



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 79

PRELIMINARY REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Monday

19 November 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

000

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, if I could I would like to take a moment to congratulate young Sean Wells, a twenty-one year old resident of the Goulds who successfully won the national five pin bowling championships in Winnipeg over the weekend, and with it, of course, the \$25,000 prize. This is the second year in a row that we have had a person from Newfoundland win this particular tournament. Kevin O'Leary last year won the same tournament and brought honour as well to Newfoundland. Certainly we would like to send a letter of congratulations to Sean Wells.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We from this side certainly concur with what the Minister has said. I, for one, watched the tournament and I suppose we cannot add anything to his performance, which was excellent. But the thing that came across to me, Mr. Speaker, was the way that he came across as sort of a diplomat from Newfoundland. Everyone there praised the way that he acted, and when that game was all over I saw so many people who were his opponents come over and shake his hand. It was really gratifying,

Mr. Speaker, and I think that we need many more. We have a lot, but I think we need many more from Newfoundland to spread the good message. Thank you very much.

Statements by Ministers

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial affairs.

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing corporation will develop a parcel of land consisting of approximately 1,000 acres south of Pitts Memorial Drive. The new development area, know as Southlands, extends south and east from the two interchanges on Pitts Memorial Drive at Ruby Line and Ruth Avenue, incorporating parts of Mount Pearl and the St. John's Metropolitan Area.

The Housing Corporation has been planning the Southlands development for many years to ensure an adequate supply of serviced residential land in the Northeast Avalon area. The area will eventually contain more than 3000 new single family building lots as well as specific parcels of land set aside for semi-detached and apartment units. Overall, it is anticipated that the area will accommodate a population of up to 16,000.

This new development will ensure that the Province is ready to meet the increased demand for housing as a result of the Hibernia development. The Southlands community will form an integral part of the overall St. John's urban region, and will provide a good mix of affordable housing

choices for residents wishing to live there.

The Southlands community development will be comprised of a variety of residential areas as well as a community scale shopping centre with offices, local commercial facilities, future school sites, and religious and other community facilities. Pedestrian underpasses will provide convenient and safe crossings of the main arterial road and will allow direct access to the Pearlgate City Centre. Provision will also be made for extensive office space, recreation facilities and conservation areas, which altogether will comprise about thirty-three per cent of the total development area.

I am pleased to note that environmental considerations have played a fundamental role in planning the area. Indeed, a distinctive feature of the Southlands community is its generous and extensive open space areas. These areas will incorporate existing streams and conservation areas, and will provide a comprehensive linear park system with pedestrian and bicycle trails to connect residential areas with community and parkland facilities, including the proposed Waterford River trail system.

Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation has been developing land for residential building lots in Mount Pearl and the Cowan Heights area of St. John's since 1973. To date, more than 3,400 building lots have been developed.

It is anticipated that development of Southlands will begin during 1991 and will take ten to fifteen years to complete.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, very briefly -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tobin: - let me say that it is encouraging to know that the Government is going to start some development as it anticipates the Hibernia project, but I fail to see why it is going to take up to fifteen years to develop housing sites such as that.

I also want to make sure and insist that the Minister continue to be consistent throughout the Province as it relates to developing residential lands. I know in my own district for example, several meetings have taken place regarding the need for additional residential sites as it relates to the Hibernia development, and I hope that it is not just the urban part of the Province that the Minister will concern himself with, but that he extends that same type of development throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and at the same time be consistent as it relates to the development by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, in terms of industrial parks as well as residential areas. So, I commend the Minister and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing for the commencement of this project in 1991 and I hope that the same type of development can be seen throughout the Province.

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

Mr. Kelland: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. It is alright for younger Ministers, Mr. Speaker, but my advanced age and my arthritic knees make it very difficult to make three or four attempts to get a paper on the table, but thank you for recognizing it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform hon. Members of this House, and residents of the Province, of amendments to the Wild Life Regulations, 1984. The changes are: Number 1. To restrict the use of firearms used in small game hunting in Labrador to those rifles using the .22 calibre rim-fire cartridge; or to shotguns; Number 2. To provide for the use of .22 calibre rim-fire rifles throughout the Province for the killing of live fur-bearing animals which have been taken in traps; Number 3. To permit the use of rifles using the .22 calibre centre-fire cartridge for caribou hunting in parts of Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I will now elaborate.

In the past, residents of Labrador, through tradition, have been able to use any calibre rifle to hunt small game. However, Mr. Speaker, our wildlife officers strongly suspect that the use of high-calibre rifles for small game hunting has contributed to the illegal taking of big game.

With this new amendment, whereby only .22 calibre rim-fire rifles or shotguns can be used to take small game, there will be less opportunity for using a high powered rifle to kill big game by those who do not hold a big game licence.

In explaining the second amendment my Department is announcing, Mr.

Speaker, I provide the following details: The most humane way for a trapper to dispatch an animal caught live in a trap is with a .22 calibre firearm. A larger calibre rifle or a shotgun could be used but these firearms are more expensive for the trapper to buy and operate and they can significantly lower the value of the pelt because of damage caused by the high calibre cartridge.

Since the use of the .22 calibre rifle is not permitted on the Island, existing regulations do not clearly address the predicament of trappers. Since last season we have permitted trappers to use .22 calibre rim-fire rifles to humanely dispatch live furbearers caught in traps. This current change will clarify the regulations with respect to licensed trappers use of the .22 calibre rim-fire rifles for that specific purpose.

The final amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to permit the use of the .22 calibre centre-fire rifle to hunt caribou in certain parts of Labrador.

Previous to this amendment and since 1984 under Wild Life Regulations, all hunters were prohibited from using these rifles to kill caribou. However, prior to 1984, centre-fire .22 calibre rifles were commonly used legally by Northern Labrador residents.

Regulations were changed in 1984 to prohibit the use of any .22 calibre rifles for caribou hunting even though some of those firearms meet and exceed the minimum requirements in terms of muzzle energy. These regulations remained in effect until now.

Mr. Speaker, since 1984 there have

been representations to the Wildlife Division to have the regulations changed to again permit the use of .22 calibre centre-fire rifles for caribou hunting in Labrador. To bring this into proper perspective I should differentiate between the two different types of .22 calibre cartridges.

The centre-fired .22 calibre rifle uses a larger bullet with a heavier powder charge, which gives a greater muzzle velocity and thus a greater impact when the bullet hits its target. It has adequate power to kill caribou humanely.

The rim-fire on the other hand has a smaller bullet with much less power, muzzle velocity and killing impact and is better suited for small game or the humane dispatching of live furbearers in traps.

As I noted earlier, prior to 1984, the centre-fired .22 calibre rifles, in particular the .22/250 calibre were in common use by Northern Labrador residents to kill caribou.

And this use was not exclusive to Labrador. Our Wildlife officials have determined that at least four provinces permit the use of the .22 centre-fire rifles to hunt big game, and in several other jurisdictions native people were allowed by specific treaty or other rights to use the .22 on traditional grounds, even though non-natives were not permitted to do so.

Having carefully considered the matter, my officials and I have decided to permit the use of the .22 centre-fire rifles to hunt caribou in Labrador. This regulation change will not

adversely affect the Northern caribou herds and, indeed, it will be of considerable benefit to the people of the region.

These changes become effective immediately.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I want to first thank the Minister for giving me advance notice of his statement. I welcome this statement on behalf of people throughout Labrador. I think it is a move in the right direction by the Minister. It is a request that has been in front of Government for the last number of years, in particular as it pertains to recommendation number three. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that having spoken to one of the larger native organizations a few minutes ago they are quite pleased with this change and hopefully it will be for the best. I think these are the kind of changes that Government has to be more aware of, changes that will help people to continue their traditional way of life. I compliment the Minister with this particular statement.

Thank you.

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

Mr. Dicks: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to address questions that have arisen concerning compensation of individuals who claim to have been

abused at Mount Cashel. I am making this statement at this time to dispel any wrong impressions that may have been left as a result of recent coverage of this matter.

Without prejudging the Hughes Commission, Government acknowledges that evidence indicates some aspects of Government, including the system of justice, did not function properly in the mid-1970's when the sexual abuse was alleged to have occurred. Therefore, where an individual offers sufficient evidence that sexual abuse occurred causing damages to that person that resulted from an act or omission of Government, the Province is and has been prepared to pay its proportionate share of compensation. However, the primary responsibility lies with the alleged perpetrators and organizations responsible for the employment of those individuals.

For the purpose of clarification, it may be necessary to re-emphasize some of these points. Any claim by an individual of sexual abuse must be substantiated in accordance with the normal civil burden of proof. Mr. Speaker, this means that there must be evidence that the alleged abuse is more likely than not to have occurred. Where such abuse is demonstrated to have taken place, the primary obligation to pay compensation lies with the individual perpetrator and/or his employer. Where it is shown that an act or omission of Government or one of its employees contributed either to the occurrence of sexual abuse or the damages sustained, Government is prepared to acknowledge its responsibility and to pay its proportionate share of

compensation.

Government is also prepared to remove any undue impediment that might otherwise exist, including the pleading of limitation periods. We anticipate that the majority of these claims, as in the normal course, may be settled through negotiations. We have indicated our willingness to consider any reasonable proposal for a settlement mechanism that would involve the normal parties to such an action.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would wish to emphasize that Government acknowledges certain failings of the system in the mid-1970's. We are prepared to consider claims stemming out of such failures. However, individuals bringing forward such claims must still provide appropriate proof of the alleged abuse, damages, and the act or omission of Government that caused or prevented the alleged abuse or damages. It remains, however, the primary responsibility of the alleged perpetrators and/or their employers to provide compensation in these cases.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister of Justice and to the Premier that this statement is too little, too vague, and too late. The Government has spent the last year and a half trying to evade its responsibility to provide public compensation to the Mount Cashel victims, and the Minister of Justice is still evading that responsibility.

Just to put things into perspective, Mr. Speaker, the residents of Mount Cashel Orphanage were boys who were in the legal care and custody of the Provincial Government. They were wards of the Director of Child Welfare. Now a year and a half ago when the Liberals took control of the Government they changed the mandate of the Hughes Commission of Inquiry. The original mandate included the power to recommend compensation for victims.

An Hon. Member: Right on!

Ms Verge: The 'real change' Government made a show of expanding the mandate. What they really did was strip from the Commission the power to recommend compensation for victims. The Hughes Commission held hearings for months on end. Why is not the Hughes Commission being restored with the power to deal with the Government's obligation to compensate the victims?

Now the Premier's excuse for removing compensation from the Hughes Commission mandate was initially that the alleged victims could always sue. They could always bring their own private legal actions against the Government. Then the excuse was revised with the statement that the Crimes Compensation Program was available. Clearly that is a program designed to deal with other types of situations, plus the program has not been functioning properly, and Mount Cashel victims who have applied to it are still waiting to have their claims processed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister of Justice that he and the Government should restore to the Hughes Commission the power to

deal with the Provincial Government's obligation to compensate the victims. Now as for the liability of what the Minister of Justice calls the alleged perpetrators and the organizations responsible for their employment, I suggest to the Government that they consider doing one of two things - and when I say this I am underlining a fact of which both the Minister of Justice and the Premier are only too well aware of and that is private legal action is expensive, time consuming, and stressful. Number One: I say to the Government that they should consider assuming the liability of the alleged perpetrators and organizations responsible and settle in full with the victims, then if the Government wants, the Government take legal action against the perpetrators or their employers.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Ms Verge: If I might have leave, Mr. Speaker, I will finish my statement?

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Member have leave?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No.

The hon. member does not have leave.

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Health. Will the Government communicate to hospitals and nursing homes some budget parameters for the 1991-1992 fiscal year within the next month or so? In particular, will the Department of Health give health care institutions some guidelines about funding for the next budget year? Will the Department, for example, rule out the suggested freeze which will deprive the system of \$60 million to \$70 million? Will the Department of Health provide some assurance to the health care institutions that there will be increases so that institutions will be able to maintain and carry on essential health care services and programmes?

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

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, that was a barrage of questions. The parameters - we are working through a programme now where we are trying to do exactly that, give hospitals and nursing homes some guidelines as to what they can expect in the next fiscal year. This is in keeping with what has been done over the years by this Government and by all governments. I do not know what the hon. Member is getting at. It is a normal part of governing, that you give your boards and your institutions parameters they can work within over the next year.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will try to be more

precise. Will the Minister of Health tell the House whether the Government will communicate to health care institutions within the next month - in other words, before Christmas - parameters for their budgets for the next fiscal year?

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

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, maybe I could put this in perspective for the hon. Member. The hon. Member will know that the Province has a fiscal problem and because of that fiscal problem it seems like the health budget will be approximately the same next year as it is this year. We have gone to all the hospital boards and we have asked them to give the Department some indication as to what this would mean. The Department has now received proposals from every single board in the Province outlining the implications. And the one thing I will tell the hon. Member is coming through, is that if we are to treat every board equally, it would be an unequal application in the end. It would not be equitable, because you could see regions stripped of, say, all psychiatric services, for example. So we have to make sure that every region maintains a level of health care for our people.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of rushing and doing it before the end of the year. Everything we do is done in very close co-operation with the boards throughout the system, and they know tomorrow things which we are discussing today.

Now occasionally some of that becomes a public issue, but

generally speaking it is not. Just this morning I met with people from the hon. member's own district, I met with people from the West Coast to discuss Western Memorial. So it is an ongoing process, Mr. Speaker. It is a very democratic, wide-open process. It is, indeed, quite a change to what the hospital boards have been used to over the past number of years.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Health confirm that hospital and nursing home board members and administrators have told him and his officials that if the Government proceeds with the indicated freeze, which will take \$60 million to \$70 million out of health care institutions next year, and if they do not have notice of that, if they do not have a hard decision in advance of March, when the full Budget is brought down, that the repercussions for health care will be much worse than if the Government gives them advance notice in December, allowing them to gear down and lay off people and absorb severance pay costs in this year's Budget?

