



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 33

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

1 May 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers I would like to welcome to the Visitors' Gallery thirty-eight Grade XI students with their teachers, Clyde Taylor and Corbett Newman, from Ascension Collegiate, Bay Roberts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I would also like to welcome nineteen Grade VIII students with their teacher, Wayne Holden, from Sacred Heart Elementary School, Cape Broyle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I would like to welcome thirty-four students of Creston Pentecostal Academy, Marystown, with their teacher, Nancy Hogan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I would also like to welcome thirty-four Grade IV to VII students with their two teachers, Nancy Hogan and Derrick Hiscock, and four chaperons, from Creston Pentecostal school in Creston.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Speaker, I have explained to representatives of the other parties that I do not have a prepared text so, obviously, could not give them what I do not have.

I am very pleased today, as I am sure all hon. members are, to welcome what is a very significant development in the life of our Nation, and that is agreement by all governments, by all First Ministers with respect to the adherence of Quebec to the Constitution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
It was certainly an anomaly, at least, that in a country like ours one of the important constituent parts had not adhered to what is the basic fundamental law of the land and of our relationships as people and as governments, as provinces and the federal government. That has now been resolved and certainly that, in itself, as Canadians we must welcome.

Just to very briefly outline the significant areas of development to the extent that I am aware of them as of now, there will be a recognition of Quebec as a distinct society. One of the big areas, of course, was immigration. Quebec was looking for certain powers with respect to immigration. One of the big factors here was, certainly for Newfoundland, we had always gone on the principle of the equality of provinces and that has been preserved. Because whatever power

Quebec may exercise with respect to immigration will also be exercisable by any other province which so wishes. It may be that other provinces will not so wish, but your principle of, if you wish, juridical equality of provinces is firmly maintained.

With respect to the spending power, the agreement there is that a province may opt out of new national programmes and be entitled to reasonable compensation provided that the provincial programme which would take its place is compatible with national objectives. That seems to be a very good balance achieved there.

Another important area is that the provinces will, by right, by constitutional reference, be consulted on appointments to the Supreme Court of Canada and the Senate, and that will commence immediately.

Probably most important for Newfoundland is the fact that there will be constitutionalized a meeting at least once a year of all First Ministers to discuss constitutional matters and there will be a specific reference in the Constitution itself that these matters will be fisheries, Senate reform, and any other matters which any of the partners wish to bring up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
So from Newfoundland's point of view, of course, here we have a specific constitutional recognition and obligation for fisheries to be discussed within the constitutional context, and, really, a real opportunity there

to achieve some important changes with respect to jurisdiction.

The other area, of course, the very important one was that of the amending formula. In that instance, also, we have been able to maintain the principle of juridical equality and the concept of veto is now eliminated. The matters of the Constitution covered under Section 42, and previously these would require seven of the ten provinces with fifty per cent of the population to change, and this, of course, was the area where the discussion on veto was taking place. What has happened now is that these become matters of unanimity. In other words, there must be unanimity for these matters to change and there, again, there is a principle of equality because every province must concur with the change. They are the Section 42 ones which are very basic, and there can be a strong argument that there should be unanimity because they are very basic to the country, they are the principles of proportional representation, if it is to apply in the House of Commons, the powers of the Upper House, the Supreme Court, the extension of existing provinces into territories, and the creation of new provinces. So all of these, which were previously subject to the seven provinces out of ten with fifty per cent of the population formula, are now matters requiring unanimity.

So, in brief, therefore, I think certainly as Canadians we welcome the adherence of Quebec to the Constitution and the constitutional rounding out of our country, the completion in many ways of Confederation, as the hon. member said, and also, of course, the specific reference and

constitutional obligation to examine fisheries jurisdiction within a constitutional reference. So I think it is something to be celebrated as Canadians and also as Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we in the official Opposition welcome the developments which took place yesterday evening, where we have an agreement in principle between the Prime Minister and the ten premiers as to how we might approach the adherence of Quebec to the Constitution. I think, at times, the publicity concerning Quebec's refusal to sign has tended to take away from the fact that this was more symbolic than real, in that the Constitution of Canada applies to Quebec today whether or not the Government of Quebec, at a particular point in time, adheres. Naturally it is better for the country. There is less dissension, there are fewer problems within Quebec if we have the elect government of the province indicating its acceptance. But we should all understand that when the Constitution was patriated, brought back to Canada when the Queen came over, thanks to the Liberal government's initiatives, the initiatives of Mr. Trudeau, particularly, as Prime Minister, when he saw that the Constitution was patriated at that point in time, the Constitution was there

for all Canadians, including those Canadians in Quebec. So what has taken place, or what began to take place yesterday evening, because there is still work to be done, we still have to get the consent of the Quebec Legislature, is, as I say, more symbolic than anything of great significance in reality, other than once we have an elected Legislature, as I say, in Quebec accepting the Constitution as drafted this will tend to reduce the opportunities for troublemaking and dissent on the part of extremists who exist in Quebec as in most other provinces, who have their own views that are not conducive to the unity of all Canada.

Now, President Roosevelt's representative during the last war, before the war was completed, said to Churchill, 'Look, the negotiations after this war are going to have to be conducted by people who are tough rather than sentimental', and I think events have proven the wisdom of that statement. In the same way, while at times it is seen that the participants were losing site of the great national significance of what was at stake in terms of bringing Quebec in, it seemed at times as though the other provinces were negotiating in a somewhat petty or trivial fashion for their own Constitutional concerns rather than dealing with the issue of should Quebec's concerns be dealt with in an up-front and direct fashion without a bargaining process of 'we will give you something Quebec if you give us something in return'? That can be carried too far, because we all have to recognize that it is in the interest of all Canadians to have the people of Quebec feeling comfortable in Canada. It is as

much in our interest to have that happen as it is the interest of the people of Quebec, because we all recognize here in this Province the benefits of being part of Canada. But we also have to recognize that we in this Province and other provinces have legitimate grievances, as has had Quebec in the past, and we saw one of our very real grievances brought to the fore with this Canada-France fisheries agreement relating to St. Pierre, where the Government of Canada was able to do a deal with the Government of France without consulting, to the extent they should have, with the provincial government, without getting the approval of the provincial government for what was being put to the Government of France.

We have a very basic resource, our fishery, which is at stake when that sort of thing happens, and I believe it was important that this Province go to these constitutional conferences and stress the importance of our having fisheries jurisdiction reconsidered. And I have to say I am very pleased that I think it was back in the time of the government of Premier Moores that I participated first in these constitutional conferences and had the opportunity of making the recommendation which was adopted at that time by Premier Moores, a man of some foresight, that this was a part of Newfoundland's bargaining position at these constitutional conferences, that we seek a re-negotiation of fisheries jurisdiction.

MR. MORGAN:

Come on back with us, boy.

MR. BARRY:

Now, I do not think there has been

any great opposition from this side of the House to that principle. I think all Newfoundlanders recognize that the existing stated jurisdiction relating to the fishery is not sufficient protection for this Province, and that was brought to the fore by this Canada - France fisheries agreement. As I said in my response to that crisis, that problem, that great crisis that developed with respect to the St. Pierre - Miquelon agreement, gave us the opportunity to once more strike home the need for fisheries jurisdiction to be reconsidered within this nation. It is a very significant development and I congratulate the Premier, I congratulate the provincial representatives who were able to get this recognized at this meeting, that fisheries jurisdiction will be on the regular agenda of these constitutional meetings in the future. That is a very significant breakthrough and it is of some significance for this Province. We will be in a better position, we will have greater protection because fisheries jurisdiction is now underlined as an area where the present situation is not adequate or appropriate.

I know, Mr. Speaker, you are giving me some leeway and if by leave I could just briefly, because of the significance of the event, deal with a couple of the specific points.

As to recognizing Quebec as a distinct society, while others have dealt with that in a significant fashion, I have never felt that to be too momentous a thing for us to do. Because in the Constitution right now Newfoundland is recognized as a

distinct society and I refer, just as one example, to the special place that denominational education has in this Province under the constitution, which is not in other provinces.

So at times I have felt that there have been underlying currents, maybe going back to the old Plains of Abraham battle, that has existed in the comment, 'Oh, we cannot recognize Quebec as a distinct society.' Sure, there is a risk, there is a danger that extremist elements could try and make a great to-do about this and try and play it up as a thin edge of the wedge of a new separatist attempt. I do not believe that is going to get anywhere. I think that all Canadians are safer if we recognize that just about every province has a distinctive character and is recognized as a distinct society under the Canadian Constitution because of the different sections which apply under the Constitution to particular provinces which do not apply to others.

As far as immigration is concerned, again not a matter that I would feel very strongly about as a provincial politician, but I can understand how the people of Quebec would prefer to have some input in terms of preserving that little element of a distinctive culture in North America. If I were living in Quebec as a Franco-Canadian I would feel threatened by the pressures of the North American culture in terms of possibly destroying our language and the other things that go to make the French culture so unique. I, as a Canadian, would not want to see the French culture disappear. I, as a Canadian, do not believe in assimilation. I enjoy going to Montreal.

AN HON. MEMBER:
And Puerto Rico.

MR. BARRY:
Puerto Rico, as well.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Does the hon. member have leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
Leave has been granted.

MR. BARRY:
I am not going to go on much longer, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, Puerto Rico, Boston, they all have their distinctive flavours. As a matter of fact, there are a lot of Newfoundlanders, as we all know, in Boston. We, in Newfoundland, have done our bit to improve the culture of Boston.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not opt for assimilation. I enjoy going to Quebec and experiencing a different culture, and this is something that is worth protecting. One of the ways Quebec felt that could be done was by giving it some control with respect to immigration.

The spending power: Again I think we should not ignore the fact that the Prime Minister has made some significant concessions. One has to ask at times whether a Prime Minister in political trouble might not be prepared to bargain away more from the National interest than he might otherwise do. He was not able to get the provinces to agree to national standards. So the wording has been weakened. It is now a matter

of where the provincial programme must comply with national objectives rather than national standards.

Consultation with appointments to the Senate and the Supreme Court: Again I think this is something that should have happened many years ago without any need for a constitutional amendment. Common sense speaks to that.

Annual meetings concerning the fisheries and the amending formula I have already referred to. Elimination of the principle of the veto I do not think is really what has happened here. In effect, what has happened is that all ten provinces have been given a veto, but again that may be a matter of looking at a glass half full of water and saying, is it half full or is it half empty?

I thank members for giving me the opportunity to go on with leave. I want to underline the fact this is a significant day for Canada, and in light of the entrenchment of the fisheries jurisdiction agenda item, it is also a significant day for Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Rather than make detailed comments on all the items which I think are best left until we actually see the wording that is being proposed for the new Constitution, I would

like to make two general comments with regard to it. The first has to do with the inclusion of both fisheries and Senate reform in the agenda of First Ministers, seemingly on an annual basis, so that I am not quite sure exactly how that is intended to work.

Fisheries: I think we all recognize the importance of it and the fact that we do need better jurisdiction there, and that, obviously, is to be applauded. What I would like to mention, though, is that I think the question of Senate reform is one that in Eastern Canada, and in Newfoundland and Labrador, we have not yet talked about or addressed to the extent it has been in Western Canada, and I think it is time now that we put it up on our agenda since, obviously, we will be dealing with it on an ongoing basis.

The Senate reform is an interesting one, because, quite frankly, the minister is quite correct, the position of the Federal and the Provincial New Democratic Party is that a Senate in which just political hacks are put in with no power and no reason is certainly something to be abolished.

When we talk about Senate reform we are obviously talking about a second chamber which probably will have some of the earmarks of the triple E formula that is being proposed out West. For the information of those in the House at present who do not understand it or who are not aware of it, the triple E formula talks about an effective Senate which has some significant power, that is elected across the country - certainly a different chamber than is there now - and is equal in

representation, so that Newfoundland would have perhaps six or eight senators, and that would be the same number as the other provinces have.

This is a completely different idea from what currently exists as the Senate, and what I am doing now is challenging government to bring out a white paper with its own views on second chamber reform at the federal level, because I believe it is important that we in this House and throughout the entire Province, have a discussion on it. Because what it comes to the heart of is the distribution of power in this country. Are we going to continue to be as powerless as we have been in the past, with the most notable example being the French fish deal, or are we going to have some sort of instrument at the centre that looks out for our particular regional interests?

So I want to indicate that, because I think the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) did indicate that we are opposed to the Senate as it currently exists. A second chamber with different powers and distribution is another matter. We would be very much interested in looking at it, because we, too, realize that the regions do not have the power that they have.

The second general observation, and then I will sit down, is from a personal perspective. I have been a Newfoundlander and a Labradorian, both actually, for the last twenty years. Prior to that, I was raised in the Province of Quebec, and at frequent intervals I return to the Province of Quebec to visit my parents - to visit my mother now, because my father is dead. But I do return there, and in the last twenty

years when I have returned I felt like a stranger in the Province of Quebec. There is a feeling there of Quebec not being a part of Canada to the same extent the other provinces are. There is a strangeness there that I think this agreement of yesterday may do something to alleviate. It may be that the actions of yesterday, as they evolve, will return a feeling of wholeness to the country. Mr. Speaker, speaking as a person who is proud to have been raised in Quebec, and even prouder to be a Newfoundlander and a Labradorian now, I say to you that it is extremely important that the Quebecers be reintroduced, brought into Confederation on a full, active and interactive basis. I think this agreement might do it. I heartily endorse it and so does my party.

Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, in August, 1986, an indepth restructuring of the post-secondary education institutions in Newfoundland and Labrador was announced. At that time, it was indicated that, through the new provincial college and institute system, government would be introducing bold new initiatives in post-secondary education and training.

In addition, on March 6, 1987 a federal/provincial announcement was made which approved a number of projects for funding from the Canada/Newfoundland Offshore Development fund. This funding, together with provincial funds approved in the 1987-1988 budget, will provide for additional facilities and equipment within the post-secondary system, much of which will make available training opportunities which specifically relate to the offshore.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that the central community campuses at Grand Falls and Lewisporte have been selected as the first two sites to implement a first year university programme, beginning in September, 1987. It is expected, Mr. Speaker, that further sites will be made available to offer this programme in the coming years. I might say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the idea of the reorganized post-secondary system was primarily directed at implementing a new system for technical and vocational education in Newfoundland. We did get involved with trying to standardize all of the post-secondary school courses and decided that first year university will be a good programme to implement in many parts of Newfoundland. It seems that lately some people have decided that the whole idea of restructuring was to bring first year university to all the campuses that we have in Newfoundland. That, Mr. Speaker, was not our primary intention. Our primary intention was to improve vocational and technical education.

As well, Mr. Speaker, as making a

first year university programme available in Grand Falls and Lewisporte, the first year of a number of programmes from the Cabot Institute of Applied Arts and Technology and the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology will be offered through the community college system.

These include, in particular, the first year programmes of: (1) The Food Technology Programme from the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology; (2) The Civil Engineering programme from the Cabot Institute of Applied Arts and Technology; and (3) The Architectural Engineering programme from the Cabot Institute of Applied Arts and Technology.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the expanded programme offerings outlined above, new facilities will be made available at the various community colleges and at the Fisher Institute of Applied Arts and Technology in Corner Brook through funds which will be expended in the 1987-88 fiscal year in the following manner:

The Grand Falls Campus of the Central Community College will receive \$1,056,000 in capital funding for a Library/Resource Centre, a Career Guidance Centre, a cafeteria extension, additional classroom, and laboratory renovations. As well as the introduction of first year MUN courses at the Grand Falls campus, provisions have also been made for the brokering of the first year of the engineering technologies from the Cabot Institute. In addition, the Grand Falls Campus will be provided access to computer aided design and project management systems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

In Lewisporte, Mr. Speaker, the Lewisporte campus of the Central Community College will receive \$1,075,000 for a Library/Resource Centre, a Career Guidance Centre, a Welding Specialty Centre and laboratory renovations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

These facilities will support the introduction of first year MUN courses, the first year of the Marine Institute Food Technology Programme, and an advanced welding programme at the Lewisporte campus.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, capital funding in the amount of \$687,000 has been allocated for the Gander campus of the Central Community College. This funding will be used for the introduction of an Offshore Helicopter Maintenance Programme. The Gander campus will also receive a Library/Resource Centre.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

The Springdale campus of the Central Community College will receive \$275,000 for a Career Guidance Centre. In addition, programmes aimed primarily at adult learning will be introduced at this campus.

The Baie Verte campus of the Central Community College will receive \$100,000 for a Career Guidance Centre. In addition, programmes aimed primarily at

adult learners will be introduced at the Baie Verte campus.

The Bonavista campus of the Eastern Community College will receive \$100,000 for a Career Guidance Centre. As well, this funding will allow for the introduction of programmes aimed at adult learners.

The Port-aux-Basques campus of the Western Community College will receive \$933,000 for the introduction of an Advanced Welding Programme and an Quality Assurance/Quality Control Training Programme which relates to non-destructive testing primarily for the offshore.

The Stephenville campus of the Western Community College will received capital funding in the amount of \$1 million for the introduction of a Crane Operator Training Programme, which may be of value not only in relation to the offshore but also to many other industries around the Province.

Mr. Speaker, the St. Anthony campus of the Western Community College will receive \$220,000 for a Library/Resource Centre, a Career Guidance Centre, and laboratory renovations. This funding will also allow for the introduction of the first year of the Marine Institute Food Technology Programme and will enable the offering of courses aimed primarily at adult learners.

The Happy Valley campus of the Labrador Community College will receive \$200,000 to upgrade its existing welding facilities. In co-operation with the Gander campus of the Central Community College, the first year of Communications Electronics Program

will also be introduced at the Happy Valley campus.

Mr. Speaker, the Clarendville campus of the Eastern Community College will receive \$854,000 for a Library/Resource Center, a Career Guidance Centre, a cafeteria, additional classroom and laboratory renovations. In addition, access to computer aided design and project management training capability will be made available at the Clarendville campus.

The Burin Campus, Mr. Speaker, of the Eastern Community College will receive \$995,000 for a Library/Resource Centre, additional classroom and laboratory renovations. This funding will also allow for the introduction of the first year of the Marine Institute Food Technology Programme. As well, the Burin campus has been identified as a site for a Quality Assurance/Quality Control Training Centre.

Mr. Speaker, the Carbonear campus of the Avalon Community College will receive \$993,000 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

- for a Library/Resource Centre, a Welding Specialty Centre and laboratory renovations. These funds will enable the introduction of the first year of the Marine Institute Food Technology Programme and the Advanced Welding Programme at the Carbonear campus. In addition, access to the computer aided design and project management training capability will also be made available.

The Placentia campus of the Avalon Community College will receive \$933,000 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

- and will be designated as a Provincial Welding Specialty Center and a Quality Assurance/Quality Control Training Center. An Advanced Welding Programme and a Quality Assurance/Quality Control Training Programme will be introduced at the Placentia campus.

During the 1987 - 1988 year, Mr. Speaker, \$1 million will be made available in capital funding as part of \$3 million allocation for the addition of a new technology wing at the Fisher Institute of Applied Arts and Technology in Corner Brook.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, the capital funding approved for this fiscal year as outlined today for new programmes and expenditures within the re-organized post secondary system totals \$10,421,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

These new post secondary education and training initiatives will enable individuals, province-wide, to have access to programmes and facilities designed to prepare them for job prospects in the offshore as well as those involving the latest emerging technologies.

Mr. Speaker, the initiatives I am

announcing today are significant steps towards improving and enhancing the overall quality and standard of post secondary education and training opportunities available within our new provincial college and institute system and is certainly indicative of the high priority that government has placed on this very important area.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House welcome any measures, any initiatives, which will result in improving the quality of education in this Province, particularly at the post secondary level, also any measures or initiatives which will result in improving the equal educational opportunity to young people in this Province. We welcome any such measures.

We also welcome any measures which will give relief to Memorial University's restricted, restrained and limited, financial resources. Just recently we heard the President of the University enunciate the tremendous financial crisis that was being experienced by that institution, thus restricting and limiting the university's ability to offer any kind of programmes that will meet the challenges of today's technological age. Indeed, the President gave the impression that

under the present financial assistance which it is getting from the provincial government, it was going to be very, very difficult to maintain the status quo, to say nothing of initiating new programmes, to say nothing of the university's inability to be able to carry out research. A fundamental job of any university is to carry out research. We heard the president say that the university was going to be stymied and restricted in this most vital area.

So, Mr. Speaker, anything that will help Memorial University in its efforts to meet the demands of today, anything that will help Memorial University in its efforts to prepare young people for the challenge and the demands that will put upon them in this technological age, we certainly welcome. Any measures, Mr. Speaker, that are going to give our young people the opportunity to develop themselves, the opportunity to educate themselves, to prepare themselves for the challenges and the opportunities which will be afforded them in the future, we welcome.

Mr. Speaker, we do have some concerns with respect to the community college system in particular. We would hope that the \$10 million will be well spent. But, in view of the shortness of time between now and the period in which these community colleges have to be ready and the various courses introduced into the Cabot Institute and the Marine Institute, we just wonder whether or not it is a little late to have the sufficient planning and the effective co-ordination that is necessary. We would hope that this will not be the case, but

those are complaints that I have heard from educators. They have been worried that it is so late in the year and many of the courses are not yet developed. As I am said, we are certainly late in the year but we do hope that, with the people who are involved, the skilled educators, they will be able to put in place the kinds of programmes and courses that will be beneficial to the young people of this Province, and that we will get good value for our dollar, even though time is against us.

We are also concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the boards that have been set up to administer this community college system. We are concerned that the boards, number one, have been appointed as opposed to being elected. We hope that is a policy the government will change very, very quickly so boards will be elected and not appointed. It has come to our attention, as well, because these boards are appointed, and, I suppose, because one would have thought the government should have taken care of this complaint, but when governments appoint, they do not always take into consideration all of the factors which are necessary. The complaint that we have received is that there is not a broad enough representation under these boards, not taking into consideration all the facets of Newfoundland life.

For example, we heard - this is certainly a large mistake, a large error and I do not know how the government would have made this mistake - that post-secondary educational institutions have not been represented on some of these boards. How could we make that error and go into an area and to try to develop programmes that would be representative of the

entire community and then to leave out a very significant, a very important, educational institution?

MR. BARRY:

Give an example.

MR. LUSH:

The member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry) is saying, 'Give an example.' I understand that has happened in his district where the Trades School at Bell Island is not represented on the Avalon Board. Now, Mr. Speaker, that certainly is a large error and I hope that the government would correct that.

I certainly hope that in the future they will ensure that these boards are elected and not appointed. It will be better for the people of this Province were these boards elected and not appointed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, as the minister probably remembers, in August of 1986, when he first announced the restructuring of it, we very quickly endorsed the initiative. We felt this was very important, that we have a revamping of our post-secondary institutions. Since that time we have been disheartened by the slowness with which it has been put together but, basically we are still in support of the general objectives and we are in support of the general trades objectives that are being accomplished here.

However, I think it is important to discuss one aspect of this proposal and that is the first year university programme, which the minister knows I was going to raise.

Mr. Speaker, the rationale behind offering first year university programmes in the community college system was to make it more available to the citizens of the Province, all around the Province. There has been a strong lobby from my district, Labrador West, to get the first year university programme reinstated that we had for twelve years and was discontinued four or five years ago when the mining companies withdrew their funding. But what do we see, Mr. Speaker? We see only two first year university programmes put in effect and, Mr. Speaker, one in Grand Falls and the other in Lewisporte. Now, let us be clear about this. I ~~entirely~~ support the principle of having a first year university programme in Grand Falls and one in Lewisporte, but it seems to me that if they are only sixty-two kilometers apart, according to the map put out by our Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett), and I have checked on it, then maybe Grand Falls might have been the first or second one put in place but, surely the Lewisporte one should have been somewhat down the list, after we have had one in Port aux Basques, in St. Anthony, Marystown, Clarenville and Labrador West. Surely we should have them more remotely located so that we could get better accessibility for the students of the Province.

I am not going to ascribe motives to the minister because I know that is unparliamentary, but why do we have only two programmes,

sixty-two kilometers apart, one in Grand Falls and one in Lewisporte, and none in the rest of these districts? It is very difficult to come to any rational explanation for doing that. Certainly Labrador West would have been a better place to put the second one, places like Port aux Basques, St. Anthony, Marystown, all of these would be better places to put it because we would access students who did not have a thirty-five minute drive from one location to the other.

I am hoping the minister eventually can give us some explanation for why this, what appears to be a totally irrational plan of putting these programmes in. If that is the way in which they continue to put these programmes in, then I think our Opposition members here have their jobs cut out for them in keeping them on the straight and narrow and making sure that we are responding to the priorities of the students out there who, in the final result, are the ones that these programmes are being put in place for.

Mr. Speaker, although we support the initiatives in general we find it lamentable that this kind of approach is being taken, which is, quite frankly, totally irrational. As a matter of fact, for a few minutes I thought maybe I did not know my geography well enough and I had to check the map, but they are only sixty-two kilometers apart. At a legal speed limit, that is thirty-five to forty minutes driving. How can you possibly justify \$1 million in each center to put these programmes together when in fact you could have put it somewhere else where it would have accessed more students?

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Culture Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As minister responsible for amateur sport, I would like to inform hon. members that despite a recent meeting between members of the Olympic Torch Relay Committee and officials from my department and the Newfoundland and Labrador Amateur Sports Federation, there will not be any changes in the route previously announced for the relay in Newfoundland.

I thought I would take this opportunity to inform members of this since we passed an all-party resolution here in the House a few weeks ago.

My officials and the representatives of the Sports Federation, including Federation President Charlie Cook, expressed our Province's opposition to the proposed route in the strongest possible terms. The members of the Torch Relay Committee, however, led by Relay Manager Jim Hunter, maintained that financial and time constraints prohibited any changes in the relay route in our Province or elsewhere in Canada. They added that the route set out had required the approval of the International Olympic Committee and any changes would require further approval, which they deemed impossible at this late date.

