually work fee for service and obviously do not have as much work to do now, during the strike, that there is now an agreement to pay them,

regardless, a flat fee of \$1,947 a week? Is he aware of that agreement?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, in response to the member's first comment I would like to inform him that, first of all, I am obviously very concerned about any problems that exist in the health care sector, especially in these present circumstances. Number two, I would like to advise him that there is a new era of collective bargaining in this Province.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: What is happening is that we believe in the collective bargaining process. An Essential Services Agreement has been bargained and agreed to, and we have procedures in place to handle these situations. This Minister, until the procedure has been gone through, is not going to be sticking his nose in and giving orders, as has been the case in the past.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to his question, there are salaried specialists, and so on, in the Province and I will have to, again, check into the details of the member's question to see if, in fact, the amounts are correct, and if that kind of agreement has been reached.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I can perhaps give him some help. I will send him a copy of the letter that was sent to all radiologists to tell them that.

Mr. Speaker, I have a final supplementary. He says he is concerned, yet he does not know anything about what is going on about all these issues I have raised. I find that somewhat alarming. Mr. Speaker, maybe it is time for the hon. the President of Treasury Board to stick his nose in and try to get this very serious matter resolved.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: Let me ask him this, Mr. Speaker. Is he aware that some lab and X-ray employees who have accrued overtime, and who are entitled to payment of that overtime, have now requested the payment that is due them, because, obviously, their income is limited at this particular stage and they need the money and they are entitled to it? Can the Minister confirm that those workers now are being denied those payments they are entitled to? And if he is not aware of this, will he check into it immediately and get that matter resolved?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, what is being done is what is right and proper to do, and what has been agreed on by union and management to do. That is what is happening in this situation. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in a strike situation everybody suffers; the people of this Province suffer because normal services are not being provided; the Government and management suffers because we are not providing that service; the union suffers, and the individuals in the union suffer because they, then, no longer have access to regular income. So everybody

suffers in a strike, Mr. Speaker. We cannot have a strike in this Province, and we cannot even think, in the collective bargaining sense, of having that kind of a work stoppage unless people on all sides are suffering.

Mr. Simms: The way it is you are breaking the agreement, and that is the whole point.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of short questions for the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. Last week, we will remember in this House, the Member for Grand Falls raised an issue which I consider to be a smouldering and potentially dangerous situation in this Province, where the dump truck operators in this Province are having extreme difficulties in finding work for their machines because of a new process that is being developed in the construction industry.

Last week, when the minister was questioned, it was suggested to him that he get the three sides together and have a meeting to see if he could mediate some type of settlement of the dispute to the satisfaction of the dump truck owners and the companies involved. Did the minister have his meeting? And could he report to us if he had any success in helping out?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, as I

pointed out to the Member for Grand Falls, I guess it was last Thursday when he raised the question, we, on this side, were very concerned with the situation that was evolving with the dump truckers in the Central Newfoundland area. As a result of it, I had meetings with the Newfoundland and Labrador Road Builders' Association, I had meetings with the United Dump Truckers' Association, and then I had a meeting with Lundrigans, who are the contractors directly involved. I suggested to Lundrigans that it would be to everybody's advantage if they met with the United Dump Truckers Association. Lundrigan's had no problem with it. They said the only thing was they had sub-contracted their trucking out to Provincial Carriers. Provincial Carriers then contacted me and said they had no trouble in meeting with the Dump Truckers' Association; Lundrigans said they had no trouble, and if the Dump Truckers Association wanted, they would meet as the main contractor and the sub-contractor with the Dump Truckers' Association. I then contacted the president of the Dump Truckers' Association and advised him of the situation and was informed by fax that the United Dump Truckers' Association would not meet with the contractor as long as the sub-contractor for the trucking was there.

I offered my services to both groups and said I would be happy to convene a meeting whenever they felt it was necessary. I have not heard anything further from either group, so I assume they are working out the problem.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to the Minister. Is the Minister aware that the Newfoundland Dump Truck Association has pretty well disbanded and that the president of that association, as he put it, is unemployed as of yesterday, and that the dump truck operators have unanimously voted to join the Teamsters Union? And does he see any further problems with the Teamsters Union coming in here to represent the dump truck owners in stopping, stalling or hampering the construction season for this year, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister for Works, Services and Transportation.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, I am not officially aware of anything. I guess I heard the media report this morning, the same as the Member did. I see nothing wrong with any group that wants to associate with a union. They have the right under the laws of Newfoundland to form a union and to apply to be certified as a union. I am sure my colleague in labour will be looking at the application and, if it is in order, we, as a Government, certainly would not have any serious concern about anyone wanting to form a union.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Kilbride.

Mr. R. Aylward: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A final supplementary. Will the Minister and the Government, with the Minister representing the Government, consider legislation or changes in legislation similar to that in Quebec? Although they are having trouble with dump truck owners themselves, the legislation in

Quebec says that provincial contracts which are allotted to certain areas, a certain amount, a certain percentage of that contract, the trucking involved in it, has to go to truckers in that local area. Would the Minister consider changing the legislation in this Province so that when provincial dollars are being spent, the local truckers can get a share of that work in their area?

Mr. Dicks: The hon. the Minister for Works, Services and Transportation.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Member is aware that the problem with guaranteeing local truckers work in various areas of the Province is not new to this year. It seems it happens every year, and did for the seventeen years Members opposite were in power.

Because of the problem that evolved this year with the truckers, I have asked my officials to gather information on what is the procedure followed in the various other provincial jurisdictions. I will be looking at it and if I think it is necessary, I will be making a recommendation to my Cabinet colleagues to consider some policy change if we deem this necessary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries pertaining to the caplin fishery. I have heard reports that the Japanese buyers are bent on buying larger, bigger caplin this year. Can the minister confirm that for the Legislature and for caplin fishermen throughout the

Province? What impact would that have on the fishermen, on their earnings and so on this season?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, there are some very delicate negotiations going on, in fact, right at this very moment, between the Japanese buyers and the Fisheries Association. I have been requested by the people in the industry not to comment on the nature of the negotiation for a little while longer. I am meeting with them in twenty-five minutes, Mr. Speaker, at which time I am going to be briefed by both parties as to exactly where negotiations stand. Hopefully, following that meeting, maybe tomorrow or the next day, I will be able to make a public statement as to exactly what the situation is and what the future holds for the caplin fishery in the Province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: I thank the Minister, Mr. Speaker. I was not aware that the negotiations were at such a sensitive stage. I sort of thought the negotiations were probably dealing with price. I have heard reports that the Japanese are sort of bent on getting larger caplin this year. Maybe the Minister would want to confirm that, or not, depending upon the sensitivity or what effect it might have on negotiations.

Let me just ask the Minister a supplementary. What plans does the minister or his department have in place this year - hopefully we will have a caplin/cod conflict for processing

space, as we usually do each year, where the processors take caplin because they are a more lucrative species. What plans does the minister have in place this year to deal with the cod situation in case there is a glut?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is virtually impossible to have a 100 per cent proof contingency plan to put in place, because you never know exactly to what extent the codfish will strike in or just to what extent we will have the glut. I can only say we have a reasonably good plan, both for Labrador and for the Province. We have a certain budget. Not too much, mind you, but we think enough to do the job. We are hoping, with the co-operation of the larger companies with whom we have had discussions in recent weeks, that the glut problem should not be a problem this year. We are hoping it will not. I am hoping there will be lots of cod in this year, but I am hoping that with the co-operation of the industry and the good work of my officials, we will be able to handle it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you once again, Mr. Speaker. Just a final supplementary to the minister, and a switch of pace on the question.

Has there been any indication given to the minister recently about the National Sea Plant in Burgeo? Could the minister inform the House if there has been any progress made with National Sea and the consortium of companies that were negotiating for the

purchase of the Butgeo plant? If so, can the Minister inform us what is happening with the Burgeo situation?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, it is another case of the hon. member, and I thank him for the question and I appreciate it and the importance of it, but it just happens that that, too, is the subject of very intense negotiations. At this point in time, National Sea are entertaining a proposal from a certain company that must remain nameless at this point in time. I understand that company is having talks with federal officials, including the minister. I understand they have had talks with the Government of Nova Scotia and that they are now in the process of putting together a package, and it is going to be a pretty extensive package, a lot of money involved. Hopefully, within a very short time period, we will be able to announce something on that, as well.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Fisheries, as well. Last week, as a result of heavy winds, there were fishermen in my District who received a fair amount of severe damage, particularly the fishermen in Red Harbour, and they have asked me if I would ask the Minister if he would be prepared to do anything, because in that community alone, a very small community, they have lost up to 600 lump roe nets. I would ask the Minister of Fisheries, does he intend to do

anything to assist these fishermen right away?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, we have had considerable gear damage in the past few weeks pretty well all around the Province, including the northeast coast, the south coast, the northwest coast and so on. In fact, it is not now a question of gear replacement, it is a matter now of income support; the people affected are losing income. Even if we had the money to build 100,000 lobster pots, it certainly would not do much good now with the lobster season pretty far advanced. We have written Ottawa. In fact, I tabled some days ago a letter to the Minister of Fisheries in which I brought to his attention the problem, the severity of it, the extent of the damage, the number of people who will be affected, and I pointed out to him that in some parts of the Province, especially on the northwest coast, the livelihood of almost entire communities has been literally wiped out by virtue of this gear damage.

I have explained to the Minister that there are a couple of options we should look at, and the Province is quite willing to work with the Federal Government in that respect. One would be to extend unemployment insurance benefits to cover the people affected, in the affected areas; another would be to come up with some kind of an income support program, again to help the people in the affected areas. And, of course, in the long-term the ideal situation would be to have some kind of a gear insurance program put in place.

Now, I wrote the minister and I asked him for an immediate response. And I am not trying to renege on responsibilities, but I think this problem is too big a problem for the Province, it affects too many people and it affects programs which are the responsibility of the Federal Government, such as unemployment insurance, for example.

The hon. Member is smiling, but I think he understands what I am saying. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we are waiting for a reply. And if I do not get a reply within a few hours or maybe a day or two, I will be going back to him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Minister of Fisheries that the letter he wrote to Ottawa is not sufficient for the people who are suffering now, because they have no earnings and have lost all their nets, in my District and in other parts of the Province. And to say that the problem is too big for the Provincial Government, I can assure the Minister that the problem, where one gentleman in particular was completely wiped out of his roe nets, he didn't save one, is far too big for him and his family.

I would ask the minister if he would sincerely give consideration to this and make an announcement in the next few days, to give some type of assistance to these fishermen. They are literally hurting!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, given

the fact that there are, I suppose, thousands of people affected, involving a cost that would, I suppose, be many millions of dollars, the Province will do all it can to alleviate the problem. But, again, we have to solicit help from Ottawa in this case. And if the Ottawa Government is willing to co-operate and to join with us in, first of all, identifying the extent of the problem and trying to come up with a mechanism to deal with it, then I think we can and will find a solution to it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Environment and Lands, who is also responsible for wildlife. Recently, Mr. Speaker, the RCMP, in Labrador, issued a statement with respect to the Supreme Court of Canada on a number of issues involving aboriginal people's right to hunt for subsistence. The RCMP have said they will limit their charges to aboriginal people who hunt for subsistence, for a living. I ask the Minister responsible for wildlife if he would also encourage his wildlife officers in Labrador to follow the same practice with aboriginal people.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

Mr. Kelland: It is hard to know, Mr. Speaker, if that was a question or if he is advocating that we ease up on people who break the law in Labrador. However, I will take it as a question.

