



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 50

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Thursday

28 May 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes of the time of the House time today to see if we can get unanimous consent to send a letter of congratulations to four young Newfoundlanders who are among thirty-one Canadian winners of this year's Terry Fox Humanitarian Award. The winners are Gerry Smith of Lourdes, Carla Pittman of Windsor, Tina Brake of Trout River and Kelly Moret of St. John's. This is a national award and is in the form of a university scholarship valued at \$3,000 annually for a maximum of four years. I think it is a fine accomplishment on the part of these four young Newfoundlanders, and I think this House should recognize it by sending a letter of congratulations from this House to each of the four.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, as a former Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth and speaking for my colleagues on this side, we would certainly like to associate ourselves with the motion put forth by the hon. the

gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward). A couple of years ago, I had the opportunity to visit and participate with a number of young Newfoundland students at the Terry Fox Center in Ottawa. It is certainly a worthwhile programme and one that the Province is proud to participate in. So, on behalf of my colleagues here, we are very, very happy to associate ourselves with the motion from the hon. gentleman.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
On behalf of our caucus, we also join in the support for the recommendation and will be quite happy to see the letters sent.

MR. SPEAKER:
Before calling Statements by Ministers, I have great pleasure in welcoming a large number of students to the galleries today. There are sixty Grade V students from Holy Name of Mary Elementary School, in Marystown, with their teachers, Mrs. Marie Pittman, Mrs. Regina Brake, Mrs. Linda Tobin and Ms Betty Collins.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I would also like to welcome twenty Grade VI students and two teachers, Mr. Hodder and Mr. C. White, from the Pentecostal Elementary School, in Bishop's Falls.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome thirty-six Grade V students and four adults from St. Francis Xavier School, in Windsor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I am very pleased, as Acting Minister of Mines, to be able to make the following statement today on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn).

Mr. Speaker, I would like to update hon. members on a currently out-of-production mining property on the Baie Verte Peninsula. I am referring to the Consolidated Rambler Mines Limited property near Baie Verte which ceased production five years ago. The close-down took place at the end of April, 1982.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of legislation enacted by this government in 1976 and amended in 1980, the Mineral Act provides that any mining property from which there has been no production for a period of five years become subject to reversion to the Crown. Reversion is not automatic, however; it takes place by order of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

I would like to take this opportunity to inform hon. members that the Lieutenant-Governor in

Council has ordered that the Consolidated Rambler Mines Limited property revert to the Crown.

Consolidated Rambler Mines Limited produced base and precious metals from the Baie Verte Peninsula property during the period 1964 to 1982. Four separate ore bodies were mined primarily for their copper content although some zinc, gold and silver were recovered as well. Most buildings and equipment, including the mill, remain intact on the property.

There has been no exploration on the properties involved since 1982 even though they are considered to have potential for the discovery of gold mineralization in addition to a further base metals potential.

Hon. members are aware from recent industry releases that the Baie Verte Peninsula area is emerging as one of the highest potential areas for gold mineralization in the Province.

It is, therefore, an opportune time to free up the Rambler properties for exploration and potential re-development. Government is taking the necessary steps to comply with the reversion order and will also decide immediately on an appropriate course of action to encourage renewed activity on the dormant properties involved.

This is the second time since the enactment of the 1976 legislation that inactive mining claims have reverted to the Crown. We were successful in attracting a new operator for the St. Lawrence property and it is government's hope that our announced action today on the Consolidated Rambler property will result in renewed interest in that property.

This action is also a clear signal that this government is not prepared to tolerate, without good and sufficient cause, the holding of inactive mining claims in this Province. This is sound resource management policy and a policy that we hope will result in renewed mining and exploration activity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, we see the government today telling us that they are now the proud owners of a defunct piece of property where a mining operation used to be. They do this, of course, under the legislation provided in 1976. We see the word 'hope' used in here a number of times. We, on this side, Mr. Speaker, are also very hopeful that this particular property, which has now become public property once again, out of the private hands of Rambler Mines, is flush and filled to the brim with gold so that we can create all kinds of jobs for our people.

The acting minister will know - and he is a pretty good actor, and a better acting minister than the real minister - that there are three areas in this Province, in the mining community, that are on the edge of crisis. Whether that word is too strong for the minister and his government, well, maybe so, but we, on this side, feel that there are three areas in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that are on the edge of crisis. There

can be no doubt that the Daniel's Harbour zinc mine is in crisis, with 165 jobs lost in that area. The Flat Bay area, where a minister came into this chamber eight weeks prior and told us that Domtar's takeover of that gypsum operation in Flat Bay would be just wonderful and successful, and eight weeks later we see them with a divestiture group in place to try to bail it out and save those eighty jobs. And, of course, we see the St. Lawrence operation where there were government ads taken out to show 100 jobs being created. Well, where are the 100 jobs, Mr. Speaker? Were are they? They were reduced to 80, then reduced to 50, and then reduced to 30. So we have to examine under the microscope and with a finetoothed comb every single statement ever uttered in here about mines ever again, whether it be by the real Minister of Mines or the acting Minister of Mines (Mr. Rideout) who, himself, is a good actor. Mr. Speaker, this is a straightforward statement of takeover. We, too, apply the verb 'hope'.