Mr. Simms: The answer is, yes.

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

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, it is almost a rhetorical question. The hon. member must know that Government and hospital boards are aware that any change we make in the next year - if, for example, we had to lay off a single person, then that person would be entitled to some notice and in some cases

severance pay and all this sort of thing. The Department of Health is very much aware of that, as are the hospital boards aware of that.

However, in the final analysis the absolute total effect of this cannot be made known until the Budget comes down next spring. Now we can work very closely with the hospital boards, as we are doing, and we are outlining some of the implications of what would happen here if something happens there. I mean, this is an ongoing process. But, of course, the hon. member is right, that if we have to lay off a person we are going to have to give that person some notice. The hospital boards have made the department quite aware of that, and the department, of course, has been quite aware of that. That is just part of the normal way you carry on an efficient Department of Health, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Health confirm that in considering imposing a freeze overall with uneven percentage change for individual institutions, grouping institutions by region, that he and his department are actively considering the infamous Option 10 sprung on the public in the spring involving closing the Grace Hospital in St. John's? Is the Minister still considering closing the Grace Hospital in St. John's?

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

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, over the past six weeks the Department of Health in co-operation with some people who have very graciously

given of their time to assist us - we have before us a map of Newfoundland and Labrador, we have before us \$834 million, and we are looking at where we can spend that money to the best use of the health care system, Mr. Speaker. We are looking at every single institution in Newfoundland and Labrador: we are looking at the Community Health Care Centre in Roddickton, which is in my own District, we are looking at the Health Sciences Centre which is in St. John's. Nothing is exempted. We are looking at every single facility in this Province to see where we can make some savings but yet not hurt the delivery of health care at the patient level, Mr. Speaker. Are we looking at closing the Grace? Are we looking at closing St. Clare's? Are we looking at making changes? Mr. Speaker, we are looking at every single aspect of the health care system. Nothing - nothing - is exempt.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

Mr. Woodford: Mr. Speaker, my question was to the Minister of Education, but in his absence I would ask the question to the President of Treasury Board. Concerning the announcements made by the Minister of Education earlier in the year concerning the cut in substitute days in school boards, would the Minister inform the House whether this was a Cabinet or a Ministerial decision? And secondly, how many days would be lost by each school board in the Province?

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

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, the decision was a budgetary decision

made by Government and it would involve funding in the budget 82,000 substitute teacher days. I think the amount we were looking at in the first place was in the vicinity of 90,000, so it is only 82,000 substitute days. This would mean on the average about eleven days per teacher. Supplying substitute teachers, we estimate on the average about eleven days per teacher. Some teachers, as you know, only need one or two or none, other teachers may need fifteen or twenty, but we felt that an average of eleven per teacher was a fairly realistic goal.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

Mr. Woodford: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister tell the House if there are any school boards in the Province that will lose substitute days retroactively, prior to this fiscal year?

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

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker I am not sure of the meaning of the Member's question. In the budget there was an amount of money put in for substitute teachers, \$12.8 million, and that would provide 82,000 substitute days. Soon after the budget the Minister met with school boards and superintendents and so on - I am not sure exactly who, but I know there were meetings held with administrative officials in the area shortly after the budget and they were asked to try and live within the allocation that was in the budget. I am not sure what you mean by retroactively. Because, as far as I know, there is an amount of money in the

budget, there are 82,000 substitute days provided, and we will see at the end of the year how many of those are used.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

Mr. Woodford: Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted. Retroactively - what I mean is that the days they were told to take off this year, for instance in the Deer Lake school board, I think it averaged out to one day per teacher for this year, this year's allocation. But they have lost 548 days of last year's allocation and they were told there would be no carryover into next year. So, really they lost 799 days of this year's allocation.

My third supplementary would be that if it is true - I know it is. All the Minister has to do is phone the school board office in Deer Lake. This is factual - that they have lost 548 days plus the 251 days they were asked to take off for this year, retroactively for February and March, would the Minister take it upon himself, in conjunction with the Minister of Education, to have those days re-instated to the Deer Lake School Board?

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

Mr. Baker: I now understand the gist of his question, when he gave me the extra detail. I will certainly have a look at the situation and see if it is in fact correct. However, you have to realize that in essence there are no real allocations of days. The collective agreement allows for substitutes for a variety of reasons, obviously. Let us say, if there is an outbreak of flu in

one area of the Province and the teachers get sick with more frequency than in another area in a given year, then, obviously, substitutes are provided to allow for the replacement of teachers who are ill and so on. We are talking about a flexible number here, but I will certainly look into it to see if there is anything to what the member is saying. I somehow on the surface cannot confirm that that would happen.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

Mr. Woodford: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary. There is - there is - an allocation to each school board of substitute days for the year. There is a cut of 27 per cent in the Deer Lake School Board this year, and there are 548 days retroactively taken out of this year's allocation. So I would just like to leave that with the Minister. I have seen a lot of members shake their heads over the last few weeks, but this is factual. I have it here in black and white and I challenge any member here in Cabinet to call the Deer Lake School Board office and get the information.

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure whether there was a question there or not. I would suggest that what the member calls retroactively might be the fact that allocations are done on a fiscal year basis and the allocation, if he wants to call it that, of substitute days goes to the March 31 and not to the end of the school year. So there may be some kind of confusion in the member's mind

with regard to the period covered by the money allocation for substitute teachers. In fact, after March 31 a new fiscal year kicks in where there is a new amount put in for substitute teachers. So there may be some confusion there, but I will try and straighten it out for the hon. member.

Mr. Woodford: The carryover for this year, that is the problem.

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

Mr. Hearn: As a follow-up my question is also to the Minister responsible for Treasury Board. The confusion is certainly in the mind of the Minister, I say to him. Because what really happened, when the boards were given their allocation of substitute days, despite the fact it was cut by 10,000, it did not begin when school began in September, after which point they were told the substitute days were taken off retroactively for April, May and June of the past year. So school boards do not have 10,000 days less this year, or fewer this year, they have 10,000 with a lot of them already used up. So, consequently, I ask the President of Treasury Board, Mr. Speaker, seeing that all boards' flexibility to use any substitute days has been taken away retroactively, does the President of Treasury Board and does Government realize the effect it is having on the professional development of teachers, and consequently, the effect it is having on the students in our Province by such a move?

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

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, if the situation outlined by the hon. member is correct, then I can categorically say that nothing has been taken away retroactively. In the fiscal year that we are now in there is money allocated for 8,200 substitute days as opposed to, I believe, 9,000 that would normally be there. That is an average of about eleven days per teacher, and we estimate that would be satisfactory for a combination of sick leave, workshop days and special leave days and so on that teachers are due under their collective agreement.

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

Mr. Hearn: A supplementary to the Minister. If the Government decided in the budget process to delete so many substitute days, why did you wait until September, when the new school year began, when a number of these days were used up during April, May and June?

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

Mr. Baker: My understanding is that that is not the way it happened, that immediately after the Budget the administrative people in the various districts - and I am not quite certain who the Minister talked to, whether it was the school board people or the superintendents and so on, but he did have meetings around the Province where he indicated that there were certain savings that Government wanted to make in a number of areas in education and that the substitute teaching days were one of them. And if a particular board in April, May and June used an inordinately large number of days for workshops and so on, then obviously that has to

have an effect on this fiscal year.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there have been reports recently that consideration has been given to opening an office, an office opened by the Newfoundland Government, in Hong Kong. I have a question for the Minister of Development. I would like him to advise whether or not he can confirm this report. If so, when will it open? And did the Economic Recovery Commission recommend this particular initiative, if it is a fact?

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

Mr. Furey: Well, I would like to thank the hon. the Opposition House Leader for his question, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is, in last year's budget the Government took a position that it would allocate some \$450,000 on an experimental basis to open an office in Hong Kong. I think I announced it - well, certainly the Minister of Finance announced it in his Budget Speech. It took some time to do some negotiating with the Federal Government under its condominium program to cost-share this particular office, because, as members know, Hong Kong is an extremely expensive place to do business.

If we were to do it on our own, the figures would be well beyond \$1 million and we felt the Province could not afford that at this time. So, what we did do was do a co-operative effort with the Federal Government. Currently we have office space located in the

Canadian Embassy, at its High Commission in Hong Kong. I have appointed a senior person, at the director level, from the Department of Development to staff that office, once again to keep costs down.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister is really nice, we will ask him some more questions. I will ask him a supplementary now. He mentioned he has appointed somebody in charge of the office, at the director level I believe he said. Would he be prepared to tell the House who that person is, what the salary is for the position, and are there any other staff going to be allocated to that particular office? And would he clarify for me - is he saying that the Newfoundland Government's share is \$450,000? And is that annualized, or is that just for this particular fiscal year?

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

Mr. Furey: Well, that is quite a few questions, Mr. Speaker. I will try to answer them one at a time. The first question was who would be staffing the office. Currently it is a senior person from the Department of Development. His name is Mr. Brian Collins. His salary is the salary that we currently pay him through the Department of Development's budget, along with proper allowances to compensate for the high cost of living currently in Hong Kong, which is done, I believe, by the Canadian Embassy and by the other provinces that currently have offices in southeast Asia.

You will know that the Provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario, and Manitoba I believe, Quebec and two Atlantic Provinces already participate in this program. They have people there as well, so we examined how other jurisdictions did this and we wanted to be fair to our people. It would not be fair to send them there with the salary he currently gets in Newfoundland, if you measure the cost of living there, the cost of housing, the cost of food and all these various costs. So we had to compensate for that and we did our investigation by looking at other jurisdictions, particularly the Federal one. So he is paid a salary from the \$450,000. Also from that \$450,000 go our cost for rental spaces under the condominium program. He has to travel, not just in Hong Kong, but we assume he will be going into Taiwan, to Korea, to other parts of Asia to try to match investment. And hon. members know that billions of dollars are flowing out of Asia from these various countries, and have been for the last seven or eight years as we move toward 1997, particularly in Hong Kong.

So he is there to have a presence for Newfoundland and Labrador, to explain all our programs, to marry and match investment opportunities with potential opportunities within the Province. And I am glad to tell hon. Members that the Board of Trade just finished a very successful tour of Asia, along with the Newfoundland Chapter of the Hong Kong Businessmen's Association, and they gave great credit to the Government for setting up that office.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Simms: I am delighted to hear about the Board of Trade's visit to Hong Kong and all that sort of thing, but I asked him were there any other staff associated with the office? That was the other question. And when did the office open?

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

Mr. Furey: Sorry, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. There were so many questions coming. The other thing we are looking at is hiring some secretarial help in Hong Kong. That will be the only other staff assigned to that office, with our senior director from my Department who was transferred there some weeks ago.

The office has not officially opened. We are hoping, and I have been after the Premier to try to get him to come to Asia to give us the highest profile possible, in the New Year to open the office and to attract as many potential investors as we can. We are trying to use the good name of the Premier, and his reputation, to do just that. It unofficially opened two weeks ago, it will officially open with our official kick-off sometime in the new year, perhaps February or March.

An Hon. Member: Shot down again.

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Environment and Lands. Will the Minister of Environment and Lands tell the House whether the Department

cutbacks announced recently by the Ministers of Finance and Works, Services and Transportation will also be felt in his Department, and what the effects will be?

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

Mr. Kelland: A strange question, Mr. Speaker. However, I can only say, I suppose, Government as a whole will feel the effects of any constraints we are into because of budgetary matters, but from the point of view of the Department of Environment and Lands, we, like all all other Departments of Government, were asked to provide details of the impacts and the significance of living next year with the same dollar figure we had in the current year.

No decision within our Department has been made with respect to what changes may occur as a result of that. The attempt by Government is to provide a more efficient and leaner service with somewhat minimum of dollars, and following any decisions, of course, we will make the public aware and the House aware of what changes there may be as it relates to our Department.

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

Mr. Parsons: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister tell the House whether within the past eighteen months a recycling program has been designed and will be implemented with respect to Confederation Building, and whether Government cutbacks will affect those plans?

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

Mr. Kelland: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest we did a little recycling back on April 20, 1989.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kelland: Mr. Speaker, that is a serious question nevertheless, and I do not mean to treat the member's question in a light manner at all. But recycling is one of the three Rs of environment control. It is almost the last resort of the three Rs actually. As you know currently there is a recycling program underway in the Province, approved by the former administration and honoured by this administration, that after a two year trial period in recycling generally, and we are talking about pop bottles and aluminum containers, at the end of that time we would assess the effectiveness of it and decide whether or not additional legislation or regulations may be required to make it more effective in the event it was not found to be effective enough.

With respect to recycling within the building, the Confederation Complex, we have made some attempts, and if you will notice around the Building there are still containers where certain materials can be recycled by departments. I would like to see that become more extensive. We generate an awful lot of waste, I suppose, in the form of paper, computer printouts, a number of forms of other types of paper, I would like to see that become more extensive. How we will accomplish that has not yet been decided, but I had a number of discussions with people who are in the recycling business, Mr. Speaker, and they indicate to me that there is a fair market for a lot of paper products that can be recycled that

is generated here in this very Complex itself. So the exact details of how we will accomplish it, how we will handle it is not known at this point in time. But it is under active consideration and our determination is to clean up a lot of the mess that the Province has.

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I find it very hard to look at and listen to the Minister making a joke out of anything that pertains to the environment. It is also good to see, Mr. Speaker, that Canadian Tire and Sobey's lead the way now, perhaps, two of our good corporate citizens lead the way in recycling, batteries at Canadian Tire and the bags that Sobey's put out, now they are asking people to bring them back. But the Minister is not aware of any of this, I presume. Could the Minister tell the House approximately how much it would cost to implement a recycling program at Confederation Building, and whether this Government considered it a priority to finance such a recycling program?