I am very well aware of the statement issued by the RCMP, and it is distressing to me, I can inform hon. members, very distressing that the federal authority which has the responsibility in the case they were referring to, when approximately 200 Innu people from the Province of Quebec came into Labrador and killed a number of waterfowl out of season, the RCMP, it is my understanding, made a conscious decision not to go in and enforce the federal regulations, of which they have the primary responsibility. We will assist, and we have assisted on previous occasions.

My understanding is, also, that the Canadian Wildlife Service took an active decision not to go in and involve themselves in that particular incident. And in justification for not acting in what we thought might be an appropriate manner - the statement, I understand, the Member referred to was issued by the RCMP in Happy Valley, Goose Bay. I have to tell him that it makes the job of the enforcement people in my Department very difficult, because while the federal people have the prime responsibility with respect to the enforcement of waterfowl regulations, we have assisted, and can assist, and can lay charges. But if the main authority negates its responsibility - and we are having this currently investigated with the RCMP, the RNC and Justice, as well - that puts an onerous problem in front of us. We cannot ignore wildlife regulations, and until such time as some native agreement, or aboriginal people's agreement gives aboriginal people special rights, our attitude in the Department, the Division of

Wildlife, is to enforce regulations as they are written in law.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A new question to the minister with respect to his statement today. I ask the minister, will he be advising hunters who will be successful in acquiring big game licences this year that they will be permitted to hunt on Sunday?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

Mr. Kelland: The hon. member knows that is not a decision the Minister responsible for wildlife can take as an individual minister. That would be a decision of Government and, as I stated many times earlier in the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, because it is a public concern, raised by the public and well-known by the public, there are three options that Cabinet will eventually be required to look at. These options with respect to Sunday hunting are simply this, and I have stated them many times: To maintain the ban in place, the status quo, to lift the ban entirely, or to lift the ban in some modified form in wilderness areas, more remote areas. As the hon. member knows, I cannot give a time frame or any comment as to when that will go to Cabinet, but Cabinet is aware of it and it is a decision that will be made by Government.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains.

Mr. Warren: Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. It is almost two

months ago that the question was asked the minister, and the minister is quoted as saying at that time that it was ready to go before Cabinet. The minister was quoted in the paper as saying he would recommend, personally, Sunday hunting. Surely goodness there have been many Cabinet meetings in the last two months. We are now only talking about two more days before some hunters will be notified, at least notification will go out in the mail, and I would hope the minister would encourage his colleagues, or encourage the Clerk of Cabinet, to make sure it is on the agenda for the next Cabinet meeting, where it can be decided once and for all whether or not there will be a Sunday hunt.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

Mr. Kelland: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I be permitted to correct some of the erroneous impressions created by the hon. member in his question. He said it was only two months ago that I said I had a Cabinet paper ready to take up to Cabinet. That is not correct. I have answered the question consistently the same way in the House of Assembly. I would remind him that it is almost fourteen months since I inherited the mess from him in the first place, so I have to live with that and eventually make a decision in Cabinet according to what we deem to be right. It is a Cabinet decision, not one I can make myself, Mr. Speaker, and I think that is commonly known.

It is not correct, either, when he says there are only two days left when hunters must know. Today day is June 13. I said in my statement that on June 14, that is

one day, we would be mailing out the notices to the people and a little later on their licences. But the actual hunting season does not start until early fall, so there is still adequate time to make a decision if Government is asked to make one.

Mr. Speaker: Question Period has expired.

Notices of Motion

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will later today move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions upon the granting of Supplementary Supply to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to give notice that by agreement of both sides, next Wednesday morning at 10:00 a.m. I will ask leave to introduce a resolution dealing with the Meech Lake Accord.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: I did not get a chance to talk to the Government House Leader. Is there any flexibility in the time, for example. I am not even sure of how our own group feels. There is some consideration about the times. I think we are going to agree later on today, sometime, to three sessions per day, if necessary, and the question was, whether it

would be 10:00 to 1:00, 3:00 to 6:00, 8:00 to 11:00 or 9:00 to 12:00, 2:00 to 5:00 or 7:00 to 10:00.

Has the Government House Leader now firmly made up his mind that 10:00 has got to be the time? We had agreed, had we, at my request? In that case, I think it is a brilliant suggestion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Two questions were asked yesterday. One from the hon. Member for Fogo, who asked me to use my influence on my Federal counterpart to have the herring season extended. I am happy to announce Mr. Speaker, that within minutes after the request was made - I didn't realize I had so much influence in Ottawa - within minutes anyway, it was announced that the season would remain open until midnight, Saturday.

The other question came from the Member for Torngat, who asked me if our Department had yet set prices for salmon and char. I promised to take notice and to advise later. I have checked it out, Mr. Speaker, and I understand that the talks are now ongoing between LIDC and my Department with a view to the future operation of that plant and that the setting of salmon and char prices is part of the negotiations, but I have been advised by my people that the

prices paid last year, I think will be matched this year, but I am not able to give a firm understanding as to exactly what will be paid until negotiations to which I just referred are completed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Health.

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the hon. Member for Grand Bank asked a question with respect to the health care services at Grand Bank. Now I have been trying desperately to avoid embarrassing the hon. Member, by giving him the truth of the matter, so I would wish to put it to the House, that the chief executive officer of the Burin Peninsula Health Care Centre has been in touch with the hon. Member to arrange a meeting with him to discuss the issues he raised, some of which are inaccurate statements.

In attendance at that meeting, will be the board chairman, the board member representatives from Grand Bank and Fortune, the chief of the medical staff and the senior medical officer from the Grand Bank clinic. Similar meetings are also being arranged with another group to include: Town councils of Grand Bank, Point May, Lamaline and Fortune to address issues they have raised with respect to the health care and to talk about inaccurate statements made about the quality of care. I would also add that the Board of Management and Administration of the Burin Peninsula Health Care Centre are fully supportive of the way health care is being delivered on the Burin Peninsula.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member is going to persist, then I

promise I will have to stand up and embarrass him in public, which I would hate to have to do in this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, yesterday there was a question from the hon. Member for Humber East about what the legislation said about school attendance. I have checked the legislation and she was right, there is an amendment to the Act. The legislation dealing with school attendance, section 63, suggests that a school board shall not refuse to any child admission to any school under its control unless the child can be accommodated in a school appropriate to his own religious faith, if any be reasonably available to him, or another school more reasonably available to him than the school under its control. And if there is any dispute as to whether a school is reasonably available or more reasonably available under this section, the Minister shall, after such investigation as he deems adequate, determine the matter and his determination to be final.

So, there was an amendment, as she suggests, to the Act, but in my view this does not deny the right of the school boards and the obligation to make decisions on school attendance unless, of course, the students had to be transported over long distances. And if that is the case, then the Minister may intervene to ensure that the distances are not unreasonable. So, I would address that to her and I hope she is listening to acknowledge that response. Thank you very much,

Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: I wonder if there might be agreement to revert to Reports by Standing and Special Committees so I can raise a question. I can raise it now, I guess. It does not really matter. The Government House Leader is not here nor is the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island. If either of those were here I would be able to ask my question more clearly. The Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island or the Government House Leader, I guess he is tied up.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: The question I wish to raise, Mr. Speaker, is the question I raised a week or so ago you will recall, and Your Honour would have a great interest in this, and that is the report of the Standing Committee on Rules.

As Your Honour is aware there was an all party Committee of this House quite some time ago set up and established to look at revising the House rules. It was so long ago now I almost forget when. I believe at one time we were asked to report by the end of March or something and we had to ask for permission of the House to extend it. At the time I think I suggested that we extend it to the end of - I cannot even remember - April or May in the hope that at least there would be some certainty there. And I believe eventually the House Leader said we would just extend it indefinitely so that the Committee

could take its time and report.

But nevertheless, I think there was always an understanding, at least I had the understanding, that the report would be presented to the House before the House adjourned in the spring. Certainly all of our discussions were centered around bringing in the report this spring so that any that we would put into place would perhaps be on a trial basis for a while and would begin in the fall. So, if we are going to wait until the fall to bring it in, or something like that, then that window of opportunity is lost I would submit.

And as I said last week, the opposition caucus dealt with the report a month and a half ago probably now. It was quite some time ago. I discussed it with the Chairman of the Committee and - My God, Mr. Speaker, you are going to have to pardon me. I have just been startled. I have been asked to go on CBC Morning Show or something.

Anyway, the Chairman or the Committee would be aware that I let him know a month and a half ago that we had dealt with the matter and had dealt with those recommendations that we were willing to put forward, because it takes agreement. It cannot be done by the Government. But forever and a day it seems the Government caucus cannot get their mind around anything else, I suppose, other than you know what, and this is another example.

So, I wonder if the Chairman can tell us once and for all, you know, are we being stymied? Is it going to proceed? I mean today is the last opportunity because next week when we return to debate

Meech Lake, as far as I understand, there will be no Orders of the Day except for one day hopefully, a Question Period as I have requested of the Government House Leader. If we do not get that, we do not have an agreement.

So when does the Chairman of the Committee plan to report? That is the question, Mr. Speaker. A long way of asking it, but I had to give all the explanation.

Mr. Speaker: I do not know how appropriate this is but by leave of the House -

Mr. Simms: By leave.

Mr. Speaker: By leave - The hon. the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

Mr. Walsh: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Deputy Chairman of the Committee for raising the matter in the House this afternoon. It is important that the rules and procedures that we are discussing in terms of changes, I might say, Mr. Speaker, are far-reaching in terms of the scope of the changes that are being looked at, are certainly going to reflect greatly on the operation of the Legislature and the House of Assembly. The irony of it is, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition has had opportunity to deal with it and I must say they did so expeditiously as well.

The irony, I guess, lies in the fact that some of the items that were, and I weigh my words carefully without getting into the report, some of the items that we are looking to change: some of my colleagues on this side feel that we may be taking too much from the Opposition, and they feel that

they would like to review some of those matters in a little more detail. The feeling is that some of the rights that may be lost to the Opposition, there might be a day when we ourselves were back in Opposition maybe fifteen or twenty years from now, that we may want to adjust accordingly.

Ninety-eight per cent of the items that were submitted in the report have been approved. There are one or two items that have not been cleared through our caucus, and I am more than willing to meet with the Deputy Chairman privately to discuss the items. But I will say to him with all due respect they are items that the Government side ironically believes may impose on the rights of the Opposition and therefore are being re-looked at. A very small number of items.

I trust also, Mr. Speaker, that although next week will be completely dedicated to one particular topic, the tabling of that report with leave of the House could be done in a matter of two minutes. And we may be ready for it by that time. But it is the Opposition rights that the Government ironically are trying to protect.

Mr. Speaker: The Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Just to comment a little further, I guess the reason we finished it a month and a half ago is because we were dealing with the Government rights, perhaps we did not feel as bogged down about that.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, CBC, The Sunday Express -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Is the hon. Member finished?