While the Committee members explained that five other

provinces and territories had the relay for the same amount of time or less than our Province - that being two days - and that other provinces, including Ontario and Quebec, had vast portions of their provinces by-passed by the relay, we are still not satisfied with the route in our Province. An Olympic Torch Relay designed to give all Canadians an opportunity to share in the Olympic spirit as symbolized by the flame, cannot be seen as complete if it leaves out a large portion of the population and the country.

In coming to Newfoundland to discuss this situation, nevertheless, and in the meeting held, the members of the Relay Committee expressed a sincere desire to enable more Newfoundlanders to join in the Olympic celebration, even if the Torch Relay could not include their community. The Sports Federation, which under the leadership of Mr. Cook played a major role in presenting our Province's opposition to the route, requested that an additional six or seven runners be included in Newfoundland. These runners would be selected by each of the sport governing bodies in the Province whose sport is represented in these Winter Olympics. The Relay Committee has agreed to this request.

The Relay Committee has also agreed to have the two polar bear mascots of the '88 Olympics along with Relay Manager and former olympian Jim Hunter, who has recently been inducted into the Canadian Sports Hall of Fame, travel to communities on the Island and Labrador, Mr. Speaker, to share the Olympic experience. Mr. Cook has agreed to have the Sports Federation coordinate these

visits with the towns involved and help organize related events and activities. The Newfoundland and Labrador Amateur Sports Federation is to be commended in this matter, as in its other work, for its ongoing commitment to amateur sport in the Province.

While we are not satisfied with the Relay Committee's final position on the Torch route, we would be negligent not to make an effort to cultivate what is the pinnacle of what amateur sport is all about -- the Olympic spirit. Our Province will be in the international spotlight when the relay begins here on November 17th. I hope all our citizens can share in the pride of our country when Calgary hosts the 1988 Winter Olympics.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all hon. members for their support in passing the all-party resolution some weeks ago. In particular, I would like to thank the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), the last two members particularly, because of the representation made on behalf of the residents of Labrador.

Thank you very much.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, it is not too often in this House that we see

ministers get up and give bad news, they generally try to present something which is positive at least. What the hon. minister is announcing, and I share some sadness in this, is that the negotiations failed.

Mr. Speaker, the art of negotiating is a very difficult art and unfortunately we see a case here where the team which our Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth put forward did not bring home the bacon. It has failed, and I am sorry for that.

It is an unfortunate disappointment, I would suggest, for amateur sport in the Province. Over the past twenty or twenty-five years we have seen some tremendous leaps, tremendous strides made in amateur sport in this Province. Anyone in my particular age group who grew up in outport Newfoundland would probably ~~not~~ have heard of basketball until he left the outports. He probably would not have heard of volleyball or badminton or curling. I certainly only read about these things in books before I came out of my outport home twenty-five years ago. Many of us were surprised to learn, Mr. Speaker, that swimming was a sport. In outport Newfoundland, swimming was something you did if you happened to fall over the wharf or if you happened to fall out of your boat. It was certainly not a sport.

I can remember when hockey was only something we heard on radio. I was in Grade XI before I ever had a hockey stick in my hand, and I cherished it. I managed to keep it for three years before I finally had to do some repairs on it, patch it up, but that was

quite common in outport Newfoundland. I would suggest that the most common games we played were rounders, leggage, and football. Football in outport Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker - I think they call it soccer - in our day was most definitely where you got out and kicked a ball around, it was not the American rugby or the English rugby they now play.

To refuse to take this torch right across Newfoundland, I suppose, is a sort of slap in the face at a time when the Olympic spirit seemed to be growing stronger and stronger in this Province. Mr. Speaker, although this battle has been lost, we have not lost the war. We as a people are not going to be shattered. We will bounce back from this minor setback and we will still carry on. I am sure that with the strides we are making now in individual sports - we are doing excellent in wrestling, we are doing excellent in swimming - we will be proud to take our place among the top sportsmen in this nation.

Just for a moment, if I could be allowed to make a point, Mr. Speaker. I have some great news now for the residents of Conception Bay South. I notice the mascots, Hidy and Howdy, the Polar Bears, have arrived before the Torch.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We would also like to add a few words of disappointment, inasmuch

as we supported the efforts of the minister and the Sports Federation in trying to have the route changed. We appreciate the information that the minister has presented, in that the Canadian Committee had no room to change the route because of the dictate of the International Committee who obviously were operating at a very high level here.

We would like to congratulate the minister and the Sports Federation on the concessions they did receive in the additional number of runners that will be made available the opportunity to participate, and also the visit by the mascots, Hidy and Howdy. We would like to encourage the minister and his department to give all the support they can to the Sports Federation in developing a programme, in his words, to cultivate the Olympic spirit. It is important now that we ~~move beyond~~ the struggle over this particular question to have the route changed and do everything we can, between now and opening day of the Torch, when the minister correctly says all international noise will be beyond the opening here in St. John's.

Events coming up over the Summer: I would like to mention the World Cup Junior Soccer which will be hosted at King George V field, which is in my own district. That event will also bring international attention to our Province and, I think, will help inspire some of the preparation before the Torch gets under way in November. I would like, for our part, to offer any assistance we can in any way to be a part of the preparations for when the Torch will commence. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a Ministerial Statement that I will be making at twelve o'clock. I have talked to members of the Opposition and have gotten leave to revert to Ministerial Statements at that time.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). It concerns the minister's attempts, Mr. Speaker, in recent days in this House and in Committee to defend his pork-barrelling antics, the indefensible actions of his department and himself in the way that the municipal grants have been allocated throughout the Province. In his desperation to justify their actions, the minister has used fiscal restraint as one of the arguments for not being able to accede to some of the requests in the Province in terms of water and sewer requirements.

MR. BAIRD:

Why did you not stay at the

meeting yesterday?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

I wonder how the minister, who is also a member of the Treasury Board, can justify using that argument of fiscal constraint when it comes to eliminating raw sewerage and polluted drinking water, and at the same time as a member of Treasury Board and a Minister of Cabinet, approve an expenditure of \$3.3 million for the first phase of a building estimated to cost \$8.8 million in Mount Pearl, that is going to be used to house Motor Registration officials, and that, Mr. Speaker, while people in this Province are tolerating raw sewerage in their ditches and being forced to drink polluted drinking water?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I think somewhere in there was a question but I did not quite get what it was. The hon. gentleman seems to be very concerned over the fact that fiscal restraint is being practiced by the government. Every department of government, Mr. Speaker, is practicing restraint right now. We have a \$25 million capital budget this year, roughly a \$30 million capital budget next year, and we can only do the very best that we can, Mr. Speaker, to address the concerns that we get. Twenty-five million dollars, \$50 million, \$75 million would not have been enough this year to address all the concerns that municipalities put forward.

As I have said several times in the House of Assembly, this year we had \$215 million worth of requests. Obviously \$25 million is not going to address \$215 million worth of requests. Out of that \$215 million we got roughly about \$100 million in priorities. Again, \$25 million is not going to address \$100 million worth of priorities. But over a three or four year period, at the rate of \$25 million or \$30 million a year, I think it is reasonable to assume that during that period we can look after \$100 million worth of priorities that we have right now.

Obviously the Department of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Speaker, would like to have much more money, but we do not have it and that is a fact.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the minister has very carefully, and I suggest to you very deliberately skirted around the main point of my question. How can he justify using fiscal restraint as a reason for not being able to provide essential services, and, at the same time, as a minister and as a member of Treasury Board, authorize an expenditure of \$3.3 million in the present fiscal year to build an ivory tower to house civil servants in the town of Mount Pearl?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, every department of government has its priorities. I certainly do not have to answer for the fact that any department of government or Treasury Board has made available a building in Mount Pearl. Obviously, that is the need for Mount Pearl. If the hon. gentleman has any problem with that, he can take issue with the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), who is also the member for the area and who is obviously a good representative in there and has made representation on behalf of his constituents and has been able to get quite a great deal of money spent in Mount Pearl. I do not think you can fault the member for that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not have to answer for the member for Mount Pearl or the President of Treasury Board and try to connect somehow any expenditure that is made in Mount Pearl on a building with the capital programme of the Department of Municipal Affairs. The hon. gentleman is playing games, as everyone knows. If he has a question on Municipal Affairs, if he has a question on the capital programme this year or the expenditures that we have made available to the Province this year, let him ask me about it, Mr. Speaker, instead of getting on with his foolish little games, bringing up Mount Pearl and the fact that they have a building and somehow trying to equate that with \$25 million of spending in capital funding that we have this year.

The hon. gentleman is playing games, Mr. Speaker, and if he has a question about Mount Pearl or a building in Mount Pearl, let him direct it to the Minister responsible for Treasury Board and the member for the area. If not, let him direct his questions on

municipal capital funding and the Department of Municipal Affairs towards me.

MR. W. CARTER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I suggest, Sir, it is the minister who is playing games. In this case he is playing it with the lives and the safety of thousands of Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

I should inform the minister, as a member of Cabinet, he shares the collective responsibility for making that decision.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the minister is this: He mentions, in his reply, that the expenditure of that \$3.3 million in Mount Pearl is to fill a need. Is he suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that when essential services are lacking in a community that does not present a need? Will the minister tell the House what are the criteria used by him and by his government in establishing needs? What criteria, for example, are used in establishing when and to what extent requests for essential services should be met? Does he place a greater emphasis on the building of an office building in Mount Pearl than he does on the provision of essential services?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, if you followed the line and the scenario that the hon. gentleman is using, I guess we should close up every hospital bed in Newfoundland and put everything into municipal services; I guess we should close up every classroom in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, and not spend any money on education and let it all go into the capital programme next year to Municipal Affairs. Maybe what we should do, Mr. Speaker, is shut down the Department of Social Services and leave every welfare recipient in Newfoundland out in the cold and put everything into municipal services. So that is the scenario that the hon. gentleman is pursuing and it just does not make any sense.

As I indicated to him, Mr. Speaker, we have very real needs in the Province of Newfoundland with respect to water and sewer allocations. Everybody knows that. We need more money, we need a greater infusion of dollars into our capital end of it to take care of some of the pressing problems, like I said, about \$100 million worth of pressing problems that we have in the Province, but we are making very real progress on that, Mr. Speaker. I think an indication of that is since the Peckford administration took office back in 1979 there has been an increase of over 100 per cent in funding that has been made available to municipalities in this Province. I think that demonstrates in a very real, substantive, tangible way the commitment that we, as a government, have to municipalities

in this Province. Again, we would like to have more money, Mr. Speaker, but following the hon. gentleman's line of thinking we would have to close up every hospital bed in Newfoundland, we would have to close down every Social Service office in the Province and close up every classroom simply because we have not got enough money to put into municipal capital programmes in Newfoundland and Labrador. That is not an acceptable scenario that the hon. gentleman is getting on with and I submit to Your Honour that he continues to play games with the people of Newfoundland, belittling the very legitimate request that the municipalities out there in this Province have, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Did you see the sigh of relief on the Minister of the Environment's (Mr. Butt) face?

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and it is relative to his capital spending. I want to say to the minister that the Premier announced, and the minister said in his statement, that the town of Windsor had received \$830,000 under the capital spending programme. Windsor in fact did not receive any money whatsoever. The whole \$830,000 attributed to

Windsor was spend in fact on regional services to service the three major towns in the area. Now why is the minister practicing such deception, why is he attempting to cover up the fact that Windsor was totally ignored, and why is he fabricating this scandalous misinformation? Why?

MR. SPEAKER:

The Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I know what the hon. gentleman is referring to and he does not have a valid point, as usual. The expenditure that was put in place for Windsor - Buchans is the same expenditure that is being listed also for the town of Grand Falls and for the town of Bishop's Falls, simply because what we are dealing with here is the regional water system. This year, in the capital programme, what Cabinet decided to do, because of the problems in Windsor, Grand Falls and Bishop's Falls with the regional water system, was to make available to that area, Windsor, Bishop's Falls, Grand Falls, an expenditure of \$600,000 which would be government's contribution in the first year towards a water treatment plant for those areas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on top of that \$600,000, \$150,000 had already been spent as well on that regional water system last year, because we had to get consulting people in place, and we had to flush out the lines. There was a boil order on out there. There had to be some polypigging of the lines done. All of that cost roughly in the vicinity of \$150,000. That is \$750,000, Mr. Speaker, in total. On top of that we had to spend an additional

\$30,000, again applying to Windsor, Grand Falls, and Bishop's Falls, which was the fee that we had to give to the consulting engineering people and the design work that had to be done on that system.