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

Mr. Kelland: Mr. Speaker, if the Member will review my total comments he will realize that there was a little facetiousness in the first few words. I do take the question of recycling very seriously indeed. I really cannot give you a figure at this point in time at least, on what a recycling program would cost within the Confederation Complex. I have had discussions with the one company

that I am aware of who has apparently a market for a number of these types of materials, computer printouts and other types of paper and so on. When we reach a stage where we can fund such an operation, all the details will be made public. And I can say there is a determination in this administration to clean up that which we have already polluted and find ways and means to prevent future pollution, reuse and reduction and recycling is all part of the program. And it will be a very active program and (inaudible) as well.

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

Mr. Hewlett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this weekend past I attended a firemens' ball in Springdale and the guest speaker at that event was the president of the Fire Chiefs Association. He expressed concern in his remarks about the future of weekend training seminars for volunteer firemen throughout the Province, especially in the upcoming fiscal year. Could the Minister of Municipal Affairs give us any assurances in that regard?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, the same question was asked of me when I met with the Fire Chiefs Association executive about three weeks ago now. They were concerned, of course, that with budget cutbacks the training component within the Fire Commissioner's Office might be impacted. I assured them that if we were going to make cuts within

the Fire Department, the Fire Commissioner's Office specifically, I doubt very much if a targeted area would be the important training area. I can't say definitely that that is the case but I would certainly not be recommending, as it appears right now, that any cutbacks would take place in the very important area of training, because we are making great strides in seeing that our fire fighting force, particularly the volunteers, in all regions of the Province are provided with good and ongoing training.

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

Mr. Hewlett: Mr. Speaker I have heard figures kicked around to the effect that the Fire Commissioner's Office could have to live with \$120,000 less. Surely the Minister does not think that this would not affect the training programmes?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker I am not sure where these figures are coming from. But certainly Government has made no decision as yet on the budget as it relates to Municipal and Provincial Affairs. As the Minister responsible I have not made a specific recommendation concerning the Fire Commissioner's Office, the Fire Department, or any other aspect of my Ministry. So it is early to say what figures might be applicable, and I am not really sure where that particular figure comes from because it is certainly not a figure that I am familiar with.

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 on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the advancing or guaranteeing of certain loans made under the "Loan And Guarantee Act, 1957".

And Mr. Speaker I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that this House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the guaranteeing of certain loans under the "Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957".

Petitions

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

Mr. Hewlett: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I rise to present a petition on behalf of seventy-four residents of Green Bay. These petitioners are from the communities of King's Point, Rattling Brook, Little Bay, Little Bay Islands, St. Patricks, Miles Cove, and Springdale.

The prayer of the petition is as follows:

Because an expenditure freeze in the health care system will mean bed closures and layoffs, we the undersigned residents of Green Bay district, petition the hon. House of Assembly not to approve such a freeze.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend my wife and I attended the 27th annual firemens' ball in Springdale, and when I arrived in town, as is habit, the first thing I did was pick up a copy of the local paper, The Nor'Wester. Appropriately enough, Mr. Speaker, there was reference to the local fire department in the front page of the paper, seeing that the firemens' ball was on that particular weekend. But, Mr. Speaker, the paper also had a front page story concerning the petitions that I have brought into this House concerning health care cuts. In particular the mayor of Springdale indicated that the Springdale council would not be supporting my petition, and furthermore the mayor indicated that my presentation of these petitions was out of order. I remember that comment was very similar to the one made by the Minister of Health first when I started presenting these petitions. Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this matter, if the mayor does not want to fight for the health care system in his town, that is his choice, and if the mayor wishes to quietly plead his town's case to the Minister of Health, that is his choice. I know the town is looking for a new fire engine and may not wish to antagonize this administration, and that is the town's choice.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hewlett: But, Mr. Speaker, when nearly 400 residents of Green Bay send me petitions protesting health care cuts, my choice is to present their petitions in this Assembly, and that is very much in order. I saw something else at the firemens' ball that relates directly to my petition campaign, Mr. Speaker. I saw a group of

young women leave the festivities for an hour or so to go down to the local cottage hospital to be present at the birth of a child belonging to one of their friends. If the Springdale hospital is closed and the nearest hospital being in Grand Falls or Corner Brook, those young women would not have an opportunity to do such a decent and humane thing. Mr. Speaker, I think people are afraid of this Government. It reminds me of Little Red Riding Hood being afraid of the big bad wolf. Well, Mr. Speaker, this Little Red Riding Tory is not afraid of the big bad wolf. It is with pleasure therefore that I table this petition and ask that it be referred to the Department of Health.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. A. Snow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise on behalf of 651 people in the district of Menihek who signed the petition in protest of a closure, or asking this administration to reconsider the closure of a Motor Vehicle Registration office in the town of Wabush in Labrador West. The prayer of the petition is: We protest the decision of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to close the Motor Vehicle Registration office in Wabush, and that your petitioners urge the Government to reconsider this decision which will have the effect of eliminating an essential Government service in our communities.

Mr. Speaker, of course, that

essential Government service they are talking about is something that has been available to the residents of Western Labrador for the last ten years. That service was the opportunity of being able to, like in a lot of the urban areas of this Province, being able to go down to your local Government building and be able to purchase your license, renew your driver's license, or buy license plates. This regime saw fit to announce, under the guise of improvement of service, saw fit to close down an office in Western Labrador and force the people to wait an additional year for this so called new service to be implemented, or use the mail services, of course, which we know, especially coming up to the Christmas season, are horrendously slow coming into Labrador. This service is something that the people of Western Labrador have become accustomed to receiving. They had fought, argued, and lobbied previous administrations to have this service, and it was a good service being provided. Apart from the fact that two jobs were made redundant, which of course is very important in today's recession, these two jobs are important, especially to those two individuals, and also, of course, to the economy in general. But more important than that, is possibly a Government service that has been removed from Western Labrador, an area that provides a tremendous amount of economic wealth to this Province. It is unfortunate that this particular regime, through this Minister, who has administered more damage to transportation in Labrador than any other, I suppose, the combined total of all previous Ministers who served in that capacity since Confederation. That same Minister

wiped out the Labrador Air Passenger Subsidy Program.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. A. Snow: Yes, that is the Liberal Government that promised change. You are correct there. That same Minister blew \$1.5 million belonging to the taxpayers of this Province because of being inefficient in his office. He is going to charge the people an extra fee to administer licencing in Labrador City and Wabush, and they are going to have to pay this even though the service is going to be worse than it was previously.

Of course, the same Minister also would not approve the clearing or winter maintenance on a highway forty miles away from Labrador City, down to a cottage lot area which has about 600 to 700 people - he would not approve that; he also would not approve the clearing of about, I believe, four or five kilometres of snow on a road to an area to allow a small business to operate and create more employment in Western Labrador.

So, you see, this particular Minister has wreaked a tremendous amount of damage to transportation in Labrador. And I must say that a lot of people are looking forward to his visiting next week so they can pointedly show him the amount of damage he has done to transportation in Labrador, Western Labrador in particular.

I would hope that this regime would reconsider what they have done and not close this office, making these jobs redundant and then suggesting as the Premier has done, and I believe the President of Treasury Board has suggested, that this service is going to be

available within three months.

It is completely unfounded according to the public relations people who have been handling this. They suggest it is going to take a full year, not three months as these people have suggested. Of course, only time will show the people of Labrador and the people of this Province the fallacies that this particular regime has been promoting as to what they are going to do in the guise of improvement and efficiency and saving the taxpayers' dollars, when really, as we all know, what really occurred was just a slap in the face to the people of Western Labrador in particular, in the fact that they are now going to lose this one time respected Government service.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask this regime to reconsider this and to make necessary changes to allow this office to remain open after November 30. It is something which has been in place for ten years, and I am hoping it will remain open after that date. Thank you very much.

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

Mr. Tobin: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Since the Minister of Transportation does not have the decency to speak to the concerns of the people of Western Labrador, I think it is only fair that someone on this side of the House have a few words to say, despite the fact that we are doing it differently from the way it was previously done, with the Minister not speaking in favour it.

I think the Premier has probably given instructions to someone to speak to the petition, and I would

not be surprised to see the Member for Eagle River stand when I sit down.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, this is an example of the arrogance and contempt this Government has towards the people of Western Labrador in particular. The Labrador Air subsidy programme has been eliminated by this Administration, and now they have attacked the other few jobs that the Government has in Western Labrador, in the Registration office.

Mr. Speaker, my own area is basically going to be affected somewhat by the closeout in Clarenville, because the people from that part of the Province, the Burin - Peninsula as well as the Bonavista Peninsula, use extensively the Motor Registration Division in Clarenville.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) use it.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, these jobs are something the people down there cannot afford to lose. It is not good enough for the Premier of the Province to say on the Open Line Programme that there would be no job losses in Clarenville, because he is going to see to it that the Eastern Community College Headquarters moves from Burin to Clarenville and there would not be a job loss.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is regrettable that this Government has taken such an arrogant attitude towards the people in Labrador and particularly rural Newfoundland. I believe we are going to see further erosion of jobs in the Registration Division offices throughout this Province because of the arrogant attitude

of the Minister of Transportation. Why they want to deny this service to the people of Western Labrador and other parts of the Province is beyond anyone's imagination.

Now we have a petition presented in this House today, and I think it is the second or third one by my colleague from Menihek regarding the erosion of services down in Labrador -

An Hon. Member: There are no services (inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Oh no? Mr. Speaker, there are services being cut. This Government has done nothing else but attack Newfoundland. My colleague from Grand Bank said one time that the Wells Administration is an economic and social curse on the people of this Province, and he was exactly right. And probably more people should be saying it. I believe my colleague for Grand Bank summed up the feelings of Newfoundlanders when he referred to the Government as a curse upon the people. That is what is taking place in this Province. And the Premier of this Province and his Cabinet should realize that to eliminate jobs in Clarendville and in Wabush is not in the best interests of the people these offices serve.

I have great difficulty, Mr. Speaker, understanding why the Minister for Labrador has not been more vocal, why my colleague for Eagle River has not stood up and supported the people of Western Labrador. They all claim, Mr. Speaker, to be great Labradorians, they are all great Labradorians until the time comes for them to make a stand in favour of Labrador. And where is the Member for Eagle River? If he cannot

blame it, Mr. Speaker, on the Federal Government, he does not speak. It is now time, if he is the true Labradorian he paints himself to be, to stand up in the interests of the people of Labrador and take a stand and let the people of Labrador know where he stands on this Government eliminating the air service transportation subsidy and eliminating the Motor Registration Offices.

It is great to be able to say I am a great Labradorian, Mr. Speaker, but it takes courage to defend the rights of Labrador, which has not been done by the Minister of Environment and Lands nor the Member for Eagle River in this instance. It is about time the erosion of services going into Labrador stop, and it is about time that the members who are involved in the erosion of services and who represent Labrador stand up to the Premier and his Government and say, this is enough. Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker.

What we have seen taking place is a drastic cut in services to Labrador, obviously supported by the Minister of Environment and Lands and the Member for Eagle River. It is about time they tell this Government enough is enough, we are not going to accept any more, and immediately have the services that Labrador had prior to the election of this Government reinstated.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Any further petitions?

The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to present a petition of the teachers of the North Shore Elementary School in Meadows, in the District of Bay of Islands.

Mr. Winsor: Where? Where?

Ms Verge: That is the Premier's District, Mr. Speaker. The petition reads as follows: 'Whereas the teachers of Humber Branch are greatly concerned with the lack of effort by Government to negotiate a collective agreement with teachers of this Province; and

WHEREAS the proposed cutbacks in educational funding will have extremely negative effects on parents and students of this Province; and

WHEREAS cutbacks in substitute teacher allocations have already resulted in cancellation of professional development activities for teachers which will have a negative impact on students in the future;

THEREFORE your petitioners urge the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to, number one, immediately begin serious negotiations with the intention of signing a fair and reasonable collective agreement with the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, and number two, thoroughly study the impact of present and proposed cutbacks in the education system and make full disclosure of these impacts to parents, teachers and other interested groups.'

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition. First I agree with the call for the Government to get serious about collective

bargaining with the teachers, and good faith negotiations involve give and take. Negotiations have to involve compromise, and so far the Government has not shown the NTA or the teachers of the Province any willingness to compromise. The Government has demanded concessions from teachers without limitation; the Government has not indicated a willingness to give as well as take.

With respect to the other part of the petition, Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues have already pointed out in questions and debate in this Assembly, the Government has already instituted cutbacks in educational funding that are having negative consequences for teachers and students. The two most damaging cutbacks have been the reduction in The Hospital School Programs outside St. John's. One of the more serious reductions was inflicted on Western Memorial Regional Hospital, which benefitted the Bay of Islands District, the students served by these petitioners, and then the Government cutback in funding for substitute teachers has had a very serious negative effect on teachers and students.

Now, as was brought out in Question Period here today, that reduction in funding for substitute teachers was decided last spring in the Budget process; it would have been decided before March 15, when the Budget was presented in this Assembly. However, the Government failed to communicate the cutback decision to the school boards until September. Effectively, the Government changed the rules in midstream and made a bad decision much worse than it should have been. Now, I have the same fear

about the Government's approach to health care funding decisions, and that is what I was alluding to in Question Period today.

Mr. Speaker, the retroactive reduction in substitute teaching hours has forced school boards and teachers to cancel many planned professional development activities. And, as members opposite realize - I am looking at the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations and the Member for Exploits, both former Presidents of the NTA - it is absolutely essential for teachers to have in-service training programs if they are to keep abreast with curriculum changes, and if they are to equip themselves to deal with the changing demands of school programs. Teachers are now providing programs to a wide variety of students, students with severe mental and physical disabilities who only a few years ago were not accommodated in the regular schools at all.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this petition. I urge the Government to bargain with the NTA in good faith, to compromise. And I also urge the Government to provide adequate funding to education, and in the case of any already implemented or contemplated cutbacks, to do research, to study and to share with the public of the Province the decisions and the known impact of those decisions on the quality of education. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member speaking to this petition?