Mr. Simms: No, no, I have to make a very important point here. The point is this, in terms of tabling the report next week with leave of the House, I do not think that would be a difficulty. The question is and the problem is, how do we prepare the report? We are all leaving tonight and will not be back until next Tuesday night or Wednesday. So how will our Committee get a chance to get together to look at the report and put it together in order to be able to table it? That is my question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

Mr. Walsh: Mr. Speaker, knowing full well that the Opposition have approved all of the items that were, I should not say all of the items, but the majority of the items that were outstanding, it is just a matter of us clearing up those few minor items, it is just housekeeping, we can draft it and make sure the Committee members have it in just a short period of time.

Mr. Simms: What we approved I gave to you.

Mr. Walsh: Yes, I have a full list of what has been approved. And again, as I say, the irony of it is it is being held up to protect some of the rights the Opposition members have.

Mr. Speaker: We reverted back to Presenting Reports By Standing And Special Committee. Now we were down to Questions For Which Notice Has Been Given. I assume that has all been done, we are now at

Petitions.

Petitions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Lewisporte.

Mr. Penney: I have a petition to present to the House today. Because of the hour and being considerably behind time I will keep my comments very brief. I have a petition from 116 teachers in the Notre Dame Branch of the NTA. They are concerned about the elimination of the Hospital School Program.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Penney: Mr. Speaker, I will read the prayer of the petition. A petition to the Minister of Education and the Government of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador: We the undersigned primary, elementary, and secondary teachers do hereby petition the hon. Philip Warren, Minister of Education and the Government of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, to reinstate the Hospital School Program which the Minister of Education has recently eliminated from all hospitals outside the St. John's area and to further extend the Hospital School Program to all rural hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated, the petition is signed by 116 teachers, and this represents twenty-one communities; ten communities from the Lewisporte district, eight communities from the Twillingate district, and there is one from Gander, Grand Falls, and one from Victoria Cove. Mr. Speaker, the teachers believe that the hospital school program has provided a necessary

service, and in conversation with several of the teachers, they refer to the value that this program has given individual students who have from time to time required hospitalization. I believe the 116 teachers who have added their names to this petition are very sincere.

I commend them for that sincerity, and I believe their concern is valid. In conversation with one of the petitioners, a Mr. John Sutherland, who I am sure the Minister is quite familiar with, he has expressed as well the concern that the program was eliminated without consultation, as he stated, without consultation with the hospital schools principals. Mr. Speaker, not having been involved in any way, shape, or form, with education in this Province, unlike approximately one third of my colleagues in the House, I have had no involvement with the program whatsoever. I state only what I was told and, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of these 116 teachers I ask the hon. Minister of Education if he will have another look at the program with the possibility of reinstating it in some other form, maybe.

Thank you, very much. Mr. Speaker, I now table the petition.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would certainly like to have a quick glance at the petition. As soon as the Page gets it from the hon. Member perhaps I could have a look at it to use in the discussion on this particular petition.

An Hon. Member: To see if it is in order.

Mr. Simms: Not to see if it is in order. I am absolutely certain it is in order, but to refer to the numbers. The rules say you must refer to the numbers and to the prayer of the petition. You are allowed to bend a little bit. Your Honour often lets us bend slightly. I want to commend the members of the NTA branch, I think it is. He referred to the members of the NTA.

An Hon. Member: Notre Dame Branch of the NTA.

Mr. Simms: I congratulate the Notre Dame Branch of the NTA, for their initiative. What is really, really interesting is that in the past we have heard representation made in this House, and questions being asked in the House on this issue by the Member for Humber East and by myself, in particular, the two of the three hospitals where the closures are going to be effected. This is a petition of 116 people from the area out around Notre Dame, the District of Lewisporte and the District of Twillingate. My point is it is from people outside of Grand Falls, Bishop Falls, and Windsor who signed other letters and made other representations and now it is extending to people outside of those immediate areas. I commend the individuals involved. I am not sure if the Member was so concerned about the issue that he went out, initiated the petition, and asked them to express their concerns because he felt so strongly about it, but I am pleased to see the Member for Lewisporte stand in his place today and express support, I would presume, when you present a petition you are supporting your

petitioners. I would commend the Member for Lewisporte for having the courage to stand in this House, present this petition on behalf of many of his constituents, and many of the constituents of the hon. Minister of Fisheries, and support their request in asking that the Minister of Education, and the Government, reinstate the hospital school program, which the Minister of Education has recently eliminated.

Now, you have seen an example of courage from the Member for Lewisporte who is a member of the Government, sits in the Government, albeit in the back benches, and now is expressing, through the forum that we have here in the presentation of a petition, his concern and his support for the 116 people's request to the Minister of Education in his own Government to reinstate that program tout de suite, if not sooner. I commend the Member, I commend the petitioners, and Mr. Speaker, I can only ask the Minister of Education once again not to give us the same answer that he always gives over and over again, will he please listen to the pleas of all the groups who have written him. They have been numerous, as he knows, boards, pastoral committees have now gotten into it, who are concerned about the spiritual educational aspects of eliminating this school. The pediatric nurses, professional pediatric nurses, medical staff, everybody has said this is a very drastic decision, a stupid decision.

You do not break something that works. These schools worked very well. If he wants to provide better service or other service to other hospitals, well then sobeit,

let him do it, let him find the money to do it, but do not do it by cutting out the programs in other hospitals that have been working.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the prayer of the petition and I will be saying so in the public media out in Central Newfoundland as soon as I can get to a telephone.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

Dr. Warren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to indicate to my hon. friend who presented the petition what I have said repeatedly in the House.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Dr. Warren: Yes, that the Department is reviewing the provision of alternate educational services for students who spend extended periods of time in hospitals.

I might provide a little bit of new information. My officials have already met with school board authorities in the areas concerned, to examine ways that we can provide a better service for students, or an equally good service for students, who are in hospitals for extended periods of time.

I do want to remind the House that in the case of Grand Falls, we had one teacher involved. The daily average I am told over all of last year was six students per day, the average length of stay was four and a half days, and there are many, many students in for two and three days and they were ill. So

we have many students who were in these schools for very short periods of time, in the case of St. Anthony the average daily to date is three students. In Corner Corner Brook the average daily attendance was ten. So we are talking about twenty students on the average per day, many of whom were in for very short periods of time.

Mr. Speaker, I assure the petitioners, and I assure the Member who made the petition, that we are going to provide alternate services for students who are in hospitals for extended periods.

The Janeway is completely different. The Janeway is a provincial hospital where students stay for much longer periods of time. It is an entirely different situation. I might say that the petition did not ask the Minister only to reinstate, the petition asked the Government to consider alternates. So I would like for the Member to return to his District and indicate that the Government is doing precisely what the petition advocated either reinstate or consider alternate programs. We are in the process of considering alternate programs as I have assured the House on many occasions in the past.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Baker: Motion 4, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act, 1977 (No. 2)" carried. (Bill No. 56).

On motion, Bill No. 56, read a first time, ordered read a second time presently, by leave.

Mr. Baker: Order 28, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Canada-Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation (Newfoundland) Act and The Petroleum and Natural Gas Act" (Bill No. 43).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

Dr. Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, in accordance with the spirit and intent of the Atlantic Accord, makes amendments to the Canada-Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation Act and it would be identical, these amendments would be identical to those amendments that are presently in the Federal-Atlantic Accord Act, contained in Chapter 28 of the Statutes of Canada, 1988 as enacted by the Parliament of Canada on July 21, 1988 and those amendments contained in Bill C-44, entitled "An Act Respecting The Hibernia Development Project And To Amend Certain Acts In Relation Thereto", presently before The House Of Commons. This latter one, Mr. Speaker, was passed by committee last night in the House of Commons.

Clauses 2 to 8 are specifically related to the Atlantic Accord Implementation Act. Clause 9, inserts a reference to the Federal Atlantic Accord Act in our Petroleum and Natural Gas Act. Clause 10, adds a provision, an evidence provision respecting documents inspected, examined, obtained or provided under or in accordance with the Royalty Agreement with the consortium

which we have negotiated over the last few months and I believe it is almost finished, and Clause 11 is a validation clause for approval of the Hibernia Development Plan by the Offshore Petroleum Board, and Clause 12 concerns proclamation, and this Bill would be proclaimed at the same time as the Federal Bill, C-44 and Chapter 28 of the 1988 Statutes of Canada. That's all I have to say on this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Green Bay.

Mr. Hewlett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to stand and indicate that I can support this particular Bill, like a couple of other matters relating to the Atlantic Accord and the Hibernia Project which has come up to this House very recently. I guess this is another fantasy. The fact that an Atlantic Accord can exist without a Triple "E" Senate is totally beyond us according to the hon. the Premier.

The fact that any regional development initiative, certainly one of this magnitude and importance to the people of our Province, could actually exist without major, major alterations to the Constitution of Canada, is impossible according to the Premier, but obviously, here we are today passing an amendment to a Bill that occurred through goodwill between the Federal and Provincial Governments of the day, and as I said, Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to support it.

I would also indicate to my colleagues opposite that there are some heavy decisions to be made by us over the next few days and I would certainly plead with my colleagues opposite to think long

and hard and carefully about the possible economic consequences of us doing the wrong thing in this Assembly next week. Mobil Oil is in the oil business to make money, shareholders to satisfy, if there is political paralysis in this nation, there will be economic paralysis in this nation, and so I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the House to pass this Bill and to think extremely carefully about the consequences of what we will or will not pass next week.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. the Minister now speaks he will close the debate.

Dr. Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank my hon. critic for his comments on this Bill and his agreement that this Bill proceed.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Canada Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation Newfoundland Act And The Petroleum And Natural Gas Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 43).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House I would like to call the second reading of Bill No. 56, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act, 1977."

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act, 1977." (Bill No. 56).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Labour.

Ms Cowan: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Bill, Mr. Speaker, essentially proposes to repeal and replace the present section 70 of the Labour Relations Act, a section that refers to the determination of a special project under the legislation.

The explanatory note of the Bill sets out for all Members the present wording of section 70. The section originated in the Labour Relations Act that was in force before the present Act was revised and consolidated in 1977, and it was enacted in relation to the Churchill Falls project or the development of the Upper Churchill River.

A key factor in labour relations at Churchill Falls was the existence of a master labour agreement covering an eight year period. The careful management of the project's labour relations has been well recognized as being a major contribution to its early completion. Indeed master project's agreements have been utilized on many major construction projects in the country and generally they have served their purpose of providing stable labour relations for major jobs with lengthy construction periods.

The specific reference to the Churchill Falls project in the original version of section 70 was deleted in the revision in 1977 and there remained a general clause allowing for a special project declaration. The declaration is for construction undertakings planned to exceed a period of three years to develop a natural resource or establish a primary industry.

The enabling provision has never

been used since its original enactment at the time when the legislation specifically deemed the Upper Churchill project to be a special project. Now when this Government is facing the prospect of a major construction undertaking to develop the Hibernia project, it is apparent that the present wording does not provide sufficient flexibility with respect to enabling the setting out of such conditions or qualifications of the declarations that Government thinks are necessary. For example it is of critical importance to this Government that any construction undertaking developing the Hibernia project provide first consideration for qualified residents of the Province.