So when you list the expenditure for Windsor - Buchans as \$830,000, the provincial government do not know at this point in time what the contribution is going to be from Windsor toward the cost of that regional water system, we do not know what the contribution is going to be from Grand Falls toward the cost of that regional water system, and we do not know what the contribution is going to be from Bishop's Falls toward that regional water system, simply because we are going to get the federal government involved, if we possibly can, toward the cost of the entire thing. The regional water system, the water treatment plant, is going to cost roughly between \$5 and \$6 million. So the expenditure that we list of \$830,000 for Windsor is the same expenditure as we are going to list for Grand Falls for \$830,000, simply because the formulas have not been worked out yet as to what each community, what each town is going to pay toward that regional water system.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, if what the minister is saying is true, that the \$830,000 he credits to Windsor is going to be credited to the district of Exploits and also credited to the district of Grand

Falls, then how does he explain - the press got this - this statement which says that funding for the year for the town of Windsor is \$830,000, when he knows full well not one cent of that money will be spent in Windsor? Explain that!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, what kind of a statement is that for the hon. gentleman to make, that of that \$830,000 not one penny, Mr. Speaker, is going to be spent in Windsor. I guess everybody in Windsor is going to turn off the taps, they are not going to use the water, Mr. Speaker. I guess everybody in Windsor did not benefit from the \$150,000 that we have already made available this year or during the last number of months for the cleaning of the lines and the polypigging of the lines and flushing out the system, \$150,000 and another \$80,000 that had to go to the consulting engineering people who were used to make recommendations as to what should be done. None of that was attributed to Windsor, apparently, in the hon. gentleman's opinion. When it comes to the huge expenditure that this government has made this year, \$600,000 for Windsor, Bishop's Falls, and Grand Falls for a water treatment plant, apparently none of that is going to be attributed to Windsor. I explained to the hon. gentleman a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, the reason why that expenditure. They asked for the figures on the Liberal districts and I had to put down the \$830,000 because we do

not have the breakdown as yet as to what Grand Falls is going to be contributing, what Windsor is going to be contributing or what Bishop's Falls is going to be contributing.

Once we know, and once we know how much the federal government is going to contribute, if any, toward the cost of a water treatment plant in Grand Falls and Windsor, we will know then what the breakdown is and we will be able to divide it up accordingly and say, "Windsor, this much is attributed to you, you have 30 per cent of the population that is going to be using this system so therefore you are going to have to come back with your contribution based on that population that you have. Grand Falls you have 50 per cent of the population or more," whatever it turns out to be, and then we will know what the breakdown is for Grand Falls, how much they are going to have to contribute, and the same thing applies to Bishop's Falls. Any expenditures listed right now, if Grand Falls comes looking for what is approved for those areas, that will be listed for Grand Falls and it will be listed for Bishop's Falls as well until the breakdowns are put in place.

MR. FLIGHT:

A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Grand Falls.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the minister has admitted that \$830,000 that he attributed to Windsor has also been attributed to the district of Exploits, has also been attributed to Grand Falls. The minister is fully aware that that money he is

talking about is for the engineering of a water treatment plant that will not be built for four years, the minister has stated it is a long-term project. That is the engineering for a water treatment plant to services Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls, Windsor, that area. So what a fabrication. What a cover-up, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

At least it gives them water.

MR. FLIGHT:

How can you take credit for giving Windsor \$830,000 and stand in this House and then say, "But that \$830,000 is also going to the district of Grand Falls, that same \$830,000 is also going to Bishop's Falls or in Exploits district, and for a purpose that the people of Windsor will not benefit from for at least three or four years until the water treatment plant is built. It is a scandalous fabrication. It is a cover-up of the worst kind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

What is the hon. gentleman's point? Is he saying that we should not start the regional water system in Grand Falls? The people in Grand Falls, Mr. Speaker, were in a turmoil last year, and the people of Windsor and Bishop's Falls in a turmoil last year because they were boiling water and they did not know what the results of all these tests were going to be. They were in turmoil and they were asking the Government of Newfoundland and

Labrador to recognize that, Mr. Speaker. This is why we came up with this \$600,000. It might very well take two or three years to put a water treatment plant in Grand Falls to service those areas.

I do not know how long it is going to take. The engineering work has to be completed. As I said, the minister from Grand Falls, the minister from Botwood and I are involved in the process right now of getting talks on the go with the federal government to try and get some infusion of funds, to try and get some involvement from the federal government on it. The way the hon. gentleman speaks, Mr. Speaker, he would be happy if the water treatment plant did not go ahead.

MR. FLIGHT:
I would not.

MR. DOYLE:
He seems to be disappointed that he cannot go out to his district now and say to the people out there, "Look at this big cruel government in St. John's not making any money available for you."

That armour has been taken away from him, Mr. Speaker. He has to go out now and give the Government of Newfoundland some credit for having responded to the problems of the people in that area. And the way the hon. gentleman speaks it is like he is very, very disappointed that we have made all this money available to try and help out Grand Falls and Windsor and Bishop's Falls to solve some of the problems that they are having.

MR. FLIGHT:
You are being deceitful.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! I will call on the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans to withdraw his comments about the hon. minister being deceitful.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, deceit is written all over this, nothing but deceit.

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Nothing but pure, unadulterated deceit.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Deceitful is an unparliamentary comment. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

MR. FLIGHT:
I withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Thank you.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, in that same list that the member for Windsor - Buchans refers to, the fabricated figures and so on, in that same list the Minister of Municipal Affairs talks about the district of Bellevue, and he talks about 47 per cent of the district of Bellevue being serviced by water and sewer. Now will the minister come clean, will the minister not admit that in the district of Bellevue there are thirty-seven towns, there are only seven with municipalities, and it is only 47

per cent of these seven municipalities that are serviced by water and sewer and not the district of Bellevue? Would the minister not admit that that is a fabrication of the facts and the truth?

MR. DOYLE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DOYLE:
No, Mr. Speaker, that is not a fabrication at all. Our engineering figures and our computer show that Bellevue is 47 per cent serviced. You have the town of Arnold's Cove that has a full water system, fully serviced. The town of Chance Cove and Chapel Arm do not yet, but the town of Arnold's Cove does have a water system, fully serviced. You have the town of Normans Cove - Long Cove with a water system, but as to what extent I certainly do not have that information available to me right now. But they do have a water system. I do not know if it is fully serviced or partly serviced. And you have the town of Whitbourne that has a water and sewer system fully serviced. The town of Sunnyside did not put in any application this year. I do not know if the hon. gentleman is aware of that. That particular system, I do not have the information on that because there was no application form that came to the government.

But, Mr. Speaker, the figures that we have indicate the district of Bellevue is indeed 47 per cent serviced. Now if the hon. gentleman has some dispute with that, he can come down and he can feed the figures into the computer

himself if he wishes to. But these are the figures I have available to me, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young). Just before the House recessed for Easter the Premier came in and announced the Government's Job Creation programme for the past year, 2,088 more than half of which are part-time jobs, and, Mr. Speaker, this despite the fact that the Commission on Employment and Unemployment stated that unless the government created, generated an extra 10,000 jobs each year that this Province would still be in a crisis with respect to unemployment.

My question is, in view of the fact that this information was carried in the news media of this Province, and in view of the fact that the government have at its disposal a \$3 million Information Service, why did the minister see fit, why did the government see fit to engage in an advertising programme? Why did the minister approve this scandalous and extravagant waste of money to advertise a monumental boondoggle, a job creation programme, Mr. Speaker, that is going to do nothing to reduce unemployment levels in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Public

Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I presume the question should be directed to someone else because I have no job creation programmes in my department. This is done by three different ministers. Career Development does most of it.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, there is somebody in this government who gave approval for the advertising, for the scandalous waste of money in advertising this boondoggle. Now maybe I will ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) whether he approved this scandalous waste of money considering the abysmal financial state of this Province, Mr. Speaker. Maybe it was the Minister of Finance. Certainly he was a part of it. So can the minister answer this: Why did he, why did the government see fit to waste money in advertising this boondoggle, this programme that will do nothing to reduce the unemployment rate in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not seem to realize that employment and unemployment is one of the most urgent matters concerning people in this Province. In every poll that is taken people say the unemployment situation in this Province, throughout Canada and throughout the Western World, really, since

the recession, is largely on their mind. At one time it used to be Constitutional matters, another time it used to be linguistic matters, all that sort of thing and very important issues, but these have now faded generally from the public consciousness and employment and economic activity are the matters that are now coming to the fore, and people are concentrating on them, they are focusing on them. The hon. member does not seem to realize this and he feels that government should ignore job creation, he does not think the people out there want to know what jobs are being created, what types of jobs are being created, how many jobs are being created. This is of urgent public interest and this government would be remiss if it did not respond to the need for information that the public requires.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the minister that if this government were doing anything with respect to job creation they would not have to advertise, the people of this Province would know it. Now let me ask the hon. gentleman this: In view of the abysmal financial situation of this Province, in view of the disgraceful high levels of unemployment, would the government have not been more prudent in directing all of their monies to creating jobs instead of engaging in this scandalous and extravagant waste in advertising this do-nothing programme?

MR. CALLAN:
Hear, hear!

Now answer that.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I must send the hon. member over a copy of the budget, and I think he needs it because he is a Finance critic. The budget was pretty well all about job creation. I mean, it laid out a whole training approach in regard to training the young workers of this Province in particular for the new technologies that are coming along. It laid out any number of temporary but meaningful job creation programmes. It laid out an entrepreneurial programme to create jobs. It indicated that government was going to look into a stock saving plan, again to promote small businesses that would lead to employment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:
The whole budget was about employment, and government is getting encouragement for it. I have a copy here of the budget and perhaps someone could hand this over to the member. I think you will find that good weekend reading.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask is the Minister of Municipal Affairs aware that many communities around this Province are unable to come up with the town's or community's portion of the capital grant and the shared grant programme? Would the minister give us some indication as to how many communities, in his opinion, are in this situation?

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

MR. DOYLE:
It would be very, very difficult for me, Mr. Speaker, to have that information immediately available to me right now because we do have roughly about 415 municipal bodies. There are a number of those which cannot come up with their 40 per cent. I mean, that is nothing new. That has happened year after year after year. Ever since we have had a Municipal Capital Programme we have had town councils which cannot, because they do not have the necessary tax base within the community, come up with their share of the 40 per cent. What some councils do is wait for a period of maybe three or four years, they accumulate so much money over a period of time before they do apply, because they know that one of the essential criteria is they must have their share in order to take advantage of the sixty/forty programme, the cost sharing paving programme in which government puts in 60 per cent of the money and the municipality puts in 40 per cent. They sometimes cannot take advantage of that programme because they do not have the money available to them, but for the most part municipalities who do apply have the 40 per cent available.

I can break out those figures within a couple of days as to the number of municipalities who did apply or who could not apply because they did not have their 40 per cent available but I do not have that information right now.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

Would the minister indicate whether in fact he meant what he said when I heard him - I think it was yesterday or the day before - saying that he has turned down at least one community because indications were - what indications? - that they could not come up with their 40 per cent? So obviously the community had made an application and said that they were prepared to pay their 40 per cent.

Would the minister indicate how often he makes assumptions because certain indications are that they cannot come up with their 40 per cent? Would the minister say for those whether there were indications they cannot or did they in fact say they cannot? I refer to the community of Bell Island where they are in a very desperate situation right now. The Town of Wabana is in a very desperate financial situation. They have not had any capital funds for paving for something like ten years, I think. What does the minister intend to do to permit these towns and communities to provide the services that their taxpayers are entitled to obtain? Does the minister say they must stew in their own juice, that the residents of these

communities must suffer and lose services that are provided elsewhere in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, as a department, when a municipality applies for funding, if it is under a sixty/forty programme, we have the responsibility to check out whether or not that municipality can come up with that 40 per cent. That is something that is done on a routine basis. I mean, we have to check out before any funding is made available whether or not the municipality can come up with that 40 per cent.

Now, the municipality that the hon. gentleman is referring to obviously is Windsor. I forget how much money the town of Windsor applied for this year under the sixty/forty programme, but I think it was probably \$600,000. I think that is accurate. We could not approve any sixty/forty cost-shared funding for the town of Windsor. It is a complicated story about Windsor but I can go into it for the hon. gentleman.

The town council of Windsor this year - they know full well what I am talking about and I am not trying to degrade or discourage the town council of Windsor - submitted a budget to the Department of Municipal Affairs that was not, in the opinion of the council, a realistic budget. We met with the people of the Windsor town council. They said to our department, 'We are submitting a budget to you. Even though it is balanced, we know it is not realistic, because we are not going to be able to live within

that budget.' This is what we were told, and they were right. We could not deny what they said. They were absolutely, 100 per cent, correct. We knew that.

Then, on the heels of that, Mr. Speaker, we get an application, I believe for \$600,000, for paving. Windsor's share of that \$600,000 is 40 per cent, they would have to come up with \$240,000. How can a council who say that they have submitted an unrealistic budget that they cannot live within get \$240,000 to contribute toward their share of the municipal paving programme? We knew they could not do it, Mr. Speaker. What would they have to do in order to get the \$240,000? They could not raise taxes. I do not think it is realistic to raise taxes in Windsor right now. It is not realistic, the council realizes that. They would have to borrow \$240,000 included in a budget that was already unrealistic to begin with, and one that they could not live within, even though the one that they submitted was balanced.