Mr. Hearn: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member

for St. Mary's - The Capes.

Mr. Hearn: I was waiting. I thought the Premier would stand to respond, seeing that the petition came from the teachers in his district. But seeing he has not, maybe he is brushing up on his notes and will respond after I sit down.

The petition itself does outline a number of major concerns that teachers are facing. I am sure we are going to see many such petitions come from teachers around the province. Three requests the teachers from the Bay of Islands area made to Government: one is that serious negotiations begin. We are now almost into the month of December and we are a long ways away from reaching a contract.

If the Government will go back to the last contract that teachers negotiated, and if they would talk specifically to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations, she will be able to perhaps advise them how to go about negotiating a contract, because that one was negotiated and signed before the old one even ran out. Teachers did not have to worry about it, they did not have to take time off from their work to attend negotiating meetings, they did not have to be in the classroom wondering whether or not they were going to get shafted in the agreement, they could go ahead and do their work and their representatives sat down and quietly and quickly negotiated a very positive agreement. I would only be too glad sometime to sit with the President of Treasury and advise him as to how to negotiate a contract.

However, the important point made

in the petition was the request that the Government study the impact of cutbacks, and they mentioned in particular the effect of the cutbacks in relation to substitute teachers, because that is the only one that perhaps has hit home at this time. Now, in the next few days we will have a lot more to say about cutbacks and the effect leading into the future, but presently many boards, many teachers, and particularly many children, are suffering because of the cutbacks of substitute teachers.

I would suggest to the President of Treasury Board that he brush up on what really happened, because we saw today he did not understand what was happening there and the effect it is having. When boards started the new school year they were under the impression, based upon the Budget, that there was going to be a reduction in substitute teaching days and they thought that over the ensuing twelve months, or eight or nine months of the school year, they would have a chance to try to spread out their various days, for some of which they had discretion and others they had no discretion, because people get sick regardless of what profession you are in; you have compassionate leave when somebody dies belonging to you, and there are other important things coming up over which you have no control and no discretion. So boards generally have very little discretion in relation to the total amount, probably in the range of 20 to 30 per cent, at most, of the days they control. Consequently, these are the days that affect professional development, mainly.

When the boards were suddenly notified as they got into their

new year that the decision was retroactive, that any days that were used in April, May and June, the fiscal year of Government, counted, they realized they had very few, if any, days left for professional development. Consequently, all the new courses that were brought in, teachers have not had the chance to brush up on them. Who is really hurting, Mr. Speaker? The children of the Province. I ask the Government to study that in particular, and to begin negotiations seriously. Let the teachers go on with their work without disruption, look at the impact of the cutback, and in particular, before you make any further cutbacks, look at the effect on the children of the Province.

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel I should take a minute or so to respond to some of the statements made by the two members opposite, the Member for Humber East and the Member for St. Mary's - The Capes. I would like to start off by saying, Mr. Speaker, that if their comments are indicative of what they actually believe, then I would suggest they know nothing about what has gone on at all; they are totally ignorant about what has happened during the past year.

Statements like no progress in negotiations, no flexibility being shown and so on, these are statements sometimes made by people who want to harden positions. However, in actual fact there has been a lot of progress and there has been a tremendous amount of flexibility on the part of Government. We

have now been negotiating for a long time, informally for about a year and formally for about four or five months. This year we are faced with a particular problem that should have been solved years ago but for one reason or another, and I suspect because the Government of the day was afraid to deal with the issue, the problem of a pension plan was never attempted to be dealt with in the past. We are dealing with that, and we are dealing with it in a process.

Right now there is a conciliation board, which again is part of the collective bargaining process, a conciliation board which has spent a number of weeks with both sides in discussions. They are now writing their report, and I expect within the next week or two to get the conciliation board report. At that point in time, then, there will be further meetings and discussions between Treasury Board and the NTA. Perhaps, first of all, between the President of Treasury Board and the President of the NTA, and then follow-up meetings by officials. The process will continue, and an agreement will be reached that both sides will sign and will be happy with. That is the process.

Unfortunately, it is taking longer than normal, longer than I believe should be normal, let us put it that way, because of the very difficult issue of the funding of the pension plan. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that, too, will be solved in this process. Negotiations have been progressing. There is no point in members of the Opposition standing up and saying start negotiations. That is silly. It is an indication of the level of ignorance that exists on the

opposite side. Progress has been made, there has been flexibility, Mr. Speaker, and we will reach a collective agreement - with the teachers at some point in time.

With regard to some of the other issues mentioned, I suspect that the level of credibility of the statements on the other issues are similar to the level of credibility of the statements about collective bargaining.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Baker: Order 29, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Health Act". (Bill No. 45).

Mr. Baker: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That Bill was introduced on our last sitting day by the Minister of Health so it has already been introduced.

Mr. Speaker: It has already been introduced? Order 29, Bill No. 45. So we are in the process of -

An Hon. Member: You are looking at the wrong -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

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

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, I just had a minute or so to speak on this Bill just before the House rose on Friday. And I was twigged to speak on it by the grin I saw on the Minister's face as he very casually and nonchalantly introduced this Bill as a housekeeping measure, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: He gave it away, he

gave it away.

Mr. Rideout: And when I see a grin like that on the face of the Minister of Health I automatically become suspicious. I just had a few brief words to say on it on Friday. As a matter of fact if the Minister had introduced the Bill with a straight face it might have even passed second reading stage on Friday, I am not sure.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is a very interesting amendment. Research that I have had done over the weekend shows this to be a very unusual amendment, I say to the Minister of Health, because -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: I will explain now in a few minutes, if the Minister will listen.

Mr. Simms: Take notes of the questions.

Mr. Rideout: The section itself does not appear to be very much other than housekeeping, as the Minister proposed when he introduced the legislation on Friday, it proposes to add to Subsection (1) of section 23 of the Department of Health Act the following, (a) (1): "prescribing fees to be charged and collected for services, inspections and duties carried out under this Act and the regulations."

And that Mr. Speaker is like I said, a very -

Mr. Simms: Innocuous.

Mr. Rideout: - innocuous amendment. But you know what is not so innocuous about this particular amendment, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Simms: The Premier does not even know, I will bet you.

Mr. Rideout: Unlike most Departmental Acts - you know that The Department of Health Act gives the power, and this power asked for here now will be solely at the discretion of the Minister.

Mr. Simms: To increase fees.

Mr. Rideout: It will now, under The Department of Health Act, with this amendment in place, it will be solely at the discretion of the Minister to increase fees for inspections, services, and other duties carried out under the Act. The Department of Health Act, you see Mr. Speaker, up until now, did not have the requirement for fees. And the Minister was allowed to do certain duties.

Mr. Simms: Naughty naughty.

Mr. Rideout: The Minister was allowed to make certain regulations and carry out certain duties. Now with adding on this particular amendment, the Minister, the Minister - not the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, not the Cabinet - will have the authority himself to impose fees. Unlike most other Departments by the way.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: No, for services, inspections and duties. Right?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: No. No. Services. Like going out and inspecting a piece of Crown land for example for health purposes. That is very, very unusual I say to the Premier.

Mr. Simms: Shouldn't increase fees without Cabinet knowing.

Mr. Rideout: It is unprecedented really, in other Departmental Acts that we have checked.

Mr. Simms: Yes.

Mr. Rideout: The Minister must go to Cabinet.

Mr. Simms: Take him out to the woodshed b'y.

Mr. Rideout: The Minister must go to the Cabinet and get Cabinet approval.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: Now the Minister might very well say that is his intention. But that is not what his present Act requires. This amendment allows the Minister himself, with no consultation whatsoever with his Cabinet colleagues, to increase and impose fees on services, inspections and duties performed by the Department of Health.

Mr. Simms: You wouldn't want that now, would you?

Mr. Rideout: So what are the consequences of that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Simms: We want to know what is going on.

Mr. Rideout: For example. Let me use a couple of examples.

Mr. Simms: Power grab, that is all it is.

Mr. Rideout: If a person out in rural Newfoundland in particular, in areas that are unserved by municipalities, applies for a piece of Crown land on which to

build a piece of residential property or some other kind of property, then the Crown Lands Division must ask various Departments of Government to inspect that piece of land.

One of the Departments that must inspect it is the Department of Health. So under this piece of legislation now the Minister himself - that is the key, the Minister himself - without any reference to Cabinet, can determine how much he is going to charge for his inspectors to carry out that inspection. So the Minister himself now, Mr. Speaker, will get his hands into the pocket of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians on inspection fees. He is not going to be restrained by a consensus around the Cabinet table - at least he is not required to be - as a result of this particular amendment.

And just to carry on with the Crown Land's example for a moment Mr. Speaker. The Crown Lands Division will ask not only the Department of Health but they will ask the Department of Works, Services and Transportation. They will ask the Department of Environment. They will ask maybe Municipal Affairs if it is in an unincorporated area like a local service district for example. They will ask Wildlife, Forestry and Agriculture. They will ask, in incorporated areas if it is Crown Land, they will ask the opinion of town councils and community councils.

An Hon. Member: An awful lot of red tape.

Mr. Rideout: A tremendous amount of red tape. But the point I am making, Mr. Speaker is each of these agencies is getting to the

point where they are now beginning to charge a fee for the inspection, environment, and health. Now the Minister of Health is getting in on the act, except that he is getting in on the act on his own. The other ministries, most all of the other ministries, we have not found one that is different yet, I am not suggesting there is not, there may well be, but most all of the other ministries that we have checked, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to imposing fees for services rendered by that department the Minister has to make a submission to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, in other words to the Cabinet, and then a decision is made.

Now I would not want this particular Minister, this Minister in particular, to be left unrestrained by the consensus that he would have to forge around the Cabinet table to impose fees. I mean I can see this Minister, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: As right wing as he is.

Mr. Rideout: As right wing as this Minister is, Mr. Speaker, I could see him really socking it to the people out there who want to have Grown lands inspected for health purposes.

Mr. Simms: Of all the Ministers who are over there.

Mr. Rideout: Of all the ministers who are over there, and that is really what twiggged me, Mr. Speaker, on Friday, was the sly grin on the Minister's chops, Mr. Speaker, when he tried to get this little innocuous inconsequential amendment through the House. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, is much bigger than it appears on the

surface. It is much more involved and has the potential to impact on the pocketbooks of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians more than was indicated to this House by the Minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to unduly hang up this piece of legislation. But I am going to make a suggestion to the Government House Leader: when we get to Committee on this Bill the Government House Leader should ensure that this particular amendment reads, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, that is very simple and it is basically compatible with most of the rest of departmental Acts. The Minister just does not have the right to go about imposing fees at will, at random, on people who want the services of his/her department.

I know with my years in Cabinet, I have seen hundreds and hundreds of papers coming up talking about fee increases, and it always had to be done by a consensus of Cabinet. I would not want this right-wing Minister, Mr. Speaker, running off with the authority -

Mr. Simms: He makes Attila the Hun look like a backbencher.

Mr. Rideout: That is right - I would not want this right wing Minister to be able to run off from this House over the next few hours with authority to be able to increase at his will fees that his department is going to charge for services, inspections, and other duties according to the Act.

Mr. Simms: You would not expect his Cabinet colleagues would want him to do it either.

Mr. Rideout: As the Minister,

first of all, why would you want it?

Mr. Simms: Yes.

Mr. Rideout: That is the first question. I mean, at least if you have to go to your Cabinet colleagues and get approval, there is some protection within the consensus of Cabinet. Why would a single Minister even seek the authority -

Mr. Simms: Power grab.

Mr. Rideout: - to want to grab that kind of power to do this on his own? I mean I cannot conceive of a Minister who would want to do that.

So I have a suggestion for the Government House Leader, if he does not want to take my word for it, check some of the other departmental Acts, check practice.

Cabinet practice will show that on fee increases in general, the Minister brings a submission to his colleagues. And generally speaking those fee increases are done as part of the budgetary process anyway, as the President of Treasury Board knows. But please, I say to the President of Treasury Board, please, I beg you, do not leave this Minister with the unfettered authority to be able to increase fees at wisdom or at his will. I am just afraid, Mr. Speaker, that this Minister might come afloat in his desire to raise additional fees; sock it to the poor and disabled out in rural Newfoundland who might want to apply for a piece of Crown land, who might want to apply for anything, Mr. Speaker. The next thing he will be out there looking to somebody who wants to build a house or a cabin or a rabbit camp

or something trying to get his \$60 million to balance his budget.

Mr. Simms: A \$5,000 fee for doing an inspection on a cabin or a (inaudible).

Mr. Rideout: That is right. So, this is what is unusual about this piece of legislation. I think it is a very important point and I ask the Government House Leader to consider it and to consider amendment making sure that the authority to raise those fees rests where it should rest and that is with the Cabinet.

An Hon. Member: You do not trust him?

Mr. Rideout: Not on your life.

Mr. Simms: And you do not trust them either.

Mr. Rideout: I would not give the Minister of Social Services too much authority to raise fees either, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you.

Mr. Simms: No, he would be a close second.

Mr. Rideout: But seriously though, I would like the Government House Leader to consider this and bring it in line with what is generally the practice, from my experience at least, in other departments, and make it a decision of Cabinet and that is where it should be. That is where all those fee increases should be anyway, not with an individual Minister, because I cannot think of a scenario where an individual Minister would want that authority himself, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Simms: Excellent point.