The proposed amendment allows the declaration order to include appropriate conditions and it further provides that the order may for clarification prescribe the geographic site to which the declaration relates and the employers and trade unions involved in collective bargaining on this special project.

While a revision of the present section 70 was considered necessary in light of possible Hibernia construction undertakings, this section is not in any way restricted to the Hibernia project. Consequently the flexibility incorporated into the proposed wording will be sufficient to meet other future major construction projects in the years to come.

Major jobs with lengthy construction periods benefit from project agreements. The agreements usually last for the length of the project, normally longer than the usual collective

agreement in the construction industry, and provide a means of stabilizing labour conditions in the area, fixing fair wage rates at a level high enough to attract trades people to the project, but not so high that the economy of the area is unduly upset.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment also clarifies that where a special project is declared by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council under section 70, any application for a similar declaration made under section 69 to the Labour Relations Board in relation to the same undertaking is void.

While this section may appear initially to be saying the obvious, it has been determined as necessary to preclude any confusion or conflict between the two sections. Section 69, as my colleagues may know, allows for special project declaration to be made by the Labour Relations Board upon application by bargaining agent employer or any party to an existing or proposed collective agreement purporting to be for a period exceeding three years if that undertaking comes within the definition in the Act of a special project.

I hope that, Mr. Speaker, will be an adequate explanation for the principle of the Bill, and I would certainly welcome any questions which I could answer when I rise to close debate.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Harbour Main.

Mr. Doyle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to see this

particular Bill come before the House of Assembly today. As a matter of fact, I was beginning to get a little bit concerned that the Bill wasn't coming before the House at all, given the fact that we might be adjourning within the next week or so, and this Bill had not, up until yesterday, come before the House. So I was beginning to get a little bit concerned, in view of the fact that the Hibernia project may, who knows? It might go ahead sometime in July or August or September, and it is going to be necessary to have that Bill if we are going to maintain any degree of labour peace here in the Province.

I believe it will be necessary for that particular site - and I think it is the Bull Arm site that we are talking about here - to have special project designation, again, as I said, if we are going to maintain any degree of labour peace in the Province. I believe the last time we had a project in the Province that had special project status - correct me if I am wrong - but I think it was the Churchill Falls project. I think that was probably the only one we had. And, in spite of the fact that that project had many, many drawbacks, in that you had so many different trades coming together on the one job, and not only trades, but you had so many different nationalities of people coming together - you had the British and the Portuguese, you had the French and the English, all coming together on one site, and a lot of people who were used to different standards of employment and different standards of labour. In spite of that, I don't think we had one day of - and I could be wrong - but I don't think we had one day of unrest on that particular project.

As the Minister points out, of course, what the legislation does is to amend the current Act to prescribe a certain geographic site as a special project site, and it gives Cabinet the authority, as well, to prescribe the employers and the trade unions that may come to that particular site and get involved in the collective bargaining process, and to become employed on that project. I don't know if that is a new part of the Act, if it was in the old Act, or not, and I don't know specifically what the purpose of it is, but, in any event, I have spoken to a number of people in the trade union movement who represent the various trade unions around the Province, and they are pleased to see this Act come before the House of Assembly, and I believe they are supporting it. I believe they are aware that it is coming.

In a nutshell, I suppose what it does, is when the various trade unions come to the site to work, they will, in advance, all have jointly worked out an agreement with the employer who, in this case, will be the HEA, the Hibernia Employers' Association. And the normal individual collective agreements will all go by the wayside, and everyone will be brought under the umbrella of one joint collective agreement, which all trade unions, when they come to the site, whether it is a carpenters' union or a boilermakers' or an ironworkers' or a tinsmiths' or a plumbers' or a pipefitters' will all be subject to this one collective agreement.

So I think this is a good Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I think it will go a long way to ensure some degree of labour peace and stability on that project, which

we are going to need. I do not believe the Hibernia Group of Companies, the consortium, can get involved in developing that type of megaproject unless they have some degree of guarantee that we are going to have a certain amount of labour peace on that project. Because the timing of the project is very, very important, as well. So I think this will do that, in declaring the site a special project site. It will ensure that we have a certain degree of labour peace on that project.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

I want to make some reference to this Bill, as well, and I am one that is not at all happy, Mr. Speaker, with this piece of legislation that the Minister has just introduced in the House of Assembly, because it is directly contrary to the policies of the previous Administration. This Government has now decided in their wisdom to deny the Marystown Shipyard workers or the Marine Workers access to that site. They have been notified in a letter by the Premier on June 7, to the President of the Marine Industrial Union. The Premier made it quite clear to them that he has now concluded and recognized that the Marystown Shipyard Union, the Marine Workers Union, Local 20, will not be able to participate on site in this megaproject. I find that, Mr. Speaker, to be an insult to the high caliber of the work force, a distinguished work force in this Province, that has been heavily involved in the Marine activities of this Province. And nobody can argue that the Marystown Shipyard workers have

not had a tremendous history of successful contribution to marine work in this Province. And I have difficulty in accepting that the Minister of Labour, together with her colleagues, would deny such a group of individuals access to that site.

I want to make it clear that I am not in any way opposed to the Building Trades Association having access to that site. I believe they should, Mr. Speaker. I believe the building trades should work on the site, but I also believe that the Marine Workers' Union has a right to be on the site as well. And this Government today, through this letter by the Premier, of June 7, to the President of the Union has basically, and they can say what they like opposite, is that the major contract that the Marine Workers' Union were going for, the Marystown Shipyard, was the mechanical outfitting on this project. The mechanical outfitting that would enable the Marystown Shipyard to bid for, and hopefully be successful in obtaining, whereby they would prefab so much of it in their own facility and then install it in the concrete platform which they have brought from Placentia Bay as well.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Pardon? What has happened here is that the Marine Workers' Union are not going to be allowed to install it. That is where it stops it. To say to my colleague for Placentia, whom I know is extremely concerned about Placentia Bay, as I am, that what has happened here is that the Marine Workers Union will not be allowed to complete their project.

Now the question then arises, whether or not Mobil Oil will give a contract to the Marystown Shipyard if they are not able to complete their project. And all they will be able to do is to do the prefab work on the contract and then have to pass it over to the Building Trades to install. Mr. Speaker, I think it is wrong for the Government to take that attitude and action. As I said and I repeat, I have nothing against the Building Trades Association, I believe they should have access to this site, but the Marine Workers' Union should have equal access. And why is this Government constantly attacking the work force of the Burin Peninsula? When it is not closing down the fish plants in Grand Bank or closing out the hospitals in Grand Bank and St. Lawrence, when it is not scuttling a shrimp trawler to be built at the Marystown Shipyard, they have decided to turn on the work force, by denying them the right to work on a project that they have done such work on. There is no group in this Province that has made the contribution to the offshore in terms of having their work force educated and qualified in all activities of highly skilled trades in this Province.

And now what we are seeing today are the Ministers, particularly the Minister of Development who is responsible for the work force of the Marystown Shipyard, and the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, we see her too standing by and letting the work force of the Marystown Shipyard basically go down the tube. Because this Premier wanted to do nothing else but disassociate himself from the policies of the previous Administration. And I have great difficulty with this. And anyone

in this Chamber who intends to be a friend of the Burin Peninsula, going around the Burin Peninsula representing the Liberal Party, should come clean and dispute the actions of the Premier and this Government in trying to sabotage what has taken place, in having the work force of the Marystown Shipyard trained and their ambitions, Mr. Speaker, to be able to become an equal participant on the project as was outlined in a memo in 1987, I believe March 1987. Why is this action taking place? I want to ask the Minister of Labour, when she gets up in this House, to explain to me why the Marine Workers' Union are not permitted to take action, to be allowed to go on site? I think there is room for both the Building Trades Association and the Marine Workers' Union. This is a special project. It is marine oriented and there is no union in this Province more qualified, more capable, and have more right to marine activities than the Marine Workers' Union at the Marystown Shipyard. This bothers me. It bothers me, Mr. Speaker, to see the way this Government is treating the people of the Burin Peninsula. There seems to be no end to their attack on the livelihoods of the men and women who depend on action from this Government to assist them. We all know that this is a megaproject and that there will be a lot of work, but there is negative fallout as to what is happening in this regard. I believe very strongly that this must change.

My colleague for Grand Bank will be coming in to speak on this Bill as well. I ask the Minister of Energy to stand up and be counted, to defend the rights of the work force of the Marystown Shipyard

whom the Department of Development has spent millions of dollars training to do the mechanical outfitting from start to finish. Not half of it, Mr. Speaker, but to start the project and complete the project. For this Government, this Cabinet to deny that to the work force of the Marystown Shipyard is shameful, it is scandalous, and it is basically hard to believe. The Building Trades Association, no problem at all. They are, I would suspect, and I have every reason to believe, highly qualified individuals. I will never argue that. They are highly qualified individuals who, no doubt, want work and deserve work on the concrete platform. But nobody should deny the rights of the work force at the Marystown Shipyard to participate in that. I don't know why, but there has never been a satisfactory reason given to me, nor in the letter. And the letter the Marine Workers' Union sends back to the Premier quite clearly indicates where they are coming from. Do you know what the President of the shipyard union says to the Premier on behalf of his workers? 'It would be impossible for me to explain to you just how shocked and disappointed our union is with the position taken by your Government to exclude our bargaining unit from any on-site opportunities created by such a megaproject.' It is an understatement to say they are shocked at that type of attitude by the Provincial Government. They are disappointed. They cannot believe it. There is nobody who has as much qualifications as the work force of the Marystown Shipyard, and nobody would believe that anyone could conceivably take such action as to deny them the right to work on a concrete platform. I

take that very seriously, and I believe all members of this House should take it very seriously.

The Minister of Employment and Labour Relations who just introduced this regulation should also - let me ask the minister, and she is smiling over there. You should not smile about this issue, it is far too important. Why did you make such an attack on the work force of the Marystown Shipyard. I shall not be -

An Hon. Member: Would the hon. Member permit a question?

Mr. Tobin: Yes, sure. What is your question?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to relinquish my right. No, no, I will not be recognized then. No, no. You are not getting me down that way.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I know exactly what I am talking about in this Bill. I say to the Member for Placentia, I hope he supports me, because Placentia Bay should be just as dear to your soul as it is to mine.

Mr. Hogan: (Inaudible) the question.

Mr. Tobin: Get up when I am finished and ask the question to the Minister of Employment.

Mr. Hogan: (Inaudible) don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. Tobin: The Member for Placentia should be extremely careful. I tell the Member for Placentia that I am not the Minister of Transportation.

Mr. Warren: The boys just told him there is nothing wrong with it, see.

Mr. Tobin: Boy, they can tell him what they like. Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Placentia does not believe what I am saying, here it is from the Premier of this Province.

Mr. Hogan: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Yes, I will let you see it. 'Within this context Government has concluded that it should recognize the Trades Council as being the appropriate union to represent the workers at the GBS', and the Marystown Shipyard is gone down the tube.

Mr. Hogan: (Inaudible) on that.