So, Mr. Speaker, you know, it goes without saying that the department has the responsibility to check these things out and to make sure that we do not drive the municipality further in debt by approving funding that we know that they cannot use, that they cannot come up with. You could possibly go to a bank and get \$240,000, but the community goes down further in the hole as a result of it. We have the responsibility to check these things out. That is why we went back to Windsor.

And to answer the hon. gentleman's question further, I do not think there are too many more

municipalities that we had to do that with. I do not have those figures available to me either, but I do not think we did. But that is the rationale behind doing what we did in Windsor.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

Would the minister permit just a brief question by leave to follow up?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have leave?

MR. BARRY:

The minister indicated, yes, that he would.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

This is a serious question. Would the minister consider taking a look at the formula that is now in place in The Municipalities Act to see whether it is possible to get a better formula to help these communities? As the minister has already indicated, he has given Windsor as an example, and there are other communities - and I have mentioned the town of Wabana from my own personal knowledge - in the foreseeable future they are not going to be able to raise the money to cover their share of the capital projects that are going to be necessary to provide minimal services. And the minister had admitted that taxes cannot go any

higher. Government cannot just wash their hands and let these communities live in despair and have their roads deteriorate so that they become impassible. Would the minister take a look at the funding formula and see whether some amendment might be necessary to deal with these cases? Granted they might be exceptional cases, but there are quite a few of these exceptional cases around the Province now, I believe.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are cases around the Province that, as I indicated to the hon. gentleman, cannot come up with their 40 per cent. That is nothing new, everybody knows that. Quite possibly that is what might be needed, to come up with a different formula to address these problems. We have received numerous representations from Mr. Dixon, the President of the Federation of Municipalities, and the Executive Director, to do just that, to try and come up with some other means so that we can make it a little bit easier for communities without the tax base and without the population base to take advantage of these programmes that we do have. You know, hindsight is 20/20. In a lot of instances, I suppose, some municipalities we have right now probably should have never become incorporated. There are not too many of them but maybe there are a few out there whose incorporation has not done them a great deal of good because they have not been able to take advantage of the programmes that they should be able to take advantage of. So we

are continually looking at new ways to try and help out these smaller communities which do not have the population and the tax base to take advantage of the programmes we have. The hon. gentleman has a valid and a good point.

MR. FLIGHT:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, earlier today I withdrew a word used on the instructions or at the request of the Speaker, and I did so, Mr. Speaker, because I respect the traditions of this House and I respect the Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would be grateful if you would allow me to say that the withdrawal of that word is in no way to be interpreted as acquiescence to or my condoning the misinformation and the fabrication that was contained in the minister's statement, Mr. Speaker, and the scandalous way in which the minister attempted to say that he had given Windsor \$830,000 when, indeed, Windsor did not receive one cent. So my withdrawal in no way, Mr. Speaker, is to be interpreted as my condoning that kind of action on behalf of the minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is prima facie case of breach of privilege.

Notices of Motion

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Establish A Community College System In The Province."

Also, Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting The Establishment And Operation Of The Institute Of Fisheries And Marine Technology, The Fisher Institute Of Applied Arts And Technology, And The Cabot Institute Of Applied Arts And Technology."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Petitions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this is a follow up to a petition that we attempted to have put before the House which Your Honour ruled out of order. The petition has been sent back and has been placed in proper order by representatives of the Status of Women Council. It deals with the Stephen Collins case.

The petition now reads: "Petition to the House of Assembly" at the top.

"We, the undersigned, hereby petition the House of Assembly to protest the decision to reduce child molester Stephen Collins' sentence from five years to two years for sexually assaulting eleven children, nine point four weeks per child.

"Our country has a legal system which says people who commit crimes must be held accountable for what they do. This system is there to protect innocent people from victimization and there are no people more innocent than children.

"Collins broke the law by committing one of the most horrible of all crimes. He used his position of power, as an adult, a church minister, and medical doctor, to gain sexual gratification from little children.

"What does it say about our legal system's priorities when it does not severely punish this man for his actions? Under no circumstances should such crimes be treated so lightly by the Department of Justice.

"We hereby request that in future the people, whom we have entrusted to administer our laws fairly, remember that it is the innocent who have a right to justice.

"We request that representation be made by our provincial legislators to the Canadian Parliament to ensure the amendment of our Criminal Laws so that similar decisions are avoided in the future."

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is a risk of trivializing or making appear easy the difficult decisions that sometimes come before our judiciary or

sensationalizing what are horrendous crimes that grab the attention of the general public. But I think the large number of individuals who have expressed their concern about this case gives us all cause to reflect whether in fact existing criminal laws are adequate.

I believe the Minister of Justice has already communicated with the Government of Canada and made a statement to that effect, asking that the existing criminal laws be reviewed in light of this case. I think that is a positive step and I think, Mr. Speaker, that this petition should be accepted and should go forward.

There are over 1,000 people who have expressed their concern relating to this petition. I believe it should be noted and the Minister of Justice and Attorney General should act on it.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, the subject of the petition is a particular criminal case that has been adjudicated in a final way by the Supreme Court of Newfoundland Court of Appeal. There is no further appeal on sentence. The Supreme Court of Canada, which is the highest court in our Nation, will not accept appeals on sentence. In any case, I would question the propriety of the House of Assembly discussing or debating a particular case. What I do think is constructive, however, is the whole question of federal criminal legislation, the provisions of the Criminal Code setting out parameters for

sentencing people convicted of sexually assaulting children and, as the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island has acknowledged, this is the area that I have been working on along with officials of my department.

Criminal law is totally within the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament. I have made representations to the Federal Minister of Justice and will re-enforce those representations at a meeting of federal and provincial ministers, scheduled for the end of this month in New Brunswick, on the general subject of federal legislation on child sexual assault.

Another area which I think can be pursued usefully is that of education for the judiciary, a matter which is within the domain of the judges themselves, given the separation of the judiciary from the legislative and executive branches of the government. The Canadian Judicial Council comprising Chief Justices in each of the jurisdictions of the country has taken the initiative of developing a proposal for a national judicial education centre, a centre where judges from across the country can take courses, can do research, a centre of continuing education and research for judges from across the country.

Mr. Speaker, this is a concept that I support. It is a proposal which I think stands to benefit Newfoundland and Labrador, a small province more than perhaps the larger provinces which, because of economies of scale, can afford to mount judicial education programmes easier than we would be able to.

So, Mr. Speaker, the idea proposed by the Canadian Judicial Council of a national judicial education centre is one that I think we should all support, provided that funding for the centre is shared in a reasonable way by the different governments who would stand to benefit.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, the area of child sexual abuse is of utmost concern to this government and to the law officers of the Crown. We are addressing the need for sensitive treatment of these cases by the police, by the Crown attorneys, by the judges, by the corrections service and by social workers. In a comprehensive way we are seeking improvements in the federal criminal law, we are supporting initiatives taken by federally appointed judges to establish a national judicial education centre. In addition to those measures, we are trying to improve our social services social work support for victims of assault and for offenders, so that they may receive counselling and therapy so that victims may be able to overcome the trauma of crimes committed against them, and so that offenders may be rehabilitated and never repeat their crime. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:
I would like to rise in support of the petition and make a few brief comments. In the past we were in support when it was first brought to the House, and now it is being brought back again. I think it

may not, as the minister said, be legally the most appropriate business for the Legislature to deal, a specific case that has been before the courts and ruled upon. I think bringing the petition to the Legislature is very appropriate, inasmuch as it reflects the concerns that exist among our population. Although the concerns may be, in a legal sense, inappropriately placed on a specific case, I think the concerns have to do with not just a specific case but the pattern of abuse that is occurring in our society. In fact, it could be said that this specific case was not the single best opportunity for this to become a public issue when there have been, over the last number of years, many other cases concerning offenders being convicted on sexual assault who received lesser sentences.

I think what happened in this case was it brought to the fore a concern that has been developing not just with the judicial system and its response to these particular cases but with the problem of abuse in our society.

I thought the comments by the minister were very enlightening in terms of the work that she and her department is doing on this issue in making representation to the Federal Minister of Justice (Mr. Hnatyshyn). The representation that she is making on the Criminal Code is quite appropriate, and the work that is being done on an educational and research development for the judiciary itself is very interesting and significant.

The minister did not make any reference to the work that her department or other departments of government may be doing to deal

with a public information campaign. It is, of course, important that a programme be put in place to upgrade the social work system for both victims and offenders. Also, I think what this issue calls for at this time is an initiative by this government to do a public information campaign over time to talk to the public, potential victims, and potential offenders, about this issue. Now that it has been brought out in such a public forum, there has been so much discussion at large in our society in this Province in recent months, it is important that government initiate an information campaign as to the rights of victims, but also to deal with the nature of the problem in a frank manner. I think that would be a very progressive and a very positive step which this government could take. It is not simply enough to talk about research and educational work for the judiciary, we must continue to take the initiative on this as a public issue and talk to our citizens and take a leading role in the debate that is going on in our society.

With those brief comments, we would like to support the petition. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Are there any further petitions?

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, this is by way of cleaning up some business. It is a couple of weeks old now, but it is a legitimate petition that has

been presented to the House. The petition has been signed by 591 individuals, mostly university students, but also a large number of other residents of St. John's. It has to do with an area we have been debating for quite a while, so I will not rehash the arguments that we and others have put forward on it, I will just read the prayer of the petition and present it to the House so that it does get filed. It is addressed to the House of Assembly - and as a subhead, 'we do not endorse any political party', by the way. It says: We, the undersigned, oppose the militarization of Labrador by NATO. We support the rights of the native people and their concerns for the environment. We believe Labrador should be developed for peace not for war.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Orders of the Day.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
I am sorry, I was outside. If I may speak to the petition?

MR. FENWICK:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Menihek on a point of order.

MR. FENWICK:
You have already called the next item of business. I do not believe we can go back to it now.

MR. BARRY:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

I think we see a very sensitive individual, on a very sensitive topic, now trying to fall back upon the technicalities which he has become so expert in in a fairly short time, to try and continue to hoodwink the general public with respect to the lack of principle, with respect to the flip-flopping that has been taken on the issue relating to the petition. It is very unfortunate that a member would get up, present a petition, not speak on it, not say whether or not he is in support of the petition, but merely state the subject of the petition. Now, does it relate to the fact that the member took a position on this issue one month and a few months later changed it? Does it relate to the fact that the other member of his group, the Socialist member for St. John's East, was in disagreement with the original position taken by the member from Menihek? If so, if it is because of this type of internal conflict, it, Mr. Speaker, does not say very much for the member's courage, for his willingness to stand on principle and let the people of this Province know where he and his party stand on matters such as raised in the petition.

It does not matter what the member for St. John's East says, Mr. Speaker, we cannot assume he is speaking for the member for Menihek in light of what has transpired in the past.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, also, on the point of order, it would appear to me that my hon. socialist friend there, who puts himself forward as the great proponent of democracy, obviously is afraid to express an opinion himself and does not wish to hear anybody else's opinion on it. I just draw to Your Honour's attention if you would take under advisement whether, indeed, the petition is in order, because our Standing Orders say that a member in rising in his place there are certain things he does and one is supports the petition. I am not sure that the Standing Orders merely allow one to present the petition but to speak to or to support the petition, so I would ask Your Honour to look at that.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order there is no point of order. I will certainly have another look at that petition and the comments that were made about it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Chair recognized the House Leader. He was already recognized.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have already ruled on that. There was no point of order. I said I will look at the petition.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Does your ruling mean I may speak to the petition or not?

MR. SPEAKER:

No. We had already called Orders of the Day.

Orders of the Day

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Motion 5.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting An Increase In Pensions," carried. (Bill No. 28).

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

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Between The Government Of Canada Respecting Reciprocal Taxation Of These Governments And Their Agencies," carried. (Bill No. 32).

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

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Government - Kruger Agreements Act," carried. (Bill No. 25).

On motion, Bill No. 25 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister responsible for Energy to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Energy And Other Matters Related Or Incidental Thereto," carried. (Bill No. 26).

On motion, Bill No. 26 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Order 6.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order 6, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting Occupational Therapists." Bill No. 8. The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle adjourned that debate.

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

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, I will just clue up my few remarks.

In discussing this Bill, I expressed some concern that at some future time the words 'occupational therapists' and 'Tory' would be synonymous. I was being a little facetious of course, but that is what can happen if you have too much government interference in the appointing of these boards.

As an aside I would suggest that in some cases this has come close to happening on hospital boards around this Province, where the government's Department of Health has the authority to appoint members to these boards. I would never want to see the day in this Province where a person's politics decides whether or not he can be an occupational therapist, or a lawyer, or a medical doctor or whatever the case might be.

I just want to the minister's attention for when he replies to this to Page 10, Limitation to Practice, Section 14. (1) which says, "No person shall, after sixty days from the date this Act comes into force, use the designation 'occupational therapist.'" What I am wondering is whether or not the reason this was put in was because of imposters. Are there quacks in the occupational therapy profession, Mr. Speaker, or is this just to guarantee that there will not be any imposters in that profession?