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

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. members for the contribution that they have made to this particular amendment. They have raised topics that, quite frankly I was not aware of myself, such enormous power. Unfortunately, as long as I am here it will be handled in a very rational, reasonable way so hon. members need not have any fear about it. But the implication is what might happen with some future Minister, Mr. Speaker. That is always the danger but I am sure hon. members know that as long as this particular Minister is here, which will probably be another twenty-five or thirty years at the rate we are going now, but we have to think in long-term, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly will take the suggestion under advisement. I am not sure that all ministers will be able to handle such gross power.

The intent of this legislation simply was for the department to recover some of the costs which are involved for the services which are provided. And these services are now - it is not just a matter of inspecting a sewage disposal field, for example, quite often now the inspectors actually do get into some designing and they make quite a few visits back and forth, and it is important that the department be able to cover some of the costs. So, after reflecting on the suggestions made from the Opposition I will take it into consideration and I would move second reading of the bill.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To

Amend the Department Of Health Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 45).

Mr. Baker: Order 17, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Social Services". (Bill No. 4).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this particular bill that I am introducing to the House of Assembly, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Social Services" is bringing the Department of Social Services Act up to today's standards because the last Act was presented to the Department of Social Services in 1973. There are a lot of changes within the Department of Social Services, not only as far as the services rendered to the people, but the different changes in what the Department of Social Services are now responsible for. Mainly, it is housekeeping for the most part, because what we are doing is making a lot of changes as to the existing names and references to the different programs within the Department of Social Services, the structure of the Department itself, and the whole operational management of the Department of Social Services. Just to give a couple of examples, when this Act was first developed in 1973, the Department was responsible for institutions. We had Exon House, we had the Children's Home, in St. John's, Newfoundland, but since that time those have been done away with. We went into a complete new area of development.

We have now gone into group homes caring for the developmentally delayed people, and for that reason, and a number of other ones that I do not need to go into, a lot of them are just word changing. There is no need to go into any great detail because the Act very clearly describes what we are doing. Except for the references made to institution changing programing, the references made to different types of people in the Province, or the terminology that was used in 1973. For example, retardation then was a popular name, but it is no longer used within the Department of Social Services. We now refer to these people with mental disabilities as being developmentally delayed, and so they should be. Those are just housekeeping things to bring the Act up-to-date. There are quite a number of changes but there is nothing major within that particular Act.

Mr. Speaker, I will now sit down in order to see if the Opposition have a couple of comments, and if not I will rise and close.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will say at the outset that our critic is not available today, unfortunately. He may have had other questions, although I did speak to him last week and I do not believe there were any real concerns, not about the legislation itself. However, as the Minister is fully aware, it is often the case that an Opposition will take the opportunity under a particular piece of legislation, certainly something as all encompassing as this, the

Department of Social Services, to ask questions, to make arguments, to criticize, or to offer opposition to policies, and so on. The Minister would be well aware that if we desired we could hang up this kind of a piece of legislation by talking about the cutbacks in the assistance program that he administers to the single parents, that issue. We could raise all kinds of other issues. We could ask him questions about recent news reports which told us about some breakouts at some youth correctional centers in the last few days, in the last week or so. I believe there has been. I remember the days when the Minister sat over on this side and he was never reluctant about raising those kinds of matters, and I am saying to him, hoping that he is not going to be provocative in his reply, because if he is, then obviously if we cannot hang him up now we will hang him up in committee, and all that kind of stuff, so I am sure he does not want any of that to happen. I am just making the point that there are lots of issues like that that could be raised and oppositions in the past, particularly the Government when it was in Opposition, particularly the Minister himself, often took advantage of the occasion when a piece of legislation was raised, to talk about everything under the sun. I just want to say to him that we could do that, we have discussed our strategy, but we feel that it is much more practical, important, and appropriate, for a responsible Opposition, particularly when a piece of legislation such as this comes up, which is really housekeeping, repealing the old 1973 Act and just putting in place a new Act that uses all the up-to-date terms and all that. We

could talk about assistance to students, which is in the Bill. We could talk about boards, committees, the Minister's powers over boards, and appointments to boards. There are all kinds of things we could talk about, Mr. Speaker, but we do not intend to because the legislation is basically housekeeping. We have no particular questions on the legislation at this point in time but we reserve the right, of course, to raise questions dealing with social services at any time, and we may even raise some when the critic returns, if there are more, during the Committee stage, but at the moment, in principle, with repealing the 1973 Act and introducing this Act, in principle we can hardly argue with it.

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

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I am going to be a little unusual in this particular case. I am going to be kind to the hon. Member for Grand Falls and the opposition members and not be political, but I have to make a couple of references.

I find it very strange that the hon. Member would stand there this afternoon and say that they do have a lot of questions when I have been sitting on the edge of my seat for the past three sessions in the House of Assembly and I have only gotten two questions, so if the hon. Member has some questions, give it to the critic so I can get some action here in Question Period in the day.

Mr. Simms: (Inaudible) as to why that is?

Mr. Efford: As far as the escapes

Mr. Simms: Do you want to give me leave for me to tell you why they do not ask you questions?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible)

Mr. Efford: As far as the escapes - You are quite right, there was an escape last night or early this morning and have now since returned. We reduced, since I became Minister of Social Services, the number of escapes from both youth centres in Whitbourne and in St. John's, by 85 per cent. Last year in the first six months we had eight escapes.

An Hon. Member: Eight?

Mr. Efford: Eight, total.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Oh, but I am not sure if it is three or four.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Efford: No, no, I am talking about since, when compared with the numbers before that. So we have made some -

An Hon. Member: That is too many.

Mr. Efford: One escape is too many. Fortunately we got them all back without any major problems, but the hon. Member is quite right, there are some housekeeping changes. There are a lot of questions which can be asked at any given time about the Department of Social Services.

The only difference is, now everything is under control, we are doing everything the way it should be done and do not leave much room for Opposition critics to get at us at Question Period, so, with that Mr. Speaker, I will move second reading of Bill No. 4.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Social Services," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 4)

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fish Inspection Act". (Bill No. 18.)

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, section ten of the Fish Inspection Act, deals with the seizure of fish and containers. Under section ten, fishing containers may be seized and detained or sold and the proceeds of the sale paid to the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Where the person is convicted, the court may, in addition to any penalty, order that the fish and the containers in which it is being shipped, or the proceeds of the sale would be forfeited to Her Majesty to be disposed of as directed by the Minister.

Now, under this legislation there is no opportunity for the person charged to post a bond or other security to allow for the release of the seized fish and containers. This is not an issue when the seized fish is tainted, unwholesome or decomposed.

Mr. Speaker, if fish is being seized for that reason, if it is suspected that the fish is tainted

or in any way unwholesome or decomposed, then of course the fish will not be released and proceedings will proceed as would normally be the case.

A further concern, Mr. Speaker, of the Department, is the inadequacy of the present legislation in prosecuting alleged violators of the Fish Inspection Act, particularly as it relates to the level of fines or sentences that can be imposed on those people found guilty of violations under the Act.

For example, currently the maximum penalty is \$500 and or six months imprisonment. These provisions are contained in sections 13, 14 and 15, The Fish Inspection Act. The draft amendment to the bill will allow for the posting of a bond or other security by the person charged, in order to secure the release of the seized fish and containers and as well it will increase the penalties paid for violations of the Fish Inspection Act or its regulations or condition of license issued under the Act or the regulations.

Mr. Speaker, it is often the case when for a variety of reasons other than there being a suspicion that maybe the fish is tainted or unwholesome or decomposed, but there are cases where the fish has been confiscated and under the existing regulations it is mandatory that the fish be seized and, if in the judge's opinion it is not tainted or unwholesome, the fish can be sold or held for sale. And depending on what happens of course then the monies realized from the sale will be dispersed, in the case where the accused is found innocent will more than likely revert back to the owner.

But, Mr. Speaker, this amendment will enable us to seize fish under certain conditions where certain violations of the Act are alleged. And if the processor is prepared to post a bond or some other form of security than that shipment will be released to him or her and the matter will be dealt with in court at the appropriate time..

Now it is often the case, like I said a moment ago, that fish is sometimes seized and held without it being decomposed or tainted or unwholesome. For example, in the case of caplin, it might well be that core samples taken indicate that maybe the fish was not frozen at the proper temperature and there might be a fear on the part of the inspectors that it is not as wholesome as it should be. In the cases, for example, when fish is being shipped out maybe without the processor having the proper license, in that case it would be held. And like I said, in the current system the fines are so low that it is not a very big deterrent. But the fines under that amended section of the Act will certainly give a person food for thought, anybody who tries to do anything to violate the Act.

So, Mr. Speaker, it gives me some pleasure to introduce this amendment to the Fish Inspection Act and I will be willing and certainly anxious to answer any questions that might arise during this debate.

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

Mr. Simms: Yes, Mr. Speaker, just a few words on behalf of the fisheries critic, the Member for Grand Bank, who is on duty on behalf of Her Majesty's loyal

Opposition today and was not able to be here this particular day. And of course we had no idea when the Bill would be coming for sure, because we do not know how much debate will take place on preceding bills. But suffice it to say I have had a conversation with him and we have discussed it briefly in the caucus and so on, and I can tell him at the outset that we have no real problem with this. In fact we are strongly supportive of some of the initiatives, in particular the amendments that will revise the penalties imposed for offenses like falsifying certificates or marketing contrary to the way the law says now. And generally for any failure to comply with any of the provisions of the Act.

So we strongly support those initiatives, increasing the fines. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I guess it is fair to say that it is with a bit of reluctance that I make the following comment, that we should have done it probably some time ago. And I do not mind saying so.

I remember when I was Minister of Wildlife as a matter of fact, when we increased the fines for wildlife offenses, poaching in particular. And it was something that I think needed to be done and has since proven to have been the right thing to do, and it has deterred a lot of poaching but it has not eliminated it of course. Neither will this I suppose eliminate people who breach the fisheries' laws. But hopefully by seeing the size of some of the fines that now can be applied to them they may have second thoughts.

So we strongly support the revision of the penalties and we also support the first amendment

of course, which will provide that fish seized under the law could be released assuming that the person seeking the release post some kind of a bond.

And the final item there, I am not sure if the minister elaborated on it or not, but it is rather important to point out that the final amendment, which is really a definition of what would constitute a subsequent offence, so that when a person is to receive a fine for a third or subsequent offence, not less than \$20,000, not more than \$50,000, he or she should be aware that that means if he or she has committed another offence within two years of the last offence that he or she would be subject, possibly, to that second or third fine. So it is important to make that note as well. But other than that, I just say to the Minister that we support this initiative. In fact, we strongly endorse his actions.

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

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker I appreciate the spirit of co-operation we are receiving from the hon. the Member for Grand Falls, especially on fishery matters. I am pleasantly surprised, Mr. Speaker, to realize that he does have considerable knowledge about the fishing industry and the need for the Province to take whatever steps are necessary to insure that a top quality product ends up into the marketplace. As a matter of fact, I would, were it in my power to do so, nominate him, maybe, to become the new critic on fisheries in the House. Because given the calibre

of some of the questions I have been asked in the past few weeks - in fact they have been few and far between, something that does bother me, in that I thought fisheries would be one of the hot items during this session.

Mr. Tobin: (Inaudible) up in Ottawa (inaudible).

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I would maybe speak to his leader one of these days and maybe have him nominated for that esteemed position.

Mr. Speaker, quality is going to be very important in the fishery over the next few years, and I think this will go a long way towards insuring that fish leaving this Province, going into the marketplace, would go there in first-class quality. I thank the hon. Member opposite for his support. I move second reading.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Fish Inspection Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, on tomorrow. (Bill No. 18).

Mr. Baker: Order No. 15, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Freedom Of Information Act". (Bill No. 6).

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to do a brief introduction to this particular Bill. Most of what is done here, I am sure there would be very little or no comment from the Opposition on. It is striking from the schedule of The Freedom

Of Information Act the boards, commissions, bodies and so on that have ceased to exist under law and replace these names with the proper names, the names of the organizations that do now exist under law. For instance, the College of Fisheries becomes the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology. So for nine boards it is simply a change in name and that change has to be reflected in The Freedom Of Information Act.

The other item. There is an extra one in the striking out section, Subsection (1) of section 1, and it happens to be the Marystown Shipyard Limited. That probably would engender a little bit of comment from the Opposition.

The reason for it, it is my understanding, is that in the competitive world of shipyards, especially now that there is bidding on segments of Hibernia and so on, we want to protect the confidentiality of financial information that the Marystown Shipyard might be in possession of and should not under any pretence be available to the competition. It is an attempt to insure that the Marystown Shipyard is not interfered with in being totally competitive and secretive in terms of its bids for shipyard work, and particularly for the offshore work that we hope they will get in great abundance, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on the Bill as it relates to The Freedom Of Information Act, particularly as it relates to the Marystown Shipyard.

I basically agree with what the

Minister has said in terms of the Marystown Shipyard being of a competitive nature. It would be unfair for some other competitor, such as Pictou Industries or MIL or anybody else, to be able to go and find out their bidding practices and how they do things in terms of the internal documents (inaudible) of the Marystown Shipyard.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, there is another area which I think is worthy of some discussion, and that is one of the reasons why there is some concern about Freedom of Information as it relates to the Marystown Shipyard, and that is through The Freedom Of Information Act the Marystown Shipyard union were able to get the salaries of the senior management people of the yard, and I think that has caused some people within a yard a concern.

Mr. Speaker, if there is someone being paid by the Marystown Shipyard, whether they be union or whether they be management, I do not see a whole lot wrong with their salaries being made public, any more than there is anything wrong with the Public Service Commission's salaries being made public, the Premier's salary is made public and everybody else's. So I do not have any great problem with that, but I do support the fact that the Marystown Shipyard is indeed a competitive business and in relationship to their practice of bidding, the financial situation of the Marystown Shipyard and all other documentation that people use should not be there for the competition to be able to acquire. I support that aspect of it.