Mr. Tobin: Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the Member for Placentia - I cannot believe what I am hearing. They shall never rescind their Charter as the Marine Workers Union, based upon the advice of the Member for Placentia or this Government. They have every right. That is shocking, Mr. Speaker, to now suggest that the members of the Marine Workers' Union should become members of the Building Trades Association. The history of the Marine Workers' Union in this Province is as good, Mr. Speaker, if not better than any union anywhere in this Province. I do not know if they have ever been on an illegal strike. That is the type of union the marine workers are and they should not, Sir, have to give up their union and join the Building Trades Union. That is an insult to that union, and I am surprised that the member took such action.

Mr. Hogan: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Placentia.

Mr. Hogan: I was not questioning the authenticity of the ambitions of the union down there or their goals, what I was trying to say, Mr. Speaker, was that that union could become a part of the Council of Trade Unions for that period of time. That is the only question I was asking the hon. member. But usually he gets all hot underneath the collar and goes shooting off at the mouth so that he doesn't know what he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker: To that point of order. There is no point of order, just a disagreement between hon. members.

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Member for Placentia if I do not know what I am talking about, why should the Marine Workers Union not have the right to work on that site?

Mr. Hogan: They should have the right to work on it.

Mr. Tobin: They should have a right to work on it as the Marine Workers' Union.

Mr. Hogan: Yes, as part of the council (inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Why do they have to be part of the council? They are marine workers and are not even affiliated with them. The Marine Workers' Union is part of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour.

Mr. Hogan: For that project, couldn't they become part of it?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: What is the former teachers' president saying?

Mr. Hogan: Never mind him, talk to me.

Mr. Tobin: I do not want to talk to either one of you. Because I am surprised at you, after I carrying the load with you on the ferry for Argentia and you treat this like that.

But I would like to get back to this. As a matter of fact, my colleague here on my left, from Mount Pearl, as well as my former colleague from St. John's West, Mr. Barrett, when they were part of the former Government they made it quite clear that the Marine Workers' Union had equal right on the site with the Building Trades.

An Hon. Member: That is true.

Mr. Tobin: That is true, is right. And they did not say they should become members of the Building Trades Council. Why should the Marine Workers' Union be wiped out by the Building Trades Council because this Government and that Minister denied them the right of equal participation on the site?

Mr. Speaker, the Marystown Shipyard Union have been blatantly

An Hon. Member: Have you seen (inaudible) lately?

Mr. Tobin: I hope the Minister of Development will reconsider the actions of this Government. I ask him in all sincerity to reconsider the actions of this Government and to give the employees the right to do what needs to be done. I know what is happening. I know what is happening down in Marystown,

yesterday and today. I can tell the Minister of Development, and everybody else who sits in this House, that I will, with whatever bit of strength is in me, fight for the rights of the people I represent, and the management of Marystown Shipyard nor nobody else will keep me quiet. I want to say that for a reason. I intend to do everything I can, everything in my power to try to get this decision reversed and give equal, shared jurisdiction on that project, which was articulated in the Ministerial Statement in this House in March, 1987. I intend, as I said, to do whatever I have to do, in my power, to ensure that, and I will not accept, Mr. Speaker, the slightest deviation from that by anyone who suggests that I should be quiet, and other things. Because this is too important to me. Everybody in this House knows the commitment the previous Administration had to the Marine Workers' Union and to the Marystown Shipyard.

The Member for Mount Pearl is here on my left, and it started under his administration as Minister of Development, when they sent people to Norway and trained them, the best welders to be found anywhere in this Province. There are no better welders or other tradesmen to be found anywhere in this Province, better than the Marine Workers' Union. They have been trained, they have been tested. They have worked on the concrete platforms; they have worked at mechanical outfitting in Norway. They all spent months and months over there.

An Hon. Member: Did they not come from Port aux Basques (inaudible)?

Mr. Tobin: Yes, there was a transfer of technology with Port

aux Basques, as well.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) work over there.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, they did.

But the workers of the Marine Workers' Union are heavily involved -

Mr. Dumaresque: (Inaudible) fanatic.

Mr. Tobin: What is the Member for Eagle River talking about, 'panic'?

An Hon. Member: No, wrong word. Fanatic, extremist.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I ask the hon. the Member for Eagle River to withdraw that statement, please.

An Hon. Member: Withdraw what statement?

Mr. Speaker: 'Fanatic'.

Mr. Dumaresque: Anything I said, Mr. Speaker, that is unparliamentary, I withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite can call me what they like and have to withdraw statements all day, but they will not deter me. Whether they are agents of somebody else in trying to do it, I don't know and I won't suggest it, but if they are agents of somebody else in trying to do it, to scuttle my line of thought on such an important issue, they will not be successful. Because with the last breath that's in me,

I will defend the rights of the people who sent me here to represent them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: I will do it, Mr. Speaker, and I shall never shirk that responsibility for anybody.

Mr. Hogan: (Inaudible) and let me ask you something simple.

Mr. Tobin: The Member for Placentia is at it again, Mr. Speaker.

I shall never shirk that responsibility.

When I found out this piece of legislation was coming before the House, I again spoke to members of the Marine Workers' Union today, before I came to this House, and again, Mr. Speaker, I shared with them their concern and their disappointment that the Government took such action towards their work force.

The Marine Workers' Union with the Shipyard have always been the leading people in doing what we hoped would be the mechanical outfitting from start to finish on this project. They started the project, so they are going to bid on it. They start it, and half-way through they have to pass it over to somebody else to finish. I am wondering whether or not Mobil Oil would be prepared to award a contract in such an arrangement. I am wondering who advised the Premier to take such drastic action against the Marystown Shipyard. Was it done in Cabinet, P and P, or did the Premier do it on his own? Or did the Department of Employment and Labour Relations recommend it? Where did the recommendations come

from to scuttle the policies of the previous Administration which were to give the Marystown Shipyard the right to work on the concrete platform on site? Where did that decision arise? Probably somebody can tell me. Probably the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, when she stands to close the debate on the bill, can tell me that. Where did the decision -

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible) because of the nature of that site project and after it was over, they went back to themselves.

Mr. Tobin: Is that the reason?

Mr. Murphy: I never said that was the reason.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) Churchill Falls.

Mr. Murphy: I told you what happened in Churchill Falls. I did not tell you anything else.

Mr. Tobin: I can say to the Member for St. John's South and to all others that there is one reason and one reason only, and it is the same reason this Administration have attacked the work force of the Burin Peninsula since they came here, it is the same reason they closed the hospital in Grand Bank and St. Lawrence, the same reason they closed the fish plant in Grand Bank, the same reason they refused to have a shrimp trawler built in Marystown, despite the fact that the Federal Government were going to pay 50 per cent of it, the same reason why you are taking the Eastern Community College from the Burin Peninsula, the same reason why this Government has done everything. There is nothing on the Burin Peninsula this

Government has not attacked. There is nothing left. And the work force doesn't deserve it.

Dr. Kitchen: Why would they do that?

Mr. Tobin: Why would they do it? Well, I do not know. That is a good question. The Minister of Finance asks 'Why is Government against putting the Marine Workers' Union on site?' I do not know, Sir. But I would expect you to know, if you sat in the Cabinet and were part of that decision.

Mr. Grimes: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, could someone tell the Member for Exploits that he is not in his own seat and to keep his mouth closed until I am finished? If he then wants to get up and speak on this Bill, he can do so. But he is always yakking and interfering.

I am not going to be any longer, because my colleague from Grand Bank is going to get up and speak on this.

An Hon. Member: What did you say?

Mr. Tobin: I said I am not going to be very long because my colleague for Grand Bank intends to speak on this, as well, and I would like to clue up.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: Now the Member for Bonavista South, who spent some time -

Mr. Walsh: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I do not expect any better, by the way, from the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island, because his head is

getting so big, he soon won't get in this Chamber. I do not expect anything from him but the way he just re-acted. But I do expect better from the Member for Bonavista South, because the Member for Bonavista South lived in Marystown and knows how important this is. As a matter of fact, I would suspect he was part of the law firm that was involved in some of this work, and maybe he did some work himself. So I would hope that he would stand in this House and support me in what I am saying, because this is important to the many friends you have on the Burin Peninsula. I would expect you to do differently. That is why the Member for Mount Scio - Bell Island doesn't have any friends on the Burin Peninsula, I would suspect.

Mr. Walsh: I have probably more friends than you have down there.

Mr. Tobin: What is that?

An Hon. Member: Probably more friends than you (inaudible) acquaintances.

Mr. Tobin: Probably he has, I do not know. But if you have friends on the Burin Peninsula, Sir, they would not appreciate your re-action at this time, when their livelihood is going down the tube by this Government denying them the right -

An Hon. Member: You are the only one going down the tube.

Mr. Tobin: Are you mad because the Premier did not take you to - I know what is wrong with the Member for Exploits, the Premier took the Member for Pleasantville to Ottawa with him and ignored him, let him stay back here, packed his bags, and he phoned him

in Ottawa in the evening and told him how the caucus performed in the House. And the Premier is now gone to Grand Bank with a bag of pre-arranged questions, and he did not even take you down to pass him the questions he has to answer tonight.

Mr. Matthews: He did the right thing by not going down there.

Mr. Tobin: I am now going to conclude, because my time is just about up, but I want to appeal, Mr. Speaker, to every single person in this House, to the members opposite and to the ministers, to stand behind the work force of the Marine Shipyard, to stand behind them. Do not deny them the right to work on the concrete platform in Bull Head or wherever it may be. Do not deny them the right. They will not work on it as Members of the Marine Workers Union.

An Hon. Member: Why?

Mr. Tobin: Why? Because they are not allowed there. The Premier has told them they are not allowed there. Pass me the letter will you. Pass me the letter. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are going to see who is telling the truth in this House. We are going to see who is telling the truth in this House.

An Hon. Member: Read it.

Mr. Tobin: 'I have listened to all sides express their views with respect to the difference of opinion between your union and the trades council, to which unions should represent workers at the site, or have access to the site for contract work obtained. Through these meetings I have emphasized that the prime objective from Government's

perspective must be:

(1) To ensure productive work environment and labour peace to demonstrate to investors that the Newfoundland work force can complete projects of this kind within budget and on time.

(2) To ensure to the maximum extent possible that residents of the Province are given higher preference for all available jobs.

Within this context Government has concluded that it should recognize the Trades Council as being the appropriate union to represent workers at the GBS site.'

Now, who is telling the truth?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I know. I know what is being said. I am going to take my seat, but in doing so I am going to ask them not to -

The President of Treasury Board is about to get up I think. I am going to ask the President of Treasury Board when he gets up to answer this question. Will the Marine Workers Union have the right to work on site in Bull Head on the GBS? Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the President of the Council.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not question the Member for Burin - Placentia West's emotion on this issue. But with respect I would suggest that he is wrong on two issues and I will explain why. I am trying to answer the question sensibly.

First of all Bill 56, which the effect of this Bill is to declare the Bull Arm project a special project. This is all that Bill 56 does and gives the Government certain rights in that regard.

I would tell the hon. Member that the intentions of the previous Government - his Government - was to operate as a special project and that is all this Bill does. So, he is wrong when he says that this Bill would not have been presented were the Government different. My understanding is that there was every intention from day one to declare a special project.