Mr. Speaker, since it is almost 12:00 o'clock and I understand we have given leave for a Ministerial

Statement, I will now conclude my remarks.

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:
Mr. Speaker, hon. members are aware that Newfoundland has been a producer of gypsum for many years. Most of the production from the operations at Flat Bay and St. George's, on the west coast, is exported to wallboard plants in the eastern United States. In addition, some 70 thousand tonnes per year go to the Atlantic Gypsum plant in Corner Brook and to North Star Cement in that city.

Domtar, the current owner of St. George's Gypsum Ltd. is announcing today that they intend to discontinue operations at their gypsum rock quarry and near-by ship-loading facility in St. George's. The decision was made on the basis that the gypsum being produced at Flat Bay is not satisfactory for Domtar's high-speed wallboard operations. The schedule for putting the plan into effect is the end of December, 1987. The operations will produce at near-normal levels during the 1987 production period to permit an orderly phase-out by the end of the year.

If the operations were to close down there would be a loss of 82 jobs consisting of 66 hourly rated, and 16 staff positions. In view of the potentially damaging effects of such an eventuality,

the Newfoundland government and the company have agreed to proceed jointly toward a divestiture by Domtar of its Newfoundland operations.

Government, therefore, plans to announce jointly with the company, in the near future, the establishment of a divestiture team whose responsibility will be to seek a new owner who would take over the facilities and continue the operations. The company has already identified its nominees to the divestiture team and the Province will name its nominees very shortly.

Needless to say, this Government has had some notable successes in the area of company divestitures. Examples include the pulp and paper operation in Corner Brook, the Baie Verte asbestos operation and the St. Lawrence fluorspar operation.

The gypsum resources on the west coast of Newfoundland are still very large and, we already know that there are other companies that are interested in those resources. Availability of existing production facilities should enhance the possibility of finding a new operator.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for providing us with a copy of his statement earlier this morning to give us a chance to reflect upon this very sad set of circumstances that have developed in the St. George's/Flat Bay area. Mr. Speaker, it is

especially sad when you consider that the unemployment numbers that we have seen recently for Western Newfoundland have jumped considerably, I think from 26.8 per cent to 31.8 per cent. This is indeed a sad announcement, where there is considerable job loss in an area where we see very substantial and crippling high unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of questions that surface. When you read this particular document, tabled today by the minister, you are left to wonder why a company like Domtar would buy this particular company, which used to be called Flintkote Holdings and which was a subsidiary of Gemstar. Why would Domtar buy out this little operation in Flat Bay, in the St. George's area, only to close it? And you are left to wonder how, Mr. Speaker, we arrived at such a negative announcement when only a short month ago we had such a positive announcement for the St. George's area. Just let me quote from the minister's own statement of a month ago where he said, 'Domtar is now the third largest wallboard maker in the USA and a large part of its gypsum requirements will now be produced at Flat Bay, near St. George's.' How did we get from that statement of a month ago to this statement of today, 'The decision was made on the basis that gypsum being produced at Flat Bay is not satisfactory for Domtar's high-speed wallboard production'? Could the company not re-equip or upgrade to produce a product that would be satisfactory to their wallboard operations?

Mr. Speaker, a month ago the minister said in this House, 'and that this year's production is

expected to exceed a half million tons for the US market in addition to satisfying the requirements of Atlantic Gypsum and North Star Cement in Corner Brook, Newfoundland.' How did we get from that of four weeks ago to this today, 'If the operations were to close' - and it appears that the operations will close - 'there would be a loss of eighty-two jobs in this particular area'? You are left to wonder, Mr. Speaker. It is a reflection upon whether or not the minister got truthful or satisfactory information, to make such a good and positive statement a month ago and four weeks later we get the death blow, it looks like to me, for an area that is already crunched under crippling high unemployment. So I would ask the minister to reflect upon future information he receives and to weigh it carefully and sift it through and perhaps get more advice, if necessary, on future takeovers. Because this is a very sad reflection of the information he had at his fingertips a month ago and where we are today.

I do hope, and I share the minister's concern, and we on this side share his concern, that this divestiture programme will be successful and that, indeed, this gypsum plant can be saved. Because these people will really be hurting. They are hurting now. The future was a little bit brighter as of four weeks ago, but the future does not look so bright today. So we share in the minister's hope that a divestiture programme can be put in place similar to the ones announced and tabled here today, and in previous experiences in Corner Brook and St. Lawrence. We hope that that kind of package can be put together to save those jobs.

The minister will recall that in my response to his positive announcement - I think I am quoting correctly from Hansard - I said that 'we, on this side, look forward to a prosperous future for this new company and we hope that all jobs will be protected by this new company in that area'. It does not look like that company did a very good job of protecting those particular jobs; and a very serious question has to be asked: Why would a company of such international importance as Domtar purchase a small subsidiary of Genstar, Flintkote Holdings, only to close it down and walk away from it four weeks later?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, something stinks in this whole pile here. We have a situation where, in the first paragraph of the minister's statement, he states that most of the production from the operation at Flat Bay is exported to wallboard plants in the Eastern United States and another 70,000 tons per year go to the Atlantic Gypsum plant in Corner Brook and to North Star Cement. Then, in the second paragraph, the decision was made on the basis that the gypsum being produced at Flat Bay is not satisfactory for Domtar's high speed wallboard operations.

The question that immediately rises in ones mind is what happened to the markets that

Flintkote had? If they had these wallboard plants in the Eastern United States who have been taking their product, which has obviously been satisfactory, since they have been operating continuously, and if Corner Brook's North Star Cement plant and the Atlantic Gypsum plant have also been taking the product, the question that arises is: Why are there no longer acceptable markets for it? It may have something to do with the corporate concentration of Domtar and whatever else is going. It seems to me a particularly poor reason to close down an operation. It sounds to me like a decision has been made at the level of corporate boardrooms God-knows-where and that the security of St. George's is certainly not high on the agenda of things they want to look at.

I think it indicates how powerless we are in controlling our natural resource industry in this Province. Decisions made hundreds or perhaps thousands of miles away have a devastating impact on us. Maybe, seeing what they can do, it is time we got a little bit tougher in terms of dealing with these corporations.

A question that also arises is: If these markets were there a month ago, as the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) has so clearly pointed out, why can we not say that they should be going ahead with those markets now, if it were not owned by Domtar, but by some other private operation or whatever combination?

I notice the divestiture committee. I wish it luck. But the other question that I have - and it is just the last one I want to stick in there and the minister

may, at some time be able to send over a note - why is the gypsum not satisfactory for the high speed wallboard operations? Is it something inherent in the ore that is being mined? Is it something inherent in the processing? In other words, can an influx of processing machinery bring it to a level which is satisfactory, or is it just intrinsically not acceptable for Domtar's operation? Maybe the minister could address himself to that somewhere down the line.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the minister moving the bill speaks now, he will close the debate.

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. FENWICK:

Would the minister allow me a few words in the debate?

DR. TWOMEY:

Yes.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the Occupational Therapist bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Just a point. I was looking through the Hansard transcript of the Minister of Health's comments on it yesterday. My hon. friend from St. John's East (Mr. Long) also wishes to make some comments on it since he knows some members in the profession and has some observations to make in it as well.

What I would like to enter into the record right now is that personally, at least, my family,

has actually been directly impacted by the problems that we have in this Province through lack of occupational therapists. As most members may know, up until two and one-half years ago, I lived on the Port au Port Peninsula in a place called Cape St. George. What members may not be aware of is that my second oldest daughter, back in 1980, got involved in a very bad fire, as a result of which, a very substantial portion of her chest, her shoulders, her arms and her face were burned, and required something in the neighbourhood of twelve weeks treatment at the Isaac Walton Killum Hospital, the children's hospital in Halifax.

Anyone who is familiar with burn treatment knows that the burn is the least part of the problem, it is the therapy that must go on virtually for years afterwards that is very important.

Because of where we lived, and because of the lack of an occupational therapist in the area, her recovery was much more prolonged because we did not have people who could visit her on a weekly basis and help her with the various apparel used to help with burn treatments. This has been a source of much concern to us. It was of much concern to the occupational therapist who is assigned in the area but, unfortunately, could only drop in to visit every month or every two months. The kind of treatment that was necessary to get her to return to the degree of flexibility and mobility that is necessary was much delayed and I think it will probably result in the future in her having to go through many more operations now that she is full grown in order to cut down on the amount of scarring

that is still evident on her body.

It indicates to me that the thirty occupational therapists we have in this Province are not enough. We need a lot more if we are going to make sure that we do not end up with major medical problems down the road as result of not having these skilled therapists in place and available for wherever they are needed across the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I not only support the legislation because I clearly see that it is necessary, but I also support the programme mentioned by the Minister of Health in his introductory remarks so we continue to endorse and expand the bursary programme to ensure that we do get enough occupational therapists in place so that in the future individuals who need the therapy will get it when they need it. Hopefully that will cut down on our medical costs in the future.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to say a few brief words and commend the minister for bringing forward legislation at this time. I have a very close friend who is one of the few occupational therapist in the Province. I spoke to her during the week and told her that the legislation was being brought forward. She was very delighted to see that their efforts as a

group of workers in the profession in this Province have paid off over the last couple of years and would simply like to offer their congratulations.

On a personal note, I have been made aware by my friend of the intense pressure that is on her as a professional both in her job and her own recognition of the lack of availability of occupational therapists and programmes in the Province. I think it is out of the need for an expansion of programmes and numbers of occupational therapists that the legislation is being brought forward. I would like to congratulate the minister for his efforts in that way.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
If the hon. the Minister of Health speaks now he will close the debate.

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. TWOMEY:
Thank you very much.

I wish to thank each and every one of you for your contribution to this debate.

There are a number of factors I thought that might be pertinent. We do admit, as I admitted in my introduction, that there is a shortage of Occupational Therapists in this Province. To that end, last year we signed an agreement with Dalhousie University to admit ten people last year and twelve people this coming year. I am very glad to

say that last September there were six people who accepted the bursary from the Department of Health and are now pursuing their studies in Dalhousie University. That is the nearest educational center to this Province. As you know, there are eleven more spread across this nation.

There have been some other suggestions and possibly some slight criticism by very clever innuendo from the gentleman from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker). It has been traditional that the Minister of Health has the right and the privilege of making these appointments after names have been submitted, one from the occupational therapist themselves, one from the public at large, which is the privilege of the Minister, and one from the Newfoundland Nursing and Hospital Associations.

We have to assume the responsibility. In going back into history, I think that there is a precedent set ever since we have had Responsible Government. I think the preponderant which has been set for me has given that right to the minister. I think on the scales, if you count the number of ministers who have proceeded me, I think the majority of them were of the political persuasion of these gentlemen opposite. I have taken benefit of their wisdom and I have continued on in that tradition and I would be very slow to change it. After all there is someone who is responsible to the public at large, and I feel that the minister has that responsibility. If he reneges on that responsibility, he reneges on many of the important responsibilities of his department.

On the Bursary programme and the lack of manpower, I feel that there is little more than I can add. I thank everyone for their contribution to this debate.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting Occupational Therapists", read a second time, ordered referred to a Community of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 8).

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Order 8, Bill No. 3.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Prisons Act And The Uniformed Services Pensions Act". (Bill No. 3).

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill, an Act To Amend The Prisons And Uniformed Services Pensions Act, is, in the true sense of the word, a housekeeping bill. It provides for changes in designations of correctional personnel so that the titles accord with current usage and practice, and so that they are the same as the terminology in the Collective Agreement and in the recently revised Prisons Regulations. The amendments substitute the current title correctional officer for the obsolete titles warden and matron. They also substitute sergeant, lieutenant and Captain for the former title of sergeant warden, head warden, and Chief Warden respectively.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is

necessary for me to elaborate. As I said in the beginning, this is simply a housekeeping measure to substitute in these two acts the current titles for personnel in the correction service for the language that is now in the acts which has been rendered obsolete by the current Collective Agreement and the recent revisions to the Prisons Regulations.

With those comments, I move second reading of this bill.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker; I would just like to comment briefly on it and say, with regards to changing the names, that is one thing. The point I want to make is with regard to the reforms that the Justice Minister (Ms Verge) has done with regards to prisons in our Province. Prisons have been built in Bishop's Falls, Goose Bay and Stephenville.

My concern is, and it will be reiterated I am sure more clearly and emphatically by our critic for Justice, the member for Mount Scio-Bell Island (Mr. Barry), is that we need not only these buildings but we need to have psychiatrists there, we need to have social workers and we need to have the proper support system which I feel now is sadly lacking in the Province.

Also, the main reason why I wanted to comment on this bill is with regard to the juvenile act for young people in Whitbourne and in St. John's. The overcrowding that

is taking place in Whitbourne is one of great concern and also now, because of a fire here in St. John's, the need to have temporary quarters. We know from the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) that this of course is going to take a couple of years to get on the go.