But I would say to the minister

that in terms of the salaries of senior management people - the Minister of Development is back now, Mr. Speaker. Probably he should be in here listening to what I have to say as it relates -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: He is listening, Mr. Speaker. It is nice to know the minister is listening. The competitive aspect of the yard I have no difficulty with, I say to the Minister of Development, but I have great difficulty with anything that can be made public. I mean if the salary - Tom Whelan, for example, who was President of the Marystown Shipyard and probably the best president the yard ever had or ever will have, and I might as well use this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to say that I am very disappointed to see a fellow of Tom Whelan's calibre leave the Marystown Shipyard, however, a fellow has to move on and do things in the world he likes to do. I wish him every success, and I know he will be successful, Mr. Speaker. I know my colleagues opposite as well as on this side wish Mr. Whelan every success in his new endeavours.

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Let me say to my colleagues that I take very seriously the fact that Mr. Whelan is leaving the Marystown Shipyard and I want to take advantage of this opportunity on behalf of my colleagues on both sides of the House to wish him well in his new endeavours. He has made a significant contribution to the Marystown Shipyard and to the people of the Burin Peninsula, and, indeed, to the Cow Head Development and other aspects of the yard.

Mr. Winsor: He is too seasoned a debater to be distracted by these people.

Mr. Tobin: I can tell the Member for St. John's South, Mr. Speaker, that I have an hour if I want it to speak on this Bill. I did not intend to spend an hour on the Bill, but if the Member for St. John's South and the Minister of Transportation want to interrupt and interject with their foolish, silly comments, then I just might take the hour that has been allocated to me to speak on this Bill. Mr. Speaker, if that is what the Government House Leader wants, for me to spend an hour on this Bill, then that just may happen. Because I am not going to be interrupted or shouted down by the Minister of Transportation. I have no intentions of it.

Mr. Gilbert: Continue, my friend.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, I will continue. I will start now. Now, Mr. Speaker, we talk about the Marystown Shipyard. Well, let us talk about it and the reason why the competition cannot get access to information. When things like that happen, we look back at the shrimp trawler this Government had built in Norway. We know how competitive the Marystown Shipyard business is, we know how competitive the ship business is throughout this country, internationally as a matter of fact. We know that it is absolutely impossible for the Marystown Shipyard to be able to compete with shipyards offshore no matter what construction phase it is in, whether it be in the offshore or ferry construction or anything else. In order for the shipyard to be competitive, it has to be done through the subsidy program.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I am telling you, if you keep interjecting I will spend the hour here. I tell the President of Treasury Board that right now. Mr. Speaker, I will serve notice that if the members down here keep interjecting and trying to shout me down on issues that are extremely important to my district, the Government House Leader might as well know right now that I will tie this up for an hour.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I tell the Government House Leader right now that if he cannot control his members here, I will tie this debate up for an hour. I am serious about the Marystown Shipyard. It is something that is very close to me, it is something I have followed for a year, and I am not going to let distractions and negative comments about the yard coming from members opposite - I am surprised that the Member for Placentia, Mr. Speaker, would take such a negative attitude towards the yard and talk about something as frivolous as my tie. I think that is downgrading the work force of the Marystown Shipyard.

But the shipyard is in a competitive business and the only way they can survive is through a subsidy program. On a subsidy program back five years ago - as a matter of fact it is five years ago today that the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada signed an agreement cost-shared fifty-fifty for a subsidy program valued at \$21 million for the Marystown Shipyard. There was a certain amount of it used, Mr. Speaker, when we were in Government; there

was a component of that used when we were in Government. But I can tell you that when this Government came to power and there was a shrimp trawler to be built for FPI and the proposals came in and the Marystown Shipyard submitted their proposal and the cost was compared to an offshore price, this Government absolutely - What did they do? First of all they went to the union, if I am right, and basically wanted to strip the union of their contract. They wanted to strip the union of their contract, Mr. Speaker. Contract stripping is what this Government wanted to do. And when they could not get away with that they said we will take the shrimp trawler and have her done in Norway. They never had any intentions of doing otherwise.

But now what has happened to that subsidy program that was put in place five years ago? This Government has taken that \$4.5 million of their portion that was remaining and has put it in the Ocean Industries Agreement. That is what happened to the \$4.5 million that was remaining. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was going to be spent throughout this Province and it is not there. I am sure the Minister of Development or the President of Treasury Board will say if the need arises for further subsidies we will look at it. Well, the need did arise for subsidies when the money was there and they turned it down, so who in the name of God is going to believe that they will look at it now. That is what is going on in the Marystown Shipyard.

They hung up the development of Cow Head by over one year - one year, Mr. Speaker. The Cow Head agreement was announced back in 1989, and it took this Government

a whole year; it is today that the contract is being awarded. That is the type of negative impact they are having on the Marystown Shipyard.

I spoke to a fellow on Thursday night, Mr. Speaker, who was laid off, the first time in fourteen years. There are more people from the Marystown Shipyard now moved to the Mainland than have ever left the area before, and it is all as a result of the lack of economic policies or support from this Government. Why doesn't this Government start immediately and put in place a program for constructing barges? There are going to be barges needed for the Hibernia development project. Well, then, why doesn't this Government start immediately to put in place a program for the construction of barges on speculation and then sell them to whoever needs them afterward? They will be there. There will be people employed.

When we were in Government, Mr. Speaker, we constructed six or seven supply vessels on speculation at the Marystown Shipyard; we constructed ferries at the Marystown Shipyard; we constructed middle distance vessels at the Marystown Shipyard. That is what this Government did for the yard. But this Government here, Mr. Speaker, has done absolutely nothing for the Marystown Shipyard except send families to the Mainland. That is what has taken place. There are more people from the Marystown Shipyard working on the Mainland today because this Government lacks any direction and any support for the yard.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) ask you to give us (inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I can tell you right now the union at the Marystown Shipyard is a good union. There have always been good unions at the Marystown Shipyard, responsible unions, responsible to their membership. There have always been and there still is a good union at the Marystown Shipyard.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Yes. As a matter of fact, I spoke to him about ten minutes ago. I can tell the Minister of Development that the employees of the Marystown Shipyard are extremely concerned about what is taking place. I know that over the years the Shipyard has had heavy losses, and I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Development is aware of what has happened since he became minister and, indeed, before he became minister in relation to the operational cost and what is happening in the Marystown Shipyard. I think there were a couple of years when the Marystown Shipyard basically broke even, and in terms of that it received Government support in the past, and financially in terms of support it still does receive Government support.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Development supports the Marystown Shipyard, but I cannot say that for his colleagues. Because I know the difference. I know where some of the ministers, in particular, stand as it relates to the Marystown Shipyard, and I know that it is not an easy battle for the Minister of Development to try and sell the Marystown Shipyard in Cabinet. He has been able to do it fairly well, Mr. Speaker, in terms of getting financial support

for the yard, but there is nothing else in terms of support for the Marystown Shipyard. When I left as Minister of Transportation there were two documents on my desk to be signed. As a matter of fact, they were supposed to be signed a week before I left; I was involved and did not have the time to sign it. But I can tell members opposite that this Minister of Transportation - one had been approved and the other one, Mr. Speaker -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: They are designing one for Fogo, which was in the plans. But the second one for Bell Island - there were two new ferries to be built, two for Bell Island and one for Fogo. All that has been built so far is one for Bell Island, and the one for Fogo is being designed. That is what is happening. And I can further tell you that it was the Minister of Development - he will not say it. I would expect him to deny it, but it was the Minister of Development who got the ferries through for the Marystown Shipyard against the wishes of the Minister of Transportation.

An Hon. Member: No. You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. Tobin: Oh, but yes. I know exactly what I am talking about. That is what took place in the Marystown Shipyard. And I can tell you something else. The Minister of Social Services, for example, supported the Minister of Transportation in not having it built in the Marystown Shipyard. And I can tell you an awful lot of other things as it relates to the Cow Head development, but I will not.

An Hon. Member: Tell us.

Mr. Tobin: Don't you ever worry, I know what is going on.

Mr. Hogan: No, you do not.

Mr. Tobin: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do. And I can tell the Member for Placentia that he should be aware of what is going on in Placentia Bay. Never once did he stand in this House and condemn everyone - the Government of Canada, the Provincial Government, and the oil companies - for taking the GBS from Placentia Bay and moving it to Trinity Bay. Never once, Mr. Speaker, and Argentia will be basically dead as a result of that decision. Never once has he stood up and condemned the decision to scuttle Placentia Bay of what was always supposed to be theirs in terms of the GBS.

But I can tell him I do not care about the Tory Government in Ottawa, because I think it was a decision that will have a negative effect on the people of my District. And I do not care about this Government. I think the decision to move it from Placentia Bay to Trinity Bay would have a negative effect on my District as well as the member's district, and it is time, Mr. Speaker, that this member started standing up and supporting Placentia Bay. Because for years we talked about the Golden Triangle, Argentia, Mortier Bay, and Come By Chance. Where is the Golden Triangle now, since this crowd got in Government? It is gone, Mr. Speaker, it has been struck and not a moan from the Member for Placentia, who stood by and saw his Premier support the decision.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can go deeper than that as it relates to that

discussion. But Argentia will suffer, Mr. Speaker, as a result of that decision, and let nobody say otherwise. Mortier Bay will suffer as a result of that decision, there is no doubt. It has to suffer, Mr. Speaker. That is what is taking place in this Province since they became the Government. And I will tell you something, that when I was in the backbenches of Government when they went to close Burin plant I did not stand by and support the Government. I stood in support of Burin against the former Premier and his Cabinet, and everybody else, and it is time that other members take the same position as it relates to their districts. When you are in Cabinet you have to toe the Cabinet line or get out. I understand that, but people in caucus do not have to get out, they can stand up and defend the rights of their district and their constituents, and that is where the backbenchers over there are lacking, Mr. Speaker. I would say that if there is one over there who has the courage of his convictions it is probably the Member for Carbonear who does not mind standing in support of them.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I have an hour and you are interrupting me. That is what is happening. I want to say again to the Minister of Development, and I am not sitting down until the Minister of Development listens, that as it relates to this Bill, Bill 6, the Freedom of Information, that I basically support that the Marystown Shipyard be exempt from freedom of information because if they are going to be bidding on work for Hibernia, or any other thing for that matter, (Inaudible).

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: I can tell the Member for Exploits that I have no intention of sitting down, or being sat down like he was the other day.

Mr. Murphy: Say a few words about the Newfoundland Dockyard.

Mr. Tobin: The Newfoundland Dockyard?

Mr. Murphy: We want a bit of work, too.

Mr. Tobin: And you should have a bit of work in the Newfoundland Dockyard. Mr. Speaker, it is a great opportunity now for the member to stand up. Every time the member opens his mouth about the Newfoundland Dockyard all he does is tear after John Crosbie and all this kind of stuff. That is not going to get you anywhere. I got up that time and spoke about the efforts of the Minister of Development, even though the Marystown Shipyard has never been so low before, in terms of employment, but the Minister of Development is not the only person who is responsible, there is a Cabinet, technically the Government. That is what has to be done and you have to try and do it, but let me get back, before I got distracted, to my friend the Minister of Development. I support that component the Freedom of Information because (Inaudible) MIL, or Halifax, or the St. John's Dockyard down there, nobody should be able to, under the Freedom of Information, find out the bidding practices of the Marystown Shipyard. They should be exempt and I agree with it. But I say to the Minister of Development that I do not think there should be any such thing as a cover-up of

salaries in senior management people. Your salary is public, my salary is public, everybody else is public, so why should -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Member for LaPoile's salary is public. I do not think the salaries should be hid away from the freedom of information but I do support the fact that the Marystown Shipyard be exempt.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. the Minister of Development speaks now he closes debate.

The hon. the Minister of Development.

Mr. Furey: I want to apologize that I was not here to introduce this, Mr. Speaker, and thank the hon. Member for the comments that were intelligent. There were some intelligent comments amongst all of that, particularly his support of the exemption for the Marystown Shipyard, because when you think about it rationally if you did not exempt the Marystown Shipyard, which currently is the status, as the hon. Member rightly points out, every other company, nationally and internationally, can apply under the Freedom of Information Act, and find out every last single detail with respect to that yard, and it would put us in a competitive disadvantageous position. This is why we are pushing forward with this piece of legislation, which essentially was on the books, I think, by the previous Government as well. Some of the hon. Member's comments with respect to: are we treating Marystown properly? I can only tell the hon. Member that it was this Government, under the Minister of

Works, Services and Transportation, which built a \$14 million ferry at the Marystown Shipyard eighteen months ago. It was this Government that put the \$10 million performance bond in place for the (inaudible) at the Marystown Shipyard. It was this Government, Mr. Speaker, that put in place the new agreement with Vinland Industries to proceed forward now, with their construction of a \$35 to \$40 million offshore fabrication yard in Marystown.

Mr. Speaker, it was this Government that put the Fogo Island ferry on the books at the design stage now, at a cost of \$24 million for Marystown.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Furey: So, Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a shimmering, shining, golden example of fairness and balance, there it is right there for Marystown.

Mr. Tobin: What about the shrimp trawlers?

Mr. Furey: Let us talk about the shrimp trawlers.

An Hon. Member: Do you really want to bring that up?

Mr. Furey: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member was quite correct when he talked about the competitive disadvantage that Canadian, not just Newfoundland but Canadian shipyards have with respect to competitive construction and bids. That was a classic example of where the Canadian Shipbuilding Policy really hurt the Marystown Shipyard, which is wholly owned by the Newfoundland Government.