So, from the point of view of this Bill - that is all that it does - and the Bill itself should be, in that respect, perfectly acceptable to the hon. Member. So the declaration of the special project was something that, no matter who is on this side, would have to be done.

Now, the second issue is the one that he really talked about. It was not, again with respect, it was not this Bill. The second issue was one that I feel he has wanted to talk about for the last couple of weeks and has not and feels that he should now talk about it. And that has to do with the process of determining what happens on the work site.

For quite some time there were negotiations held between Mobile and the Building Trades Council and the Marystown Union, for quite some time. There was an attempt to reach an agreement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I wonder if the hon. the Member for Torngat Mountains and the

Minister of Environment and Lands could carry their meeting outside the Chamber?

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

Mr. Baker: Negotiations were carried on for quite some time to try to reach some kind of an agreement to see if it was possible to have shared jurisdiction on that particular site. Mr. Speaker, to put it into perspective, if the GBS site was in St. Anthony, it would be logical that the Building Trades Council Unions would have jurisdiction on the site everywhere in St. Anthony, but it happens to be in Bull Arm which is in fairly close proximity to the Marystown location and because of that, there was an attempt made to get an agreement so that there could be shared jurisdiction, joint jurisdiction on the site. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, these attempts failed, and a decision had to be made, and the decision was, that the jurisdiction would be given to the Building Trades Council Union. The Member is absolutely right.

Now, then, to put it into perspective, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems is, that a lot of workers are members of both unions and that causes a problem. Some of the workers, I don't know how many are members of both unions and that really causes a problem. To put it into perspective, Mr. Speaker, the Marystown Shipyard, and here is where I want to get to the impassioned part of the Member's speech, about somehow Government is picking on the

workers of the Burin Peninsula.

The Marystown Shipyard will have more work than ever before in history. Than ever before in history. The site around the Marystown Shipyard will be booming. As a matter of fact, there may be even difficulty in getting workers, because in certain trades and so on, there may be a shortage of workers. The Marystown area will be booming. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's not an attack on the workers of Marystown, but I will go a step further, there are an awful lot of workers on the Burin Peninsula who are not members of the Marystown union, a lot of workers, and these workers will have access to jobs in the Bull Arm site, as will workers from all over the Province. The workers from the Burin Peninsula will have access to a lot of jobs, to lots of jobs. There will be enough jobs in Marystown to take care - there will be more than enough jobs to take care of the people of the skilled trades which we have there, more than enough. Marystown will be booming.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the letter to which he refers was simply a question of jurisdiction, could we guarantee labour peace on that site, and it is extremely important that we guarantee labour peace. Not only guarantee labour peace but guarantee that whatever contracts are signed between union

Mr. Tobin: You are wrong - if you think the Marine Workers' Union are going to take this lying down.

Mr. Baker: Did I say that?

Mr. Tobin: No, but you talked (inaudible).

Mr. Baker: Did I say it, how am I wrong if I didn't even say it! That doesn't even make sense, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't even make sense. Where was I? Oh yes.

Declaring the special project should guarantee labour peace on the site, but it should guarantee more than that, and this is the point I want to make to all hon. members. It will guarantee that whatever contract is signed and whatever arrangements are made between the union and the management companies on that site, it will ensure that whatever arrangement is reached, will be compatible with the Atlantic Accord.

An Hon. Member: Is that already signed?

Mr. Baker: That's already been signed. In terms of local content it will prevent a great influx of workers from outside and that's why it is important that we have this special project designation. So in conclusion, I would like to say to the Member for Burin - Placentia West and the Member for Grand Bank, who is now going to get up and say the same kind of thing -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: - I would like to say that we need, we need this special project designation to ensure the two things: the labour peace on the site and that the conditions of the Atlantic Accord are met with regards to local content.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker.

I want to speak to this very important piece of legislation for what I hope is all the right reasons, let me say to the President of Treasury Board. Sometimes you can prejudge what a member is going to say or how he is going to behave on certain issues. I would not say that I am not predictable. But on this issue, he cannot prejudge me. Some people want to know what is going to be asked of them, or said before they go places, but I am not like that. There is one such gentleman on his way to the Burin Peninsula today that they had to set up a panel and have questions screened before he got there, so he would know what answers to prepare. But I am sure there will still be some surprises left when the hon. gentleman gets there this evening.

On this particular Bill, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on this today out of concern for the workers at the Marystown Shipyard, the Industrial Union of Marine and General Workers of Canada. A number of them are constituents of mine, live in the same town where I live, live on the same street where I live, so that is why I am speaking on this particular piece of legislation today. The President of Treasury Board is correct, there was no other way for this to go than to be designated as a special project. No one could ever argue that. To my recollection the Shipyard union never had any difficulty with that. That was never their contention or a bone of contention with them about the special project status, and being designated a special project.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Yes, I know that. But you see linked with that, is tied in what my colleague the Member for Burin - Placentia West has said, because their bone of contention is being able to perform work on site. My recollection of this particular issue, and I mean, as you said, when we were the Government we gave serious consideration to designating this as a special project. We had to. You had to. No one can argue that. But the problem that the workers of the Marystown Shipyard have and we have, as representatives of the Burin Peninsula, my understanding is that the company or the managers of the project, that if work is started at the Marystown Shipyard and taken to the site for hookup or linkup or whatever you want to call it, the company would require that the same union, the same workers finish the job. Now in order to finish the job and to hookup or linkup, and a lot of the work that the Marystown Shipyard would get would be this type of work, this is my understanding again, that they could not just deliver it to the site and leave it and then someone else would take it and finish the job on site with whatever it had to be hookedup or linkedup with. Now that, it is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, is the problem.

So I would like for someone opposite, if they could, to answer the question, if they are listening, Mr. Speaker, to respond to that particular question, because my understanding is that the company or the project manager would only let a contract for total completion of the work. That they would not let a contract for partial work.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Say Marystown Shipyard workers or Marystown Shipyard say, here is the work that we have finished now someone else take it over on site and connect it or link it up. Now, my understanding is that the company is not receptive to that. Therefore, therein lies the problem for the union and the workers of the Marystown Shipyard, because if that is the case then no one is going to let a contract to the Marystown Shipyard to do partial work.

Mr. Murphy: It is not the case.

Mr. Matthews: It is not the case.

Now the Member for St. John's South says it is not the case - I hope he is right. I hope he is right. Because if the Member for St. John's South is right then the problem that my colleague and I perceive, and the union of the Marystown Shipyard perceive, is not real. Now I would suggest to the Member that he should research this issue a little more, because I have a letter here that was written to the Premier by the President of the union in Marystown, Mr. Brenton, on June 7, where he outlines his concerns after a meeting I believe they had with the Premier. They left the meeting feeling very encouraged about it all. The Minister of Energy was there as well, I would think. I do not know if the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations was there or not. But they were encouraged. That was on June 7 that Gary Brenton wrote the Premier - no, the Premier wrote Gary Brenton, I am sorry. Then on June 11 the Premier wrote back, but what was very important-

Mr. Tobin: There is an answer right there to what he just said.

Mr. Matthews: That is what the President said. 'In light of the fact that our workers cannot go to Bull Arm as shipyard workers, do you feel we should be the workers to do the Cow Head expansion? Any indication that the building trades should do this will cause a great deal of friction between our members of the council. In addition, I feel it would not sit well with the respective town councils on the Burin Peninsula.' In light of the fact that our workers cannot go to Bull Arm as shipyard workers, that seems to be the concern.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just to refer to the letter the President of the union wrote to the Premier, where he expressed that 'it would be impossible for him to explain just how shocked and disappointed the union was with the position taken by your Government to exclude members of our bargaining unit from any on-site job opportunities created by a project of this magnitude', now therein is the bone of contention. 'This decision represents a complete reversal of the previous Government's position', which my colleague has outlined, 'as well as your Administration's position as to the role that Marystown Shipyard would be playing when construction of the platform will be taking place.' Then, of course, there is reference to the Ministerial Statement of March 1987. It goes on to say, 'As well, our discussions with you were very encouraging. Your Government's opinion that all people in Newfoundland should be given an equal opportunity to secure work on the project indicated a philosophy of fairness on your part. After we left our meeting with you and your officials on April 20, 1990, it

was our opinion that you would not waiver from this philosophy. We now feel that we have been led down the garden path by all groups involved.' Now, that outlines the feelings of the President of the union, speaking on behalf of the membership of that particular union.

I just want to say, as I see it, and as honestly as I can express it in this Legislature, that is the concern of both my colleague for Burin - Placentia West and I, representing the Burin Peninsula, where most of the workers who are left at the Marystown Shipyard reside. Hundreds of them have left the Burin Peninsula over the last six months and have gone to other parts of Canada. Those who are left there we hope will find work as a result of the Hibernia project, which we hope will soon be signed and work increased significantly, as the President of Treasury Board has indicated. We hope that happens so that they can be employed in work on the Hiberia project, and hopefully the hundreds from the Marystown area who have left the Province over the last months will be able to return. Because they are very, very qualified people, as the member has outlined, and I do not think there is anyone who would argue with that. They have, over the last number of years, been upgrading and going overseas for technology transfer in Norway and so on. We just hope this all materializes.

Why I am speaking here today as one member representing the Burin Peninsula is out of concern that this may not materialize for the people of the Burin Peninsula, and specifically for the workers of the Marystown Shipyard. There is no other reason. I would hope

that when someone responds over there, the President of Treasury Board or the Minister of Energy, whoever, that they can at least address the concern as I see it. Maybe the Minister of Energy, after his discussions with the companies, can just outline for us if the concern I have expressed is real, that the companies will not tolerate partial work, partial contracts, they want the work finished on site if it is done off site. Having said that, I think I have expressed my concerns as I see them. To me they are very real, and for the union they are very real. All they are asking for is their share of the work as is going to pertain to the Hibernia project. They want to be able to conclude the work they begin and start at the Marystown Shipyard on site, and based upon the correspondence between the President of the union and the Premier, there is an interpretation by the union, of the Premier's letter, that they will not be able to do that. Consequently, that will impact very negatively on the amount of work which can be done by the Industrial Union of Marine and General Workers of Canada, who work at the Marystown Shipyard.

So I hope one of the ministers across the way, when they stand now, will at least address that very, very serious concern we have. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, in concluding, there is some way around this so that we all benefit.

Mr. Speaker: If the Minister speaks now, she closes the debate.

The Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the closing, then, of

the debate on this particular item, I will just respond very briefly because I don't want to repeat the things that were said by the President of Treasury Board, who put it very well. I will, once again, say to hon. members from the Burin Peninsula who have spoken that it was our intention as a Government to see both groups working together, just as it was the position of their Government. However, as we moved along through the negotiations, we found out - we did not find out, but Mobil found out - that it was not going to be desirable and, as a result then, we have the concerns the gentlemen bring here to us today.

Certainly we couldn't have a forced accommodation between the two groups, because that in no way would provide or promote any kind of lasting labour peace at the site; anything that is enforced is usually not that successful. It is also historically known that in any projects of a special nature, major megaprojects, which are done across Canada, this type of thing is normal, that the building trades do take over the work and those representing the industrial unions are not involved.