So I would say to the minister with regard to changing the words 'wardens' and 'matrons', to correctional officers, just to change the words does not make them correctional officers. We need proper training for them and by proper training I mean having psychologists, sociologists and other people give them training in how to deal with prisoners. We often take a view in society that once you do commit a crime you have to pay for that crime, but you are paying for it once you are incarcerated. We also take the attitude that once they are there, their rights and their dignity is often taken away. Some of the correctional officers, or the wardens or the matrons, can be rather abusive at times with psychological words, by the way they treat them. Once a person who has committed a crime and is being corrected, then I feel that our system should be built in such a way as to rehabilitate the person who committed the crime so he can come back into society and contribute to society.

We do not have the training programmes that are needed in those correctional institutions. They are only two years. We need more adult education courses in it. We need more flexibility with university courses and trade courses in them. They can do it by correspondence and I think in many ways we have to look at these buildings. Now that we have the

buildings, it is like the vocational schools changing to community colleges. Just changing the name is not going to bring about the correctional aspect of why they are there in the first place, that they broke the laws of society and now are paying for it. Hopefully, as I said, we will end up doing it in such a way that they would have jobs available after.

I remember working with juvenile kids North of Montreal in Shawbridge and after they came out of the juvenile centre there was a support system set up to get them back into the work force and get them jobs. The John Howard Society helps somewhat here but again the bottom line comes down, you pay for your crime by incarcerated, you get very little correction, very little support once you are in there, you are back out on the street again, no support service of housing, of jobs, and you are back again. The cycle goes on until finally you become an habitual criminal and everybody then basically gives up hope.

So I say to the minister that we in the Opposition, and I am sure our Justice critic for Mount Scio-Bell Island (Mr. Barry) will again comment on it, have seen too many bills come into this House changing words.

One bill was brought in to change the principal of the Bay St. George Community College to the word president. Now we seeing a bill coming in changing the word 'warden and matrons' to 'correctional officers'. Hopefully, the Department of Justice and our Department of Social Services have more meat, have more substance by way of

having instructors in there, of having psychologists, of having support teams set up to make sure that they get employment and get back into the work force. I say to the minister if this is the type of bill that her department is going to sponsor, then I suggest that it would be better off just calling them wardens and matrons.

In concluding, I will just say again that it is regrettable that we have seen this government bring in legislation just to change the words 'wardens and matrons' and that we need some sustenance.

I look forward to listening to the views of my colleague the critic for Justice and I thank him for the liberty of allowing me to speak on this bill instead of me going and giving the floor to him, which we do in our party, when you are critic. The critic is normally the first one to lead on this. So I thank the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry).

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
I am not sure I caught all of that last statement.

Mr. Speaker, while this is a housekeeping bill which makes one wonder at times whether the energies of members opposite are not too caught up in housekeeping rather than getting on with the job of creating jobs, it does provide an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to discuss the subject of prisons and specifically the need

for a new federal penitentiary in this Province. The minister opposite has been very, very quiet in the face of the scandalous revelation that this Province lost its money for a new federal penitentiary, which has been promised, because of patronage engaged in by the Prime Minister of this country.

MS VERGE:
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:
The minister might consider that she has been outspoken but she has not made too much of a dent in the public psyche of the Province as far as I am concerned. The minister also has to keep in mind that words are one thing and actions are another.

Has the minister, for example, had meetings with - forget the Solicitor General - Mr. Crosbie, our representative in Cabinet? Maybe the minister can tell us the meetings that she has had with our representative in Cabinet and what has been the success of the minister in getting back that money to which this Province is entitled for a proper prison system? Mr. Speaker, the sad part about it is that basically what we have now in this Province is a system that discriminates against those convicted of offenses and sentenced to prison because there is the added punishment, not just of incarceration, but of being removed from the Province, of being removed from easy or inexpensive access to ones relatives or ones friends, who might add somewhat in the process of rehabilitation. If the minister, maybe she can, in the course of her closing remarks, indicate, does she believe at all in rehabilitation as a function of

the prison system any more or is she a member of the old Alcatraz school, basically that of locking up prisoners and throwing away the key, out of sight, out of mind. She is, Mr. Speaker, permitting the Government of Canada and the Prime Minister to break his word with this Province with respect to a new penitentiary.

By the way, the minister might keep in mind that I would not want her to exclude totally the Alcatraz way of thinking, because there is an island off the east coast of Newfoundland which is interested in a penitentiary. Bell Island is not too bad a place to keep in mind, Mr. Speaker. When one considers the close proximity to the largest population base, one would have to keep in mind Bell Island, and the minister should give some thought to the site of Bell Island as a location for a new penitentiary.

MR. BUTT:
The member for Windsor - Buchans is cringing in his seat.

MR. BARRY:
Well, I know the member for Windsor-Buchans, like all members in this House, believes that the penitentiary should be located in the place that makes the most sense, that goes furthest in furthering the policy of penal reform which includes promoting the rehabilitation of prisoners, and which includes easy access for the visitation rights of friends, relatives and so forth.

MR. PATTERSON:
A ready supply of raw material.

MR. BARRY:
In that case, it would have to be located right next door to the member for Placentia (Mr.

Patterson).

Mr. Speaker, we would ask the minister also to consider the adequacy of many of the holding tanks that are now being utilized. Apart from the womens' correctional centre and the penitentiary here, there has been some publicity given to the rather deplorable condition in which, I believe, women prisoners particularly are forced to reside while they are awaiting trial in St. John's. I think that is the particular complaint.

I wonder if the minister would give her opinion as to the adequacy of the general jail or holding tank facilities available around the province. It is my understanding that many of these, which are only designed to hold prisoners on a very short term basis, end up holding prisoners for a long period of time. Conditions are deplorable for a long-term stay. There is a very rudimentary meal service and overcrowding. I would ask the minister to look into this.

Also, with respect to the penitentiary - the hotel by the lake - I shall ask the minister if they are still using some of the older cells. I have received complaints from prisoners that the most rudimentary conditions of civilized penal institutions were not present, namely, adequate heating. I have been informed that prisoners, at times, were in cells that were too cold. I was told by prison officials when I checked into this that these older cells, at that time, were more convenient for keeping a close watch on prisoners who officials were concerned might injure themselves if left unguarded or unwatched. That was possibly the

reason why blankets had been taken from the individuals.

There has to be a method for ensuring that if a prisoner is in a cell without adequate bed clothes the cell is adequately heated so that the prisoner is not put through a form of torture, which I know is not the policy of the minister and her government but which can result inadvertently from just plain sloppiness in the way in which prisons in this Province have at times been administered.

I would ask the minister to deal with some of these matters in the course of her closing remarks on this bill.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

If the Minister of Justice speaks now she will close the debate.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MS VERGE:

I will defer to the member opposite for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight). I anticipate his finally letting us know whether he prefers locating the federal penitentiary in Windsor or in Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the minister has been living in anticipation ever since she got elected to this House of Assembly. She is still anticipating the Forestry Centre in Corner Brook I would think, too. It is not very relevant, but maybe we should give her leave,

when she stands up to close the debate, to say where she stands on and what she has done about the Forestry Centre. Maybe she has other thoughts today. Maybe an event this past week or two has given her other reasons to be concerned about what might happen to her and her great district in the very near future.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in this debate and I want first to say that I would -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not particularly want to be repetitious. The member for Mount Scio probably said it more coherently, I suppose, than I would, in questioning the minister as to why the scandalous silence this past year or so with regard to the federal penitentiary. I understand and I respect his supporting Bell Island, protecting his constituents' rights to have a prison built in the long run. Obviously, Bell Island has a lot going for it, and I understand and respect the member's right for standing in this House of Assembly and making a case for his constituents.

Mr. Speaker, it is my duty and my great privilege and honour to stand and request that the minister would still consider that great historic district of Central Newfoundland, Windsor-Buchans, since both towns have made a case to the minister and to the federal

people in Ottawa. It is a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has already gone on record and put her government on record as supporting Buchans for the penitentiary, and that was very much appreciated, I am sure, by the people who have done all the work and the various committees in Buchans and the Action Committees. So, Mr. Speaker, that is passe, that is history. My position on Windsor and Buchans is simply this: I have great confidence in the Town of Windsor and the Town of Buchans in making the case for the penitentiary. I would not try to attempt to make a case or to improve the situation. They are capable, competent people. They have shown the minister, they have shown Mr. Crosbie, they have shown the Solicitor General (Mr. Kelleher) all the things that the various communities have going for them, and I understand it has been said publicly that Buchans has made an exceptional case. The minister admitted that when she announced the government's support for Buchans.

And, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister will support that area of Newfoundland, because all prisons, as the minister knows, have been built across Canada on a politically motivated decision. You had a strong regional minister or a Prime Minister who wanted a prison, the need was there for a prison in the area, so it was put where it would provide the most economic benefit to that area. That is the way it has been. Whether that is right, wrong or indifferent that is the way it has been and it will probably be no different in Newfoundland. And so if that is the way it has been, and that is the way it is going to be, then the minister, I am sure,

will support the area of Newfoundland that is the most economically depressed and the area that would benefit the greatest by receiving a penitentiary.

MS VERGE:

The member does not seem to understand the rationale for Central Newfoundland location.

MR. FLIGHT:

Oh, is that right! Well, maybe the minister will fill me in on the rationale now when she stands up. The minister will explain to me about the infrastructure that is required. And I understand that the committees that have made representation have explained to the minister's satisfaction. A year ago, I suppose, she would not have gone on record publicly supporting Buchans for the prison if she did not understand the rationale or she did not agree that Buchans, given all of the other areas that had applied, was the best suited. I do not think the minister is so irresponsible, when she knew there were many other towns applying, to put her government on record as supporting Buchans if she was not satisfied that they had made the case and all the infrastructure and all the requirements would be satisfied. So do not be playing silly games, Mrs. Minister. The minister is on a sticky wicket on the prison.

The minister knows that Newfoundland, as the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry) said, has been denied the funds for a prison by one hon. Prime Minister, Mulroney. And the minister knows that the cost of the prison going in the Prime Minister's riding exceeded the estimated cost by roughly the same

amount that the prison in Newfoundland would have cost. And the minister knows that when the decision was made to put that prison in Port Cartier, the prison for Newfoundland went to the bottom of the list.

Now would the minister stand up and tell us if the reason we have not heard her talking about and demanding a prison for Newfoundland, wherever it is going to be located, is because of the poisonous atmosphere that exists now between Ottawa and Newfoundland? What is the minister's priorities now with a \$172 million budget deficit in this Province? Is one of the minister's financial priorities a prison for Newfoundland? If it is, I have not heard her say so lately. I have not heard her open her mouth about the prison since the day in estimates when she announced, in her nice political ways trying to put me on the griddle politically, the government support for Buchans. Well, we have not heard one word from that minister or this government demanding that a prison be built in Newfoundland since.

So when the minister gets up to close the debate, with all of the other things she is going to inform me on, I would like for her to inform me on why she is not accepting her responsibility as the Minister of Justice and her responsibility to the people, incarcerated all across this country, from Newfoundland? Why is she not meeting her commitment and her responsibility to those people by demanding that a prison be built in Newfoundland? And, when you get the commitment and the funding, then make a decision on where the prison will go, based on the better interest of the

prisoners and based on the better interests of Newfoundland in general. Tell us why we are not getting a prison.

Mr. Speaker, we have been entitled to a prison since 1949. We are no closer to that prison today for the very same reason that we did not get it in 1949. The member for Mount Scio - Bell Island challenged the minister when she stands up to lay out for us the correspondence and reiterate for us here the discussions she has had with the regional minister, Mr. Crosbie, relative to what the position is with our prison.

So, Mr. Speaker, the minister can get up now and close the debate. I want the minister to know that everyone in Newfoundland interested in a prison for Newfoundland is wondering why it is that the Minister of Justice has been so quiet on that blatant denial of our rights, which she herself went on record as saying that she had put a time limit on. Go back and get Hansard, and she put a time limit on as to when she would expect a decision would be made and an announcement be made on funding for a prison in Newfoundland. Well, that time limit has gone now and we do not hear anything about a prison or we do not hear anything about funding. And it is incumbent upon the minister to stand up now in closing this debate and tell us why.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. minister speaks now she will close the debate.

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, look who is talking! Talk about a wishy-washy

representative of Central Newfoundland -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:

- somebody who purports to be the member for Windsor-Buchans and obviously does not even understand the rationale for locating the federal penitentiary for this Province in Central Newfoundland, the rationale which has as its first plank serving the interests of the offenders since rehabilitation is a central part of the aim of corrections in this country, federally and provincially, and since experts in the corrections field have demonstrated without question that access on the part of offenders, prisoners, to their relatives is key to their chances of being rehabilitated. There is a great emphasis put in the corrections field on inmates being visited and having personal contact with their relatives and friends and since in the thirty-eight years of Newfoundland and Labrador being part of Canada we have not within our boundaries a federal corrections institution, inmates from this Province have had to go to other provinces, to the Maritimes or Ontario, and have been denied any reasonable chance of visits from their relatives, from their family and friends, any reasonable chance of personal contacts with their relatives and friends. And, of course, by definition people serving time in federal institutions are there for a two year and longer term.