MR. BARRETT:

Hope Brook.

MR. FUREY:

The Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) shouted Hope Brook. Yes, we hope there is a Hope Brook in Baie Verte as well, because we will take every single job we can get. But we ask the acting minister in his capacity - and he is a fine Minister of Fisheries and I suspect he would be a good Minister of Mines - to take under consideration these three areas of mining in our Province that are now on the edge of crisis and to perhaps knock some sense into the real Minister of Mines.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

We are pleased to see that the provincial government has a policy for recycling mine sites and recycling mines. I think it is admirable that we are in the position now where other operations can come in and work it.

Mr. Speaker, it is just lamentable that the provincial government has not kept up with the communities that are associated with those mining ventures and that we have not comprehensive policies to deal with the problems of the communities themselves, that we do not have a single-industry towns policy that has been developed by this government or the federal government, or on a joint basis, and that communities such as Buchans, when their mine goes down, suffer badly because we have not planned for it.

There is an old expression in mining that the mine starts to close the day that it is opened, when the first shovelful of ore is taken out of it. That has obviously happened at Daniel's Harbour. We had no policies in place to accommodate the trauma that the people of Daniel's Harbour are going through. The same thing happened in St. Lawrence and the individuals themselves had to bare much of the brunt. Luckily, we have it back up again, however tenuously.

The same thing, Mr. Speaker, has happened in Labrador City, where we lost 1,000 workers over the

last five years and very little, if anything, was in place beforehand in order to accommodate the human tragedy that associates with these mine closures. Mr. Speaker, if we were consistent, we would have had companion legislation long ago which would have provided for these individual communities when they come into trouble. The unfortunate thing is we have not kept up with looking at the people as well as we have at the mine sites, themselves.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, today I am tabling as per Appendix I, 115 new projects approved under the Private Sector Employment programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:
In so doing, Mr. Speaker, I would like, first of all, to respond to criticism by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons), and some others opposite, regarding the distribution of application forms in connection with this programme. It should be made crystal clear to everyone in this Province that the distribution of application forms was done fairly and equally.

When the Private Sector Employment programme was first mentioned in the Throne Speech, my department immediately began to receive requests for information from interested parties. A mailing list was maintained with the intent that when the programme was

in place, application forms would be distributed to all enquirers.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1987 a Ministerial Statement was read in the House outlining details pertaining to the Private Sector Employment programme. A copy of the application form, as well as an information sheet, was attached to the statement distributed to all hon. members at that time.

The departmental mailing list contained requests from all areas of the Province. As soon as the application forms were printed, a copy was mailed to all interested parties.

Mr. Speaker, there was certainly no manipulation on the part of government to have P.C. districts receive application forms before other districts in the Province. Liberal M.H.A.'s and NDP M.H.A.'s had access to the same information as did P.C. M.H.A.'s and if government members were faster off the mark in getting application forms to their constituents, then this is certainly not an example of political partisanship but rather an indication of the kind of interest government members take in their ridings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:
Bang on the desks. Because they are lazy over there. They do not work hard on behalf of their constituents.

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, with respect to comments by the Leader of the Opposition to the effect that it was no accident that of the twenty projects announced on May 22 only

one was located in a Liberal district, I want to make it perfectly clear that projects are approved on a 'first come first served' basis and if an application form meets programme requirements, then the project will receive favourable consideration. Whether the person applying is in a P.C., Liberal, or NDP district has no bearing whatsoever on the selection process.

Mr. Speaker, the projects I am announcing today involve a total provincial contribution of \$707,037. Of the \$5 million allocated for the Private Sector Employment -

MR. CALLAN:
Is it government funds or P.C. Party funds?

MR. POWER:
It is taxpayer money, distributed equally throughout the Province. Of the \$5 million allocated to the Private Sector Employment Programme the total funding to date is \$823,217.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:
This latest announcement will create 217 jobs, 38 of which will be student positions. Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of weeks, 148 projects have received approval under the Private Sector Employment Programme for the creation of 263 new jobs - 263 jobs, Mr. Speaker, that did not previously exist.

Mr. Speaker, this programme is an excellent job creation initiative and as it goes into full swing over the next few weeks, the enthusiastic response government

has received to the programme will be clearly evident to everyone, in all areas of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, while I will not take the time of the House to read out the full 115 projects, I will table them for hon. members advice, and the consolation of members opposite, to make sure that all districts are being treated fairly. I will be glad, Mr. Speaker, for members opposite, to read out per district how much money has been spent on job creation in this Private Sector Employment Programme.