The original objective, I believe, in having the Shipyard Union as a part of the Council of Unions for the GBS site was to improve the chances of the Shipyard, or Vinland, in any competitive bidding for the shaft mechanical fabrication and outfitting work. Government is satisfied that the ability of Vinland to compete will not be impaired by the lack of access by the Shipyard Union to the GBS site, because all other bidders for this work will also have to arrange for the outfitting through the site contract.

Vinland, of course, will still be able to bid on the fabrication work at Marystown.

So, Mr. Speaker, although I have a great deal of sympathy for the concern of the two gentlemen for their constituents, and it is certainly right and proper that they should bring it to the attention of the House, we know the people in the Marystown Shipyard are a very qualified work force and we have every reason to believe that there will be more than adequate work for those particular individuals. With that, Mr. Speaker, I shall take my place.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act, 1977 (No. 2)", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave. (Bill No. 56)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Order 2.

Mr. Speaker: It is moved and seconded that Bill No. 7 be now read a third time. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Dr. Gibbons: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

Dr. Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be not now read a third time, and that the bill be recommitted to the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of making a further amendment.

On motion, that the House resolve

itself into Committee of the Whole to consider an amendment to Bill No. 7, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are now back to the Committee stage of an "Act To Amend The Mineral Act, 1976". (Bill No. 7).

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

Dr. Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move a further amendment to this particular Bill by adding immediately after clause 14.1 the following: 'Section 14.2 stating sections 2 and 14.1 of this Act shall come into force on a day to be proclaimed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.' That is the total of the amendment.

The intention of this amendment is for these two particular things which were put in in the amendment yesterday to the bill, we would like to be able to proclaim this part later to give us time to do some consulting with the particular companies in Labrador which are immediately affected, the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company and the Iron Ore Company of Canada. Since yesterday, we have received representation from the companies; they would like to talk about the implications for them before we proclaim; and we did not have a proclamation clause in the Bill as previously presented. This will give us some time to do that

consultation.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

The hon. the Member for Menihek.

Mr. A. Snow: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not have a copy of the proposed amendment, however, I just want to say that the implications of this particular amendment to the Mineral Act has tremendous implications on the mining operations in Western Labrador. I want to thank the Minister for reconsidering and having consultation with them, and I want to thank him for going along with my suggestion of at least having more input from the companies with regard to this, because this has serious implications, as I suggested, on the operating companies in there. And while, in fact, this is not a tax Bill per se, it has tax implications on the mining operators and the lease owners, or the owners of the lease holds in there and, thus, any expansion or capital expenditures that could be anticipated within the next couple of years, undoubtedly this particular Bill would have serious implications on it.

I think it is only fair that these two mining operators in there have the opportunity to have some input with regard to the changes that could occur with regard to the revenue that is generated from royalties and taxes on their particular operations. They are the largest mines operating in this Province, and they provide a lot of revenue to this Province. While on the one hand I am pleased to see at least permitting the opportunity of local taxing agencies or authorities, such as the Municipal Government's and

School Tax authorities, this may give them the opportunity of collecting more local revenue, and in that sense it is good for the local residents of western Labrador to be able to derive more local revenues into the local economy from this industry.

On the other hand, we do not want to see the amount of taxes - royalties not necessarily changed to the point of wiping out or impeding the development or further expansions of the mines in western Labrador.

Again, I just want to congratulate the Minister and thank him for having the wisdom of reconsidering that. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to have a very brief word on this amendment, more to commend my colleague, the Member for Menihek, who, I believe, deserves commendation from all Members of this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: As we know, yesterday the Bill flowed through the House fairly quickly, and yesterday the Member did not have the opportunity to delve into the situation, because he was not quite sure whether it was going to be done yesterday or when. Subsequent to the debate in the House yesterday, he came to me expressing some concern about this. Subsequent to that, I understand, he received some representation, as did the Minister, from the company and I think they had some pretty startling concerns. Whether they are accurate or not remains to be

seen. I know the member has been on my back constantly, all day, to try to figure out a way to address this problem now that the Bill was entered into the third stage reading process. I indicated to him that certainly he could debate in third reading - although it is irregular, it could be done - but, more importantly, if he wanted to attempt to bring about some change or some improvement to it, there would have to be some mechanism found to revert back to Committee. He persisted and he persisted, so much so that when he got here in the House he went over and bugged the minister, he got the minister to bug the President of Treasury Board, the Government House Leader, and now we find ourselves in a situation that rarely ever happens, Mr. Chairman, very rarely, as members would know.

So I just want to take the opportunity to take thirty seconds to - I commend the minister, as well, for bending under the pressure applied by my colleague, the Member for Menihek, and I commend the Government House Leader for bending under the pressure applied by the Minister of Mines and Energy to revert to this. But I could not let the process go without quite sincerely commending the Member for Menihek, because I know he is a good constituency man. He has had consultations with the company now and he knows, as does the Minister, that there is some concern there. And the minister did the right and proper thing by putting forth this amendment, at least to allow time for consultation, and it might never be proclaimed if he is not satisfied that there aren't any undue concerns or problems. So I commend the Member for Menihek for doing that.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, Clause 14, as amended, carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the Bill with amendment, carried.

Mr. Baker: Bill 43, by leave.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 43, by leave?

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Canada-Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation (Newfoundland) Act and The Petroleum And Natural Gas Act". (Bill No. 43).

On motion, Clauses 1 to 12 carried.

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

Mr. Baker: Bill 56, Mr. Chairman.

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act, 1977 (No. 2)", (Bill No. 56).

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

Mr. Baker: Bill 28.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take a great amount of time to address this piece of legislation this afternoon. I have spoken on it before and I spoke for about an hour a couple of days ago on this debate. I just want to make just one or two final points. One point I want to make is that the Minister has assured us that public agencies, Crown corporations, Departments of

Government and so forth will be held revenue neutral. I simply want to point out that there is nothing in this legislation which guarantees that. Absolutely nothing in the act which guarantees - the Minister was not listening, so I will repeat it. The Minister has assured us that Crown corporations, Government funded bodies, health care institutions, educational institutions, these sorts of institutions will be held revenue neutral. The Minister agrees with that statement?

The point I am trying to make is there is nothing in here which guarantees that. We have no guarantee. Those corporations have no guarantee, only simply that the Minister has said so in debate. Many of them have yet to have any formal communication from the Minister, the Minister agrees with that, confirms that's true. They have absolutely nothing in writing which guarantees them that what the Minister is saying is accurate, not that I am questioning the fact the Minister has told us so and he is on the record in the House of Assembly and that's a pretty sound piece of business.

I simply want to point out to the Minister that there is no assurance there. There is certainly no guarantee that such funding will remain in place, that next year a Government will not change it, but then of course, Government could institute a new tax next year anyway if they chose. But I simply want to point out for the House and for the people of this Province, that even though the Minister has made these assurances, there is nothing in writing, there is nothing in this legislation, there is nothing

which guarantees -

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!
Order, please!

It is five o'clock. Is it agreed to stop the clock?

Mr. Windsor: Agreed to stop the clock, I believe, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Chairman: Agreed? Okay.

Mr. Windsor: The Government House Leader is asleep but it is agreed to stop the clock. It has been agreed to stop the clock.

So, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to make that point, the Minister nods his agreement, he understands what I am saying, and I would simply ask him therefore, if he would correspond with these groups within the next few days, and confirm to them what funding will be made available to cover additional cost to them and how it will be made available.

The Minister has not yet told us how he proposes to do this, but I take him at his word, he has said in this House that that will be done, and I accept the fact that it will be done, but I think it is high time that these groups and corporations and institutions are told how it shall be done.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, is simply to make reference once again, and in closing, I have opposed this piece of legislation for many, many reasons and I won't go through them again today. I am on the record and the Minister is not about to change his mind, I will simply point out to him once again, the experience of the Province of Manitoba and the letter from the hon. Minister of Finance, Mr. Manness, and he says:

' Our Government has made the commitment to phase out the payroll tax. It is a punitive tax which is a disincentive to the creation of new jobs and economic growth in Manitoba. I am fully aware of the burden it imposes on the business community'. Mr. Speaker, that is the considered opinion of the Minister of Finance of Manitoba, that is the experience of the Province of Manitoba.

I have pointed out previously, in speaking to this House, all the reasons why I feel we will experience the same difficulty here. We have experienced the same difficulty here, the business community is expressing grave concerns about this particular tax and I am sure the Minister has heard - I would hope the minister has heard some of these concerns from the business community. I certainly have, loud and clear, and I would hope that the Minister would consider that, so, with those few comments, Mr. Chairman, I will take my leave and make note once again that I strongly oppose this particular legislation.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Technically, we should be discussing this Bill in the Committee of Ways and Means, but we are now in Committee of the Whole, so, I guess we are doing it by leave. Can we do it by leave?

An Hon. Member: Yes, by leave, Mr. Chairman.

On motion, clauses 3 and 4, carried.

Mr. Simms: How many clauses?

Mr. Chairman: There are 47 clauses.

Mr. Simms: Forty-seven clauses (inaudible).

An Hon. Member: Can they all carry by agreement, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Simms: They will not carry. We will vote against it.

Mr. Chairman: Shall Clauses 5 to 47, carry?

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Some Hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the enacting clause carry?

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Chairman: It is moved that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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. L. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to

report passing Bills Nos. 28, 43 and 56 without amendments, and Bill No 7 with amendments.

On motion, report received and adopted, amendments ordered read a first and second time now, Bills ordered read a third time, presently, by leave.

On motion, amendments read a first and second time.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Mineral Act, 1976," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 7).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: I just want to try to catch my breath here now and find out where we are. What we are doing exactly, is it third readings of a number of Bills? What ones did we just do?

Mr. Speaker: Bill 43 -

Mr. Baker: Yes, I would just like to point out what I believe is an irregularity as well, Mr. Speaker. We have done the second reading Committee stage of Bills 43, 56, and Order 2, which was the Mineral Act. The Speaker went into the third reading of that one, so that is done. Okay? Then Bill 28, which happens to be a finance motion, which in fact is a resolution, and has to be brought into the Bill stage and go through all that which I presume we could go through right now.

Mr. Simms: That is where you do all three readings at one time.

Mr. Baker: Yes.

So I am assuming that is what we

do now with Bill No. 28, which is a finance motion.

Mr. Simms: What have we done on Bill 43, and 56 then. Have we done third readings?

Mr. Baker: Not, third readings.

Mr. Simms: We have not done third readings.

Mr. Baker: No. We will hold that.

Mr. Simms: Okay.

Mr. Speaker: Bill No. 28 is the -

Mr. Simms: The payroll tax.

The only one we have passed on third reading is Bill 7, correct?

Mr. Baker: Right.

Mr. Speaker: The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports that it has considered the matters to it referred and has directed him to report that it has adopted a certain resolution and recommends that a Bill be introduced to give effect to same.

Resolution

That it is expedient to bring in a Measure to Impose a Tax on Employers for the purpose of Funding Health and Post-Secondary Education.

On motion, resolution read a first and second time, carried.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Impose A Tax On Employers For The Purpose Of Funding Health And Post-Secondary Education" read a first and second time.