Mr. Speaker, the first and foremost reason that it makes sense for a federal institution to be located in Central Newfoundland, in Buchans

logically, is to serve the interests of inmates and their families and friends so that the aim of rehabilitation, which is so important in the corrections field, can be realized.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has spared no effort in impressing upon the federal government, the Mulroney administration and the Trudeau administration for many years before that, the great injustice being done to the people of this Province through the federal government failing to meet its obligation to this Province by locating here, within our boundaries, the federal institution. This is an obligation that has been outstanding for the thirty-eight years Newfoundland and Labrador have been part of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, since the Mulroney administration took office in Ottawa, this administration has stepped up our efforts to get the federal government to honour its obligation to this Province. I have personally been involved in meetings and discussions with our representative in the Federal Cabinet, Mr. Crosbie; with the present Solicitor General, Mr. Kelleher; with the past Solicitor General, Mr. Beatty, as has our Premier and our Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer), when he was Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, we made our best efforts privately for the first year and a half of the Mulroney administration when the Mulroney administration disappointed the people of this Province, by shelving money already budgeted and deferring going ahead with the project in this Province, we spoke out publicly. We will continue to

do so to press Mr. Crosbie and Mr. Kelleher and Mr. Mulroney to honour their obligation to this Province.

Mr. Crosbie has assured us, privately and publicly, he said this through the news media to the citizens of the Province, that he is committed to delivering a federal corrections institution to this Province before this present term is out. Mr. Speaker, we will spare no effort to support Mr. Crosbie in that resolve and to hold the Mulroney administration to their obligation to the citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador to build a federal corrections center in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the justification for a federal prison in Newfoundland and Labrador has long been acknowledged by, obviously, people within this Province, private citizens, the John Howard Society as well as professionals in the corrections service of the Province, but, Mr. Speaker, it has also been recognized by the Corrections Service Canada officials. Mr. Speaker, officials of the two orders of government, the federal government and the provincial government, have developed a consensus about the type of institution that is required, namely, a minimum-medium security facility built to accommodate roughly 130 inmates. Mr. Speaker, that consensus was developed since the Mulroney administration took office in Ottawa. Before that, when the Liberals were in power in Ottawa, there was some disagreement on the part of the federal people about what kind of institution this Province was due. Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows they were in power for many, many, many years, and it

is to their discredit that they shirked their responsibility to the people of this Province by never proceeding with putting here a federal prison.

Mr. Speaker, the type of federal prison that the two orders of government have agreed is needed here is estimated to cost about \$25 million. That estimate was developed about two years ago, so perhaps with inflation since then the figure has gone up. It is a substantial capital project but, Mr. Speaker, well within the financial means of the Solicitor General's Department, well within the financial means of the federal government. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that it is a social and a moral debt owed this Province for thirty-eight years. Mr. Speaker, this administration will keep up our efforts to press Mr. Crosbie, to support him in his stated resolve to deliver that federal prison to this Province before the end of his present term.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the subject of the provincial corrections system, which is the subject of this bill, Mr. Speaker, while the bill is a minor measure to adjust the language in our legislation to accord with what is in the present collective agreement and the recently revised Prisons Regulations. Mr. Speaker, it comes on top of an outstanding record of progress in provincial corrections championed by this administration. Mr. Speaker, a lot of the credit for the progress we have made has to go to my colleague, the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer). Mr. Speaker, in the eight years of this administration we have greatly improved the provincial corrections centers' facilities. We have upgraded a couple of the

older institutions and we have added a number of new institutions. The St. John's institution on Forest Road, the oldest one in the Province and the largest institution, has been upgraded significantly. There has been new construction, a whole new wing was put in place, and, Mr. Speaker, we intend to carry on the structural upgrading there. Salmonier on the Avalon Peninsula has been improved. Clarenville is a brand new institution put in place in the past eight years, a modern, bright, vibrant institution housing about 25 inmates, Mr. Speaker, with attractive murals on the walls painted by the inmates themselves.

Bishop's Falls is another brand new institution added during the time of the Peckford Administration, again, a facility housing about 25 adult inmates. It is located in an attractive area of the town of Bishop's Falls in a large grassy field. Part of that land has been dedicated to agriculture. The inmates keep gardens there and grow some of their own vegetables.

On another part of that site, Mr. Speaker, we have just added a hobby shop, a new building where the inmates may receive training in carpentry and may carry out useful carpentry activities.

Mr. Speaker, in Stephenville on the West Coast of Newfoundland there are two provincial corrections institutions, the Provincial Women's Centre, which is a model facility in the whole world. It is an institution which well meets the needs of women offenders in this Province. Thankfully we have only a small number of women offenders

sentenced to time in our corrections centre. The average occupancy there, the average number of women inmates there at any time is only about 7 or 8.

Mr. Speaker, next to that is a male corrections centre. Both of those institutions are across the street from the Stephenville campus of the Western Community College, formerly the Bay St. George Community College. Mr. Speaker, the community college and other agencies and organizations and individuals in the Stephenville-Bay St. George area have been tremendously supportive of those two Stephenville institutions.

There is excellent integration of the corrections programmes and community activities. Many, many volunteers from the Bay St. George area are working in the two institutions carrying out education programmes and recreation programmes. Some of the inmates work in the community, some of them participate in programmes across the street at the Bay St. George Community College.

Mr. Speaker, the other new corrections centre that has been constructed and put into operation in the time of this administration within the past eight years is the one in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, just a beautiful building.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have excellent physical facilities. There have been tremendous strides made in our buildings for provincial corrections in the past eight years. But, Mr. Speaker, I would be the first one to say that it is not buildings but rather correctional officers and programmes that are at the heart

of any corrections service and here Newfoundland and Labrador excels. We are second to no other service in all of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I would urge anyone opposite who is not well informed about the area of corrections to do some investigation, to check with experts in the field in this Province and in other parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to personnel we have a team of correctional officers who are well trained, who are highly motivated, who are fit and who are tremendously effective. Mr. Speaker, it becomes obvious meeting these correctional officers individually or in groups, seeing them at work in the different correctional centres, socializing with them through their association activities, through their union activities, that these are people who are committed to doing a good job for inmates they look after; to doing their best to rehabilitate inmates; to doing all they can to have meaningful education training and recreation programmes in the institutions.

When it comes to programmes, Mr. Speaker, much work has been done in recent years to add and to develop programmes. I think some of the best work has been done in Stephenville and in Labrador. In Labrador within the past couple of years, as my colleague from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is aware because he was a great supporter of this initiative, the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation took the lead in developing a training programme for inmates of the Happy Valley-Goose Bay Centre so that they would be moved outside the corrections building in Happy

Valley to the Voisey Bay fish camp and, with good supervision and training at the camp, given training in being a fishing and hunting guide, an occupation that in demand in Labrador where there are real opportunities for earning income and holding down jobs. Mr. Speaker, it is a type of activity which many of the inmates were well suited for and had a great deal of interest in. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the co-operative effort of the LIDC, supported by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and the Justice Department Corrections Service, that programme was piloted at Voisey's Bay and proved to be tremendously successful. Mr. Speaker, we are committed to continuing that kind of innovative programming for our inmates because, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure all members that rehabilitation of inmates is a primary objective of our Correction Services.

We have good physical resources now. We have centres well distributed in the Province, and no one of our centres is too large. I think that is key to effective rehabilitation, looking after inmates in small units in regional centres reasonably close to their home so their families and friends can visit.

Our Provincial Correction Service, as I say, is a model. It is really and truly second to none in all of Canada. We have made a lot of improvements in the last eight years and we are committed to carrying on improvements, especially in the programme development area.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Prisons Act And The Uniformed Services Pensions Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment I would remind hon. members, as I did yesterday, that Monday morning at 9:30 the Department of Energy Estimates; Monday evening at 7:30, the Department of Finance Estimates; again I should, it had slipped my mind earlier today, I should wish a Happy May Day, today is May 1. May Day, of course, the first of May is the international holiday recognized for the international Marxist and the International Socialist Movement. I think there are celebrations in Prague, Leningrad and everywhere else. There will be many anti-NATO demonstrations as well. We wish our socialists friends a happy May Day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Could we have a rendering of the Internationale?

MR. FENWICK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Menikah.

MR. FENWICK:

There is also one other thing that the member forgot to mention. May 1 is also the feast of St. Joseph The Worker. It is a recognized feast in the Catholic Church to recognize the contribution of working people. I agree with the sympathies that that is what the day is for.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, it was not St. Joseph because I think St. Joseph could fend for himself. It was rather the Internationale and the International Marxist Movement I was thinking of and those great anti-NATO demonstrations, I understand, taking place throughout Eastern Europe today.

Having said that and wishing our socialist friends a happy May Day, I would move that the House adjourn until Monday at 3:00 p.m.

On motion that the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, May 4, 1987, at 3:00 p.m.

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C., Premier

Hon. P.J.McNicholas, Speaker

Hon. Roger Simmons, P.C., Leader of the Opposition

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Aylward, Kevin (Lib)	Stephenville
Aylward, Hon. Robert J. (PC)	Kilbride
Baird, Raymond J. (PC)	Humber West
Baker, Winston (Lib)	Gander
Barrett, Hon. Harold (PC)	St. John's West
Barry, Leo (Lib)	Mount Scio - Bell Island
Blanchard, Hon. Ted. A. (PC)	Bay of Islands
Brett, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Trinity North
Butt, Hon. John (PC)	Conception Bay South
Callan, Wilson (Lib)	Bellevue
Carter, John A. (PC)	St. John's North
Carter, Walter C. (Lib)	Twillingate
Collins, Hon. John F. (PC)	St. John's South
Dawe, Hon. Ron (PC)	St. George's
Decker, Chris (Lib)	Strait of Belle Isle
Dinn, Jerome W. (PC)	Pleasantville
Doyle, Norman E. (PC)	Harbour Main
Efford, John (Lib)	Port de Grave
Fenwick, Peter (NDP)	Menihek
Flight, Graham (Lib)	Windsor-Buchans
Furey, Chuck (Lib)	St. Barbe
Gilbert, Dave (Lib)	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Greening, Glenn C. (PC)	Terra Nova
Hearn, Hon. Loyola (PC)	St. Mary's-The Capes
Hiscock, R. Eugene (Lib)	Eagle River
Hodder, James E. (PC)	Port au Port
Kelland, Jim (Lib)	Naskaupi
Long, Gene (NDP)	St. John's East
Lush, Tom (Lib)	Bonavista North

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

...2...

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Matthews, Hon. William (PC)	Grand Bank
McNicholas, Hon. Dr. P.J. (PC)	St. John's Centre
Mitchell, Calvin (PC)	LaPoile
Morgan, James (PC)	Bonavista South
Ottenheimer, Hon. Gerald R. (PC)	Waterford - Kenmount
Parsons, Kevin (PC)	St. John's East Extern
Patterson, William G. (PC)	Placentia
Peach, Milton (PC)	Carbonear
Peckford, A. Brian, P.C. (PC) (Premier)	Green Bay
Power, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Ferryland
Reid, James G. (PC)	Trinity - Bay de Verde
Rideout, Hon. Thomas G. (PC) ,	Baie Verte - White Bay
Russell, Hon. Maxwell James (PC)	Lewisporte
Simms, Hon. Len (PC)	Grand Falls
Simmons, Hon. Roger P.C. (Lib)	Fortune-Hermitage
Tobin, Glenn (PC)	Burin - Placentia West
Tulk, R. Beaton (Lib)	Fogo
Twomey, Hon. Dr. Hugh Matthew (PC)	Exploits
Verge, Hon. Lynn (PC)	Humber East
Warren, Garfield E. (PC)	Torngat Mountains
Windsor, Hon. H. Neil (PC)	Mount Pearl
Woodford, Rick (PC)	Humber Valley
Young, Hon. Haig (PC)	Harbour Grace

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C.	Premier
Hon. Robert J. Aylward	Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
Hon. Harold Barrett	Development and Tourism
Hon. Ted A. Blanchard	Labour
Hon. Charlie Brett	Social Services
Hon. John Butt	Environment
Dr. The Hon. John F. Collins	Finance
Hon. Ron Dawe	Transportation
Hon. Jerome W. Dinn	Mines and Energy
Hon. Norman E. Doyle	Municipal Affairs
Hon. Loyola Hearn	Education

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

-2-

Hon. William Matthews	Culture, Recreation and Youth
Hon. Gerald R. Ottenheimer	Energy President of the Council Government House Leader
Hon. Charlie Power	Career Development and Advanced Studies
Hon. Thomas G. Rideout	Fisheries
Hon. Maxwell J. Russell	Consumer Affairs and Communications
Hon. Len Simms	Forest Resources and Lands
Dr. The Hon. Hugh M. Twomey	Health
Hon. Lynn Verge	Justice
Hon. H. Neil Windsor	President of Treasury Board
Hon. Haig Young	Public Works and Services