And how did it hurt? It hurt

because every fishing vessel over one hundred feet which comes into Canadian waters that is completely completed with all of the components and comes in, the hon. Member knows this, it completely sails into Canadian waters without any duties, any tariffs, any bonding any of that stuff, it is automatic, it is waived, but when our shipyard tries to purchase components from Europe, when we bring in the components, those components are heavily taxed, there are heavy tariffs on them which drives the cost of doing business in a Canadian shipyard, particularly Marystown Shipyards.

So when you talk about the shrimp trawler, it was this Government that put \$4.5 million on the table, married it to \$4.5 million with the Federal Government for a total subsidization package of \$9 million to try to keep that shrimp trawler and those hundred jobs in Newfoundland. Perhaps the hon. Member should have advised the union a little differently than he did.

Mr. Tobin: I did not give the union any advice.

Mr. Furey: Well, that is not what union members tell me. What I was told was, that, Furey is bluffing, call his bluff, and the Government is bluffing - the Government told the truth.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Furey: Here is the amount of money, here is what it will cost, here is what is being (inaudible) -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Furey: - well, I will tell you right now what I told you -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Furey: - what I told you was the truth, everything I told you about the shrimp trawler was the truth. The amounts, what Government expected, the cost differential on subsidy. Everything I told you, was the truth.

An Hon. Member: Yes, who (inaudible).

Mr. Furey: I did not tell you anything that I did not tell this House -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Furey: - or the union, or the shipyard or FPI or anybody else.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Furey: Perhaps the hon. Member is puzzled because he was faced by the truth for the first time, perhaps that puzzled him a little bit. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation is important to protect the integrity of the shipyard and I move second reading.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Freedom Of Information Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow." (Bill No.6).

Mr. Baker: Order 34, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act, 1988 (No 2). "(Bill No. 65).

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

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gilbert: This is a minor amendment to the Highway Traffic Act, and what it in effect does, is now if you have an accident it has to be reported to the police if there is death or injury or damage to property of over \$500.

What we are changing now, is to put this to a \$1,000 and it will come into all jurisdictions across Canada. There is a Bill right now, so I move second reading of this bill.

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

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the Bill, I heard what the Minister had to say about it, increasing the traffic fines and all that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I am having difficulty in hearing the hon. Member, because of the conversations going back and forth.

The hon. the Member for Burin - Placentia West.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, let me say I listened to what the Minister had to say and I have read the legislation and I do not see any great problem with it in terms of changing the fine system or not. I am not so sure if there is any need getting into any great amount of debate on it. But I think we have some other Acts in Transportation that we have coming up tomorrow, I guess, that we will have the opportunity to say what we think about in the Transportation Department, have to say what we think about the incompetence of the Minister and

the lack of any support to the transportation system. And we will deal with that tomorrow, and I have no difficulty in what he is proposing right now.

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

The hon. the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation.

Mr. Gilbert: I am glad to see, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Burin - Placentia West is full of the milk of human kindness as usual. This legislation is again a very social legislation. It is improving service again to the people of Newfoundland and they do not have to be making reports on an accident that is over \$1,000. Again, it is one of the good Acts that this Government is bringing in to make it easier for the people of Newfoundland to function within the system, and I move second reading of this Bill.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act, 1988 (No. 2)," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow (Bill No. 65).

Mr. Baker: Order 18.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Health) Act". (Bill No. 19).

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will defer to the Minister who just came in.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and

Agriculture.

Mr. Flight: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As hon. members will soon recognize this is very, very unimportant, I suppose, in a sense, it is not a major amendment. It is a housekeeping thing. The situation we have now, as the hon. House will know, is that all livestock coming into the Province has to go through a process -

An Hon. Member: It has to be alive.

Mr. Flight: - and it is a very cumbersome process, Mr. Speaker, and we found a lot of the people who deal in livestock, pet shop owners, people bringing in animals for their own purpose, and their own pet, is now quarantined in Nova Scotia and it creates a lot of problems. So what the amendment is doing, it will vest in the Minister the right to exempt certain livestock or animals coming into the Province from that kind of a quarantine, and the one exception that will stand, of course, animals that have the potential for carrying rabies to the Province, obviously will not be exempted, and what I would propose or what I would see happening is my officials will draw up a list that it would be right for the Minister to exempt the passage or the bringing into the Province of those kind of animals.

So, Mr. Speaker, the amendment is purely to facilitate and to do away with some of the hardships that are being imposed on the general population now by what might be considered as fairly archaic regulations and it is

meant purely to expedite.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will answer any questions that are asked, but I move second reading.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Humber Valley.

Mr. Woodford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few short comments pertaining to this particular Bill. Some of the things that the Minister mentioned with regards to the importation of livestock into the province, as far as I am concerned, is a good move because while I probably take exception, the same thing applies to pets. The only thing about a pet is that most of the pets in the pet shops today can be ordered by phone. They do not have the hassle that, for instance, a livestock operator has in going, in the past, had to go to mainly Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and PEI to bring in livestock. The big one was dairy cattle because for the last seventeen or eighteen years until the maturity of the dairy industry in the Province you had to do just that, go over and spend your time, it is very expensive, going around and staying in a hotel in one part of Nova Scotia and a hotel in another, then picking out two animals in one community, four in another, six in another and then have a different vet from each community inspect each and every animal before you were allowed to take it across the Gulf. And it was very important that it was done, I suppose, but it was a hassle in having it done because of the possibility of brucellosis and tuberculosis. And I do not have to tell any member in the House today the importance of that because it infects both man and animal. If anybody has been

watching television for the last few weeks you can certainly tell what is happening to some of the game - I think there is one in Alberta and another one the other day in Manitoba if I am not mistaken. The bison herd, I think, in Manitoba is going to have to be destroyed. That is what happens when an animal does get brucellosis. They are destroyed. In fact if there is one animal infected in any herd, especially in a dairy herd, the whole herd has to be wiped out. We had an example in Nova Scotia a few short years ago, out of 675 dairy cattle on a farm, one or two had it and the whole herd had to be destroyed because of the circumstances surrounding the particular disease.

If I am not mistaken it gives the Minister the power to exempt certain species. You can do it at any given time, exempt the species or else put one on that has to be tested. That is important too because it can be done on short notice without coming back to the legislature.

The other thing I would like for the Minister to take into consideration - I have done it several times now and it is probably the time to say a word on it - and that is the priority for cattle crossing the Gulf. I have had, time and time again, where truckloads of cattle - I do not think it is -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Woodford: Yes, coming in. And it is about getting to the boat and being left there over night and sometimes all the next day, and having to lug water by a bucket. As far as I am concerned there is nothing more cruel to an

animal, especially, again I say, to a dairy animal who is used to being milked twice a day - had to be watered, had to be fed and everything like that.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Woodford: I do not know. I could never get an answer. They just used the simple reason that there was no priority. To me it was rather stupid as far as I am concerned. I mean it is like having an ambulance there waiting and the hospital on the other side and not letting them across as far as I am concerned. It is very important. You are not talking about something that costs \$100.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Woodford: Off Sydney side, yes; \$100 to \$150. You are talking about animals that are costing \$2000; anywhere from \$1000 to a young heifer to \$2000 and \$3000 or probably more. Notwithstanding the price is the cruel and unusual punishment that those animals have to endure in waiting there all -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Woodford: That is the Federal Department of Agriculture's responsibility and the inspection services. I do not think it is as bad now, but it is still happening. We still have cases of it happening. And the other thing -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Woodford: They just will not put them on, period. It is a policy of Marine Atlantic really, I suppose. But I am sure every member in the House has experienced the one that I am

going to bring up now, and that is when you go to Port aux Basques or go out to Argentia. Here you are within, you have to be hosed down, washed down, and then if they are not sure of that they will give you a second one.

An Hon. Member: For the car.

Mr. Woodford: For the car. And if you open your trunk and you have a few potatoes or a few vegetables in it, what do they do with it? They take it out. You do not see it happening anywhere else in Canada. And you do not see it happening coming into this Province - bring what you like in.

An Hon. Member: Why?

Mr. Woodford: Because of canker. Now, I do not have to tell any member out of all the other diseases that is in the vegetables today and we spray herbicides and pesticides every day of the week in this Province and outside. And a lot of these diseases that are in the crops today have come in from other parts of Canada simply because we are an island in any case.

But nothing irks me more than to go there and be subjected to the type of - I do not know what you would call it - CIA or KGB interrogation and scrutiny and just a complete embarrassment as far as I am concerned. And you are just hauled in. Your car, you open the trunk, what do you have here, what do you have there? Everything is just rolled over, and if you got something and someone is on a holiday and they happen to buy something in Sydney or to take with them, pluck it out, chuck it in, no questions. Do not ask any questions. Because you are insulting them. But it is

the only place it is happening and I just - it is an opportunity now, talking about livestock coming in, it is the first opportunity I have had to raise it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Woodford: That is right, that is right. But in any case no, Mr. Speaker, I do not see anything wrong with this particular Bill. In fact it is going to help the agricultural industry in the Province and to add to that probably the Minister might take it under advisement, maybe. It would have more weight coming from his office. In some sense some of the suggestions I have made with regard to inspections and the priority for cattle crossing the Gulf, either way.

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

Mr. Warren: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I would just like to make one comment and I would hope that when the Minister gets up to close the debate he would take this under consideration. This has good merit in movement from across the Gulf to the Province. I would like to ask the Minister could he not consider another section to this particular piece of legislation asking that it would also include coming from Labrador to the Island? I think it very very important because Labrador under this particular Act is treated as a foreign country altogether, and I would suggest to the Minister that in particular as it pertains to pets, dogs and cats, the same thing apply as coming from the Gulf to the Province as it applies from Labrador to the Island.

So I say to the Minister, let's

clean up our Act within our Province at the same time he is making improvements to the Act as it pertains to the Gulf.

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

The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Mr. Flight: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In closing the debate I just want to acknowledge a couple of concerns that were raised. And I would say to the hon. Member for Humber Valley that it irks me too in the same sense it irks him that we have to wash our cars and wash everything going out and not allowed to take things out where there is no impedance coming back.

I will tell you a quick little story for the levity of the House. Just this summer an old gentleman and his wife were going to PEI for a couple of weeks holidays. And when their car was inspected on crossing the Gulf the inspector found a ten pound bag of potatoes in his car that he was bringing with him, you know the way Newfoundlanders do. So anyway they forced him to take the potatoes and they could not bring them across the Gulf. But he kicked up a racket, obviously he was not prepared to take it lying down, and insisted that he be allowed to take the potatoes.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Flight: And in the kerfuffle while they were making a decision it was determined that the bag of potatoes had never been opened and written right on the bag was, grown and packed in PEI. So he was not allowed to carry it back. The level of the sense of humour

is very low in the House today, Mr. Speaker, not to appreciate that.

An Hon. Member: We did not know it was a joke.

Mr. Flight: That is right.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Flight: It was very serious to the man who was involved. But Mr. Speaker the clause that amends the bill says it all. That those species or classes of livestock which the Minister considers appropriate to exempt from the regulations, or portions of the regulations. I want to tell the House that I will be very vigilant and make sure that no animals or livestock are exempted from the regulations that will endanger the health of our livestock. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me deal with Labrador. I want to tell the hon. Member for Labrador that I will, now that he has drawn my attention to it, immediately talk to my officials. I obviously cannot think of any reason off the top of my head why Labrador should not be treated the same way as Nova Scotia, it makes immense sense, and to the extent that wording is required in the Bill I will see to it that it is there, unless there is a problem, and if there is I will take it up with the member again.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Health) Act," read a second time, ordered referred to the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 19)

Mr. Baker: Order 23, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill,

"An Act To Amend The Income Tax Saving Plans Act." (Bill No. 29)

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This is a fairly simple amendment. The Income Tax Savings Plan Act now reads, in Section 2, it is a definition of what a savings plan is and it indicates it means a retirement savings plan as defined by the Income Tax Act, Canada, or a Home Ownership Savings Plan as defined by the Income Tax Act, Canada. The proposal is to simply add something to that and in order to do that we have to delete the, or, in Subsection 1, strike out the semicolon in Subsection 2, and add a comma and, or, and then add Sub 3, a retirement income fund as defined by the Income Tax Act. All this does is it would permit a person with a retirement income fund, under the Income Tax Act, to designate a beneficiary directly in the fund as now permitted in the case of the RRSPs. Mr. Speaker, it is something that is needed and I am sure that all hon. Members of the House could support it.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I think we have evidence here in this particular Bill of the Government's Legislative Program, the meat that is contained in the Government's Legislative Program, and the weight associated with the Government's Legislative Program. Now, I am not downplaying the fact that this is an important change. It has to be made, there is no question about that.

Mr. Baker: It is an important piece of legislation.

Mr. Simms: As I just said, I am not downplaying that, but when I read the Bill, I must say, I thought to myself, about two years ago when the now Premier was Leader of the Opposition, I remember being very frustrated with him one day as Government House Leader then, in talking about a Bill and a piece of legislation. We must have spent at least an hour in Committee, surely, where he was arguing about the need for a comma in place of an apostrophe, or something like that, I mean, it would drive you nuts, but the funny part about it is, as I read this Bill and it says, Paragraph of Section 2 of the Income Tax Plan Act is amended by striking out the word, or, at the end of Sub-paragraph 1, that is fine, but then (b) says, striking out the semicolon at the end of Sub-paragraph 2 and substituting a comma and the word, or, and I said to myself I have a funny feeling that the Premier himself must have been personally involved in the drafting of this particular piece of legislation.

Now, there is nobody here at the table from the Legislative Council at the moment, there is nobody who can confirm it, nor would they probably confirm it anyway, but sometimes you can tell by the twinkle of an eye. If I made that comment and I could see the Legislative Council over there sitting in that seat, I am sure he or she would probably look over at me and go, like that, the typical way a Newfoundlander does when he acknowledges you are dead on, you are right on. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, as the Government House Leader has said this is an important amendment, there is no

question of that, but there is no reason for us to take up any more time in debating it.