Mr. Speaker: It is moved and seconded that the Bill be now read a third time.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take advantage of the third reading to propose a traditional amendment to this particular Bill.

We realize that we have debated it, and debated it, we have not gotten anywhere with it. The Member for Mount Pearl, our Finance critic, has debated it and asked question after question, but we realize we have reached the stage, obviously, where we are not going to get any further ahead with it but, I think, in order to register our protest on this particular piece of legislation I move, seconded by the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes, that all the words after 'that' be deleted and replaced with the following, 'This Bill be read a third time, this day, six months hence.' I so move that resolution Mr. Speaker. I presume it is in order.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, that is briefly debatable.

I just want to have a few brief words on it, Mr. Speaker. I probably would not have had any comment to make on it except, that I probably would not have debated it to any length at all, but I will say a few brief words because I have been provoked now by the Member for Windsor - Buchans, the Minister of Forestry, I say to the Government House Leader, so that he can chastise him afterwards for shouting across the House not even in his seat and making reference

to the fact 'we got the numbers'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to refresh the memory of the Minister of Forestry, when there was an occasion in this House not too long ago in the debate, I believe it was on the rescission motion with respect to Meech Lake, where the Minister of Forestry could have easily shouted across, we got the numbers, we got the numbers. But very clearly, Mr. Speaker, in that particular debate an amendment and motion moved by my colleague the Member for Torngat Mountains was clearly passed by the numbers that the Opposition had that night, when we caught the Government with their parliamentary pants down. So the Minister of Forestry, I say, should not be too cocky about those kinds of things because it has been proven in the past that Governments, even though they have elected more than we have in the Opposition, do not always have the numbers in the House to carry the votes and that was a very good lesson for them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I reject the comment made by the Minister of Forestry that simply we will use our majority and that is it. That is not acceptable to us and not necessarily always the case.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Simms: Now, Mr. Speaker, he is getting worse. I presume the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture has had consultation with the Government House Leader, who surely would tell him if he is going to continue to provoke then we will continue to debate. Perhaps he might like to bite his tongue and go out in the Common

Room and have a cup of coffee, because I can assure you we are easily provoked. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the point that has to be made on this whole issue of the payroll tax is that we express our displeasure. We have done it in the best way we possibly could have, by continuing debate, by asking questions in Question Period, time and time again, not getting any answers, and now the last straw we can grasp at, I guess, as an Opposition -

An Hon. Member: The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture is wanted on the phone. He has a call.

Mr. Simms: The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, I am told, is wanted on the telephone.

Mr. Matthews: He is finally going to get the call.

Mr. Simms: Anyway, the last straw we can grasp is to move this six month hoist amendment in the hope that members opposite will have seen, because of the persistent questioning from members on this side, particularly the Finance critic, that there are a lot of flaws in this particular legislation and hopefully members on that side will support us in supporting and voting for this six month hoist, so that we will have time to have a further review of the payroll tax and bring it back to the House six months later. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I move that amendment.

Mr. Speaker: It is moved that this Bill be not read now but six months hence. All those in favour 'Aye.'

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: Those against 'Nay.'

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is defeated. Now, we are back to the main motion.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Impose A Tax On Employers For The Purpose Of Funding Health And Post-Secondary Education," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 28)

Mr. Baker: By leave, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 57.

Mr. Speaker: Notice was given for Bill 57 earlier today, by leave. The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: 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 31 March 1991 by way of further Supplementary Supply and, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution Act 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 resolution be referred to a Committee of Supply.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply to discuss the resolution, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of Supply

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Resolution

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain additional expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the thirty-first day of March 1991 the sum of Fourteen Million Seven Hundred and Ninety-Nine Thousand One Hundred Dollars (\$14,799,100). (Bill No. 57).

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Chairman, this is a bill for Supplementary Supply as has been distributed, and I would like to table, as well, a Schedule indicating more detail on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, in the amount that is requested as \$14,799,100, of that \$14 million, \$13.6 million is for the payroll tax. That is to put money in the various Headings of Government departments and others so that they can pay the payroll tax. There is a further \$210,000 for the Canadian Sealers' Association; and for the administration of the new payroll tax, the sum of \$532,000.

An Hon. Member: What?

Dr. Kitchen: For travel funding re Meech Lake, \$150,000; and for increased funding for International Literacy Year \$300,000.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about the administration of the new payroll tax, \$532,000. When we introduced

it first, we were under the clear impression, and the Estimates were that this would cost us a minimal amount of money. However, it has been ascertained that the computer programming for the tax has indeed cost more than we anticipated, and it looks like now it could cost as much as \$350,000.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Dr. Kitchen: This is by no means certain at the moment, but it looks like that is what it is going to cost. In addition, we are going to have to hire some temporary people to do the keypunching, to get the various accounts set up, and this will cost us some money, as well.

There will be some additional postage, about \$40,000, and there are a few other additional items with respect to that.

Mr. Chairman, I will stop now and see if any members have some questions.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Chairman, we have just now seen these details. I would like to have more time to study them. The \$150,000 for Meech Lake goes without saying. I do not know how that is going to be distributed. To my knowledge, and my colleague can correct me if I am wrong, we do not have any idea of what items are eligible for members in the House; I was absent earlier, at the beginning of the session today. Is there a breakdown?

An Hon. Member: Normal expenses - travelling.

Mr. Windsor: Normal expenses. So

that is what we are estimating.

Mr. Chairman, you have to express concern at \$3.2 million, Government Personnel Costs, Employee Benefits.

An Hon. Member: What is that?

Mr. Windsor: Item 2.5.02 - \$3.2 million, it is one-sixth of the annual. Surely the Government Estimates could not have been off by that much. Can the minister tell us why there is a requirement for an additional \$3 million? It is incredible! Our budgeting system is much more accurate than that, Mr. Chairman. That seems to be an incredibly high amount. Why, all of a sudden, do we have an additional \$105,000 in salaries in the Department of Finance? An additional \$100,000 out of \$974,000, that is a 10 per cent increase.

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible) answer all your questions.

Mr. Windsor: Well, I would be happy to pay the \$105,000 if we got answers to the questions. I say to the Member for St. John's South, I have not received any answers to any of the questions I have asked here in the House. But I would like to receive these. Professional Services, an additional \$376,000 added on to \$1.5 million. In the Department of Finance, what are all these Professional Services? You can answer all these questions? I will wait and hear the Minister of Finance answer them.

Grants and Subsidies in Fisheries, an addition \$200,000. Would the minister tell us what that is about? That is 40 per cent of the amount, in fact. That is 40 per cent of what is approved

previously. It is a tremendous amount. Others are only small. Education Teaching Services - Grants and Subsidies \$3.8 million. That is 1 per cent of teachers - I guess there is an increased adjustment there. We can probably live with that. School Board Adjustments \$210,000 on \$40 million. I can live with that. \$1 million to the University. Is this the million dollars, then, for the payroll tax?

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Windsor: That's what that is. Institutes and colleges, a half million dollars for the payroll tax. I see. So that is what all this stuff is, as we have said. All these, the Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission, Newfoundland Liquor Licencing Board, these are all to cover the payroll tax. This is all the money in one hand and out the other.

An Hon. Member: What about the University one there.

Mr. Windsor: The University is \$1 million.

An Hon. Member: No, no the one hundred and thirty-three.

Mr. Windsor: One hundred and thirty-three, that is University Faculty of Medicine, Grants and Subsidies. That is to cover their share of the budget. It is a separate budget item. That is in the medical school, which is attached to the hospital. I assume that is why that is different.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) the payroll tax.

Mr. Windsor: It would be a

payroll tax, \$133,000 for the medical school.

Most of these are, the Medical Care Commission, \$20,000, that is payroll tax. Physicians' services, \$176,000. Is that payroll tax? The Minister nods his head. Grants to hospitals, \$3.3 million, to cover payroll tax. The Minister is nodding his head, for the record, for Hansard. Newfoundland Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, \$6,800; Extended Health Care Grants and Subsidies - these would be the private board-run institutions - \$22,000, the Minister nods his head; Long Term Care Facilities, \$674,000, the Minister is nodding his head that's payroll tax; Community-based Services, \$7,400, that's payroll tax the Minister agrees; Other Special Care Homes, \$1,500; Legal Aid Society, \$18,000. I assume that is all payroll tax. Federal Police Services, \$130,000, that's payroll tax.

I thought we were allowed to tax the Federal Government under this. We are giving it back to them now for Police Services, because we are paying for Police Services. That's what it is. So we are charging ourselves and giving it back to ourselves. Municipal and Provincial Affairs, \$8,000. Is that just for the Department? That is just for the Department. Maybe the Minister can tell us now, then where is the money going to come from for municipalities? The Minister has said that -

Dr. Kitchen: They don't pay any taxes this year.

Mr. Windsor: They don't pay any this current year, they have to pay it next year. That's right.

So they are going to have to pay it next year. So there is nothing there to protect municipalities.

Canada Games Park, \$8,000 there. That is the Aquarena; Newfoundland Public Libraries Board, \$35,000. That's to pay the payroll tax on libraries throughout the Province, no doubt. Regional Correction Services, Department of Social Services, \$1,200. This is payroll tax, too, all of this? Residential Alternatives, \$16,500; some small items there.

Mr. Chairman, this is primarily payroll tax we are talking about. There is not much else in here. I ask the Minister, is that correct? It is basically the payroll tax. There is \$150,000 for Meech Lake, and most of the rest is payroll tax.

Dr. Kitchen: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: So it is in one hand and out the other.

For the record, Mr. Chairman, that is the reason I painfully went through all these, I want it on the record just how foolish the payroll tax is. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: I just want to clear up one point. There is \$210,000 in there under Fisheries, in that list, for the Canadian Sealers' Association, there is \$300,000 there under Education for International Literacy Year, for increasing the funding for International Literacy Year, and there is Meech Lake. So there are three other items, apart from the payroll tax, and the \$532,000 for the administration of the payroll

tax.

I would like to go into detail on that \$532,000. There is \$105,000 for salaries. One is this year's salary for one permanent person, \$12,000, and \$93,000 for temporaries who are required to do a lot of keypunching to get this thing set up. That will be short-term, and then that will be the end of it. The postage would be about \$40,000 extra, and Computer Services about \$376,000, \$350,000 of which is to get the program set up properly. Then there is some travel, \$5,000, in connection with the payroll tax, and then there is a basic service charge of \$6,000, making up \$532,000. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Motion, that the committee report having passed a certain resolution and a Bill consequent thereto, carried.

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

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

Mr. 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 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 Ninety-One 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. 57).

On motion, the following Bills were read a third time, ordered passed and their titles be as on the Order Paper:

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act, 1977 (No. 2)". (Bill No. 56).

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Canada-Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation (Newfoundland) Act and The Petroleumm And Natural Gas Act". (Bill No. 43).

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Commissioners For Oaths Act". (Bill No. 47).

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act, 1972". (Bill No. 52)

The Hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As hon. members know, we have made some unusual arrangements for next week. The arrangements are that sitting times are going to be morning, afternoon, and evening, for three hour periods, starting at 10:00 in the morning.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until

10:00 a.m. next Wednesday, and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 20, at 10:00 a.m.