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

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the hon. Opposition House Leader for his endorsement of this piece of legislation. It is something that has to be done and the only way it can be done is through an Act of the Legislature.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Saving Plans Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, on tomorrow.

Mr. Baker: Order 11, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Municipalities Act." (Bill No. 23).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill deals with some ten or twelve amendments to The Municipalities Act, amending the Act in clauses 1, 9, and 10 to make orders respecting assets and liabilities where towns, communities and regions are amalgamated. It deals with the disposition of the assets and liabilities from the previous towns, communities and regions that were in place prior to the amalgamation.

Clauses 4, 5, and 6 are amendments

resulting from the enactment of the Department of Environment and Lands Act, 1989, Bill No. 23. Clause 2 provides the municipality with the power to impose a minimum business tax, and clause 3 would allow a council to exempt a property from water and sewerage taxes where the property is not connected to that service - they do not presently have a provision to do that.

Clause 7 would grant a council the power to define what constitutes waste and litter, and clause 8 would make it an offence to violate regulations made by a council to prevent littering. Clause 11 would add a minimum monetary penalty of \$50 to Section 297, which has a present maximum monetary penalty of \$1,000. Clause 12 would amend the act to clarify the procedure that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may order in the event that a town or a community becomes insolvent. This is simply to set up a procedure in the case of insolvency. Amendments 13 and 14 are tied into 12, and just deal with the detail of insolvency.

Clause 15 provides a municipality with flexibility in establishing a date for advanced polls in the event of an election. And clause 16 would add non-recreational hunters and trappers to the list of impeditive voters able to vote in a municipal election by a proxy vote. So all these amendments, Mr. Speaker, are amendments that are necessary to The Municipalities Act and that we have been looking for changes in now for some time. They may seem inconsequential, but they are important to the municipalities and I would like to see this Bill pass. Thank you.

Mr. Simms: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Opposition House Leader, on a point of order.

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have not had a chance to mention this to the Government House Leader. I meant to ask him earlier if we could defer this particular one and jump on to some others, for a couple of reasons which I will not necessarily go into now. But since the minister has introduced it, perhaps we could adjourn debate on that item and move on to the next items. Would he have a big problem with that?

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

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, on this one, Bill No. 23, I have no problem with adjourning it now and then when we come back have a response or whatever happens. The next one I intended to call was Bill No. 15, The Securities Act. The The Minister of Justice is not here and that is rather a thick thing.

Mr. Simms: And after that?

Mr. Baker: After that The Urban And Rural Planning Act, Bill No 9 was the next one. If you are ready to go with that one I would be. Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn debate on this particular Bill and move to Order No. 10.

On motion, debate on Bill No. 23, "An Act To Amend The Municipalities Act", was adjourned.

Mr. Baker: Order 10, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Urban And

Rural Planning Act." (Bill No. 9).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, this Bill speaks to the need to amend The Urban and Rural Planning Act. First of all, in Section 132, it presently provides a procedure enabling a landowner to serve notice on an authorized administrator which has refused or restricted development of land. The notice, if confirmed, would, in effect, require the authorized administrator to purchase the land.

Section 132 (2), the proposed amendment would place the responsibility for transmitting a copy of the notice with the land owner and remove it from the authorized administrator.

Clause 1(2), Section 132 (3), provides a number of criteria of which the Minister has to be satisfied before confirming a purchase notice. That would simply clarify the law once again so that all three criteria would have to be fulfilled before the purchase notice is confirmed.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) idea.

Mr. Gullage: Clause 13, Section 132 (7) provides that if the Minister has not taken any action in a six month period from the original service of the purchase notice it is deemed to be confirmed -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Gullage: That is right - it is deemed to be confirmed by default. That would simply clarify the law once again by providing purchase notice is

deemed to be confirmed six months from the date of transmittal to the Minister.

Clause 1(4), Section 132 (8) presently gives authorized administrators an opportunity to air their views before a decision is made. This amendment would replace the existing subsection with two new subsections which would ensure that all affected parties are notified of the Minister's actions.

Mr. Simms: With all due respect, we can read these (inaudible).

Mr. Gullage: Okay. Alright. Clause 2, would amend Section 134 of the Act to increase the penalty for contravention of the Act from a maximum fine of \$200 to a maximum fine of \$1,000.

Mr. Simms: Would you describe this as housekeeping?

Mr. Gullage: I would, yes. These amendments are necessary amendments to The Urban And Rural Planning Act to tidy up some sections very similar to the amendments that preceded under the Municipalities Act.

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

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, the Minister made reference, I think, when my colleague from Grand Falls asked him a question as to whether he considered it housekeeping - basically what the Minister is doing is putting into effect what has been practiced for some time, not through this bill, but through others which are in the House.

There are people no doubt who have had some difficulty as it relates to this particular Act,

particularly as it relates to Section 132 (2), I guess, and 132 (3). What is happening here is the Minister is putting in place some things which have already been practiced. And I do not have any great difficulty with it, but I caution the Minister that he should tread very carefully when he is dealing with this piece of legislation.

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

The hon. the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Gullage: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would agree that the amendments are important. To say that it is routine is probably not the correct wording, but it is routine in the sense that it does not require a great deal of debate, I would not think.

Mr. Simms: What? (Inaudible).

Mr. Gullage: I was just anticipating the Opposition would not have any great objection to these changes which are important as the hon. Member has suggested. In fact, we are making these amendments to clarify many of the concerns right now with the procedure - the fact that it does make it difficult to enable a landowner to serve notice on a particular development of land. We are simply tidying up these sections. They all really tie into the same point that I made earlier. I would move second reading.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Urban And Rural Planning Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, on tomorrow. (Bill

No. 9).

Mr. Baker: Order number 16, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Welfare Institutions Act". (Bill No. 20).

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

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, the intent of this Bill is to make some minor changes to the Welfare Institutions Licencing and Inspection Authority. Previously, the Chairman of this Authority used to be the Chief Executive Officer. After we assumed power, we thought we would like to make the Chairman of this particular Authority an independent person, who was not necessarily an employee of the Authority, so we decided to split the two positions down the middle and that entailed, of course, a change in legislation.

So we have indeed put in place a Chairman who is not a Government employee, and that Chairman, of course, can carry on the duties of the Authority. We thought it would be much more impartial if a person could do that, because in a sense, where the employee was the Chief Executive Officer at the same time, there was, at least, potential there for partiality. So we thought we would make the position wide open and put an outsider in there. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, hon. members will know that we did, indeed, appoint an independent chairperson who, at the time, was not an employee of Government. Since then he has become an employee of Government, but he is not the Chief Executive Officer. That explains why, in No. 3, this will be retroactive legislation which

will come into effect on January 1, 1990.

Then, Mr. Speaker, under Section 2, members of the Authority who are not members of the public service, may receive remuneration for their services as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council fixes. It is not a major piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. However, I would certainly be pleased to receive any suggestions or questions, or anything the hon. Opposition members would want to know further about this bill. They will find I will be wide open in my answers, as is usual, of course, and that I will be able to entertain any questions they have on this particular piece of housekeeping, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are a couple of things I would like the minister to elaborate on when he closes the debate on this Bill. He kind of casually brushed over it. The last time he mentioned 'this is basically not a major piece of legislation' it was the one on the fees for the Health Minister, and we caught him out on that one fairly quickly.

On this one here, the Act is deemed to come into force retroactive, as he mentions, on January 1, 1990, and that is almost a year ago. Can we assume from that, the reason is because the Government actually broke the law -

An Hon. Member: What?

Mr. Simms: - in appointing a chairperson - or chairman, I guess, in this particular

instance, to head up this board, who was not employed in the public service? Now, that is contrary to the law. I think he said that the person they appointed, in fact, was not employed in the public service at the time he was appointed. Therefore, the minister quite openly admits he broke the law, and in order to cover his tracks now, he is bringing in this little bit of legislation, retroactive back to last January. This is a Government, by the way, that when they were in Opposition lambasted us if we did anything of a retroactive nature in terms of legislation. Here they are, themselves, bringing in a bill eleven months after, perhaps longer. I do not know. Perhaps the Minister can tell us. Who is the person, first of all? I am not familiar with the person or the name. And when was that person appointed as Chairperson or Chairman of the Board? Was it after January 1st? I presume it was, otherwise they would have to make it retroactive to April of 1989. I would like to have him answer that question: when was the person appointed? Who is the person, by the way, because I understand now that the person is, in fact, employed in the public service and still serves as Chairperson but not CEO. Now as I understand it, what the new law will say is that this person, the Chairperson, will not - I am not sure if it says will be in the public service or does not have to be - will not be in the public service.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Will not be the chief executive officer. But shall remain as an employee of the public service?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Either, or. Okay. Perhaps he can tell us who it was, when they were appointed and presumably they will remain in that position now because the law says they do not have to be or they can be in the public service, whatever. The other amendment there, of course, is that members of the authority who are not members of the public service shall receive remuneration. I think that is obviously only fair. I presume what happened in the past was that most of the people on the board perhaps were people in the public service. That may no longer be the case. There may be people on that board now who are not in the public service or may be in the future.

This is not really an opportunity for the Government to make any patronage appointments or anything like that. I do not suppose they would be looking at anything like that. No, because this Government does not practice patronage anyway. I hate to slip that out, but I just mentioned it in passing just so that the Minister can assure us that there is no intention to practice patronage in appointing people to this board. He can even say not like the previous administration used to always do or whatever way he wants to address it I do not care, but I would like him to address it just for the record.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, we do not have any major questions.

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

The hon. the Minister of Health.

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. opposition for these cutting questions and comments on this Bill. That is truly the spirit of democracy, you know, when you have an Opposition which shows the other side and is always vigilant that the Government is not going to do something, which is wrong. I should point out though, for the hon. Members benefit, that this particular Bill was on the order paper last year, but at that time the Opposition was not quite as co-operative as they are and of course the House closed and the paper never had a chance to be called, but I do not hold any malice, Mr. Speaker.

The person whom we appointed now, I am not 100 per cent certain, but I think it was a Mr. Brace, he is a young lawyer who works in a firm downtown, and I do not know their politics. It could happen to be the firm Ed Roberts is with, Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I have no reason to suspect that the man is -

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: But we all know that Mr. Roberts was never a member of the Tory Party, but that is the firm with whom he works, he is a very young lawyer, and there is very little money with this particular position. I think it is a per diem, I believe it is \$150 per day -

An Hon. Member: Probably more.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Decker: He did not have to be a lawyer to have the position, so it is probably \$150 a day, Mr. Speaker. Were those all the questions, did I cover them all? I think that is it. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will now move second

reading on this bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Welfare Institutions Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow" (Bill No. 20).

Mr. Baker: Order 26, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Young Persons Offences Act," (Bill No. 36).

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is just an amendment to the present Young Offences Act. One minor amendment that we want to change and because of the implementation of the demerit point system we have to make this change, because under the Young Offences Act, nothing confidential about that individual or any record can be relayed to any public system or anybody.

The implementation, The Young Offenders Offences Act, states very clearly and I will read it out, 'A record maintained by the police, a court, the provincial director, a Government department or agency of an investigation, a charge concerning an offence by a young person, shall not be disclosed, unless disclosure is desirable in the interest of the proper administration of Justice.' And because of the implementation of the driver demerit point system, we have to change that to read, adding immediately after subsection: the following subsection does not apply to a record concerning a conviction for an offence by a

young person contrary to the Highway Traffic Act 1988. So that will now mean, a young offender who gets points under the driver penalty for the demerit point system, information can be relayed now to the court system. Under the old Act it could not be relayed because of the confidentiality of the Young Offences Act.

An Hon. Member: What do you (inaudible).

Mr. Efford: Because it is very clear. If a young offender commits an offence under the Highway Traffic Act, in order for that information to be relayed to the officials - say out in the Department of Transportation - that information has to be relayed in order to lose his points on the system, or otherwise he could not be charged with that offence and he would commit all of -

An Hon. Member: Drive as fast as he liked.

Mr. Efford: Drive as fast as he liked, break The Highway Traffic Act, and no information could be relayed to the Department of Transportation. That is just to clarify that, because under the old Act it could not be done. I move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to understand it. But as I understand it now, in order for a young person in this category here to have his demerit points properly recorded, this legislation has to be approved in order to allow the department to release that information to the Department of Highways and that is

all there is to it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) the whole thing.

Mr. Simms: Well, that is why he is changing it. Under The Young Offenders Act you cannot disclose that information. Now, under this amendment, you can. And the reason you need this is because, obviously, their points have to be recorded the same as anybody else's.

An Hon. Member: What happens if (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: If my friend here is going to keep bawling things in my ear - we have not had a chance to discuss it - let us just adjourn the debate, maybe. We will not close the debate on it at the moment.

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Do members agree to call it 5:00 o'clock?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Baker: Two things: First of all, tomorrow in debate I intend to call Bill 48, which is The Highway Traffic Act Amendments, and on Wednesday it is Private Member's Day, and the Resolution on the Order Paper from the hon. the Member for Stephenville is the one I intend to call. However, I have to check and see what is happening to the Member for Stephenville, if, in fact, he will be here on Wednesday. If not, I will let the House know tomorrow and we will perhaps substitute. But right now that is the one I intend to call, the Member for

Stephenville.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I can
tell the Government House Leader
that I spoke to the Member for
Stephenville about twenty minutes
ago, in his hospital room, and he
tells me he intends to go home for
a few days to recuperate, either
this evening or tomorrow morning,
as soon as he gets out of the
hospital. I think the Acting Whip
can confirm that for you. So, if
that is the case, I do not know if
the Government House Leader may
want to reconsider, or we would be
quite prepared to let somebody
else introduce it, I guess. That
is no big problem. In the
meantime, I am not sure what it is.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: An Education Bill?
Another one?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Okay. Okay.

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

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

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