In the district of Placentia, Mr. Speaker, there has been four projects approved to date. In Conception Bay South there have been seven projects. In Ferryland there have been six projects. In St. John's East, where there are still some entrepreneurs, there are nine projects approved. In Harbour Main there have been ten projects, in St. Mary's - The Capes, seven; in Burin - Placentia West, one.

MR. SIMMONS:
(Inaudible).

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, it is not our fault that the majority of Newfoundlanders see what good government can do and votes for more members over here than over there. St. John's South has one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Tory.

MR. POWER:
Port de Grave, one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, boy!

MR. POWER:

Bellevue, one. Mount Pearl, five.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Tory.

MR. POWER:
Trinity North, five.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Tory.

MR. POWER:
Humber East, six.

MR. SIMMONS:
Tory.

MR. POWER:
Humber Valley, five.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Tory.

MR. POWER:
St. John's North, six projects approved to date.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Tory.

MR. POWER:
St. John's Centre, three.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Tory.

MR. POWER:
Grand Falls, six.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Tory.

MR. POWER:
Terra Nova, five; Gander, two;
Trinity - Bay de Verde, three.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Tory.

MR. POWER:
Bay of Islands, two.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Tory.

MR. POWER:
Carbonear, six.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Tory.

MR. POWER:
Humber West, four.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Tory.

MR. POWER:
Harbour Grace, two.

MR. FLIGHT:
They are all Tory, Mr. Speaker.

MR. POWER:
The Strait of Belle Isle, four projects.

MR. FLIGHT:
Tory. They are all Tory.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. POWER:
St. Barbe, three projects;
Bonavista North, two projects;
Bonavista South, two projects.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Tory.

MR. POWER:
Twillingate, one project; LaPoile,
two projects; St. John's East
Extern, one.

MR. FLIGHT:
Tory.

MR. POWER:
Green Bay, one; Fortune -
Hermitage, two; Pleasantville,
one; Lewisporte, two; St. John's
West, two; Waterford - Kenmount,
Exploits, and St. George's one
project each.

Mr. Speaker, I know members opposite have to find some way to criticize, their job is to oppose, and their job in this case is to find a good programme and oppose it as best they can. Just as proof of how fair we have been with these projects, almost \$7.5 million has been allocated for the provincial employment programme, Mr. Speaker, and to date, of the over \$7 million allocated, 62 per cent has been allocated for P.C. ridings and 38 per cent for other.

Mr. Speaker, that might surprise people in this House: P.C. ridings have been allocated 62 per cent of \$7 million, and the other parties have been allocated 38 per cent. It may be a coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that even though the P.C. ridings only got 62 per cent of the money, we do have 67 per cent of the ridings.

MR. HISCOCK:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:
The Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies just said that these applications are on a 'first come first served' basis. With the severe mailing problem we have down in Labrador, it is not surprising that none of these projects were approved for Labrador. I ask that the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies allocate sufficient funds for Labrador. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say the essence of what I said last time I responded to such a statement. I said that the concept, as the minister says in his concluding paragraph, is a good one. It is an excellent form of creating job opportunities. Now, he did not bother to recall that, he got all psyched out by the criticism. It is a good programme in concept, number one.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, the implementation of it is being botched in two ways. First of all, there is not nearly enough money in it, so that the 2,000 people down in Port de Grave out of work, if they do not stampede each other to death looking for that one job the minister just announced - there must be great rejoicing in Port de Grave, one job for 2,000 unemployed people, or the three that were announced for St. Barbe, where fully 70 per cent of the adult population up there is unemployed, and almost all the youth in the sixteen to twenty-four age group. Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister wonders why we are not dancing in the streets about this particular initiative. No, we are not.

The initiative itself, Mr. Speaker, is sound. The idea is sound. It is being botched in that not enough money is being put into it, and it is being botched in the overall implementation, and I will come to that in a moment, Mr. Speaker.

The minister takes fully half the

written statement and most of his off-the-cuff remarks to rebutt some remarks I made about it last week. The quotation that comes to mind is, 'Me thinks he doth protest too much'. Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) just drew attention to one of the problems, one of the problems that is created when you have a desperation approach to job creation, where you announce something today and expect to implement it tomorrow. It is blatantly unfair to the people of Eagle River, to the people of more remote parts of this Province generally, that they have to compete in time frame, they have to compete with people who can walk into the office in St. John's and personally, physically, pick up the application, or people who are just a day removed by mail from receipt of that application. It is blatantly unfair, Mr. Speaker, blatantly discriminatory against those people, some of whom are just getting their applications.

Now, let me come, Mr. Speaker, to the minister's assurance as contained on page one of his statement, the second paragraph, where he says, "A mailing list was maintained with the intent that when the programme was in place, application forms would be distributed to all enquirers."

Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt the truth of that particular statement, but let us apply it. Let us apply that statement. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in the last few minutes I have direct information from one enquirer, who, as the minister has indicated, called in and presumably was put on that list. But somewhere the name got lost,

because that enquirer got the application form from the department last week. I can give the minister the exact day. It was one day last week, within the last five to seven calendar days. He got the information from the department on the basis of that telephone enquiry. He received the information one day last week, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I come now, then, to page three of the minister's prepared statement, the top of the page, in which he talks about new jobs "that did not previously exist". What he did not say but should have said in the interest of complete honesty is that those jobs will also not exist after the government funding runs out. Because, Mr. Speaker, very little attention has been paid here to the encouragement of long-term job creation initiatives. And that is another fault, Mr. Speaker, with that particular programme.

You cannot, Mr. Speaker, get up and create a few ten weeks or fifteen weeks programmes three or four times a year, and then, while I suppose it is statistically honest to say that if you got a job for fifteen weeks and there is more than three times fifteen in a calendar year, say that you have created three jobs in a calendar year period. You cannot go on doing that, Mr. Speaker, because it is blatantly dishonest and that person, who has that job for ten weeks or twelve weeks, is still without employment the other forty weeks. I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, those "jobs" translated into person years, and, I submit to the minister, that it would be far less than 283 person years.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMMONS:
I will buy him a watch one of those days.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We would like to thank the minister for a copy of his statement in advance, although I would note again, as I have in the past couple of weeks with other statements by other ministers, that it is a rather tedious fashion in which ministers from different departments continue to come into the House to total up the number of jobs, essentially as the basis for a propaganda campaign. There is going to be a long way to go to reach the 40,000 jobs that the Premier promised a long time ago to the people of this Province.

In any case, I would also say that the tone of the statement that the minister has presented obviously shows that not only his own department but the government is increasingly defensive about the charges of political patronage and are aware that that is becoming an issue in the minds of many people in this Province, with municipal grants especially, but that will remain to be an issue to come.

The minister noted the number of projects awarded to St. John's East, saying that there are still some entrepreneurs left. Well, I would like to tell the minister

that there certainly are entrepreneurs in St. John's East and they are part of the community that supports the New Democratic Party, and the projects that are there only reflect the good work of the member in encouraging entrepreneurs in the East End of St. John's to come forward and take advantage of the programme.

The minister in this statement, though, is falling short of the standards that he set out with the percentage of jobs that will go to the youth and students. By my own calculation there is only 20 per cent of these jobs that are identified as going to students, and it is unclear whether there are more jobs that are going to young people who are not students. I raise that a concern again as I have in the past, especially in light of the lack of any real Summer job programme directed towards students, and particularly in light of the fact that this government withdrew the \$1.5 million contribution that it made to the federal programme last year. This comes at a time when the Social Services Minister has announced that there will thirty-five jobs cut back in his own department. What we see in this statement and this programme is a dogmatic allegiance to the private sector. When other ministers are cutting human services programmes in this Province, we have a high rate of unemployment, we have such serious social ills as family violence and alcoholism, issues which are constantly addressed in public and here in this Legislature. We have no programme to put people to work in non-profit community organizations taking care of people who are hurting. In fact, we see ministers cutting back on jobs that exist providing services

for the people of this Province, and this minister has nothing to offer to provide community based work.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
It is mainly a point of clarification for the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power).

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no such thing as a point of clarification. Does the hon. member have a point of order?

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, my point of order has to do with the misleading information that the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies just gave to the people of the Port de Grave district, the 2,000 people who will be overexcited this afternoon because he announced one job. In fact, Mr. Speaker, that job is very clearly for the district of Carbonear, in a branch office. In fact, they are only going to get half a job.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

Oral Questions

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). In recent months, Mr. Speaker, we have seen advertising outside of this Province for doctors and for nurses and for pilots for Air Services. Would the Minister of Labour indicate whether or not he anticipates that any advertising will be done outside of this Province for operators for an operating refinery at Come By Chance?

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
A simple answer, Mr. Speaker, no. I do not know of any advertising campaigns outside of the Province for tradesmen. I understand that virtually all of the tradesmen, except for a very few cases of specialties, are from within the Province.

MR. CALLAN:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, I will ask the minister, then, is he aware of an advertisement which appeared in a Fort McMurray newspaper today advertising for ninety operators and fifty maintenance personnel, that is one hundred and forty workers, to work at the Come By

Chance oil refinery? And in answering that question, will the minister explain why it is that Newfoundland Energy or Newfoundland Processing, which is the same company, are advertising out in Alberta at a time when people who were operating that refinery, former workers of the Come By Chance oil refinery are walking the streets in the district of Bellevue and other places in this Province?

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know about the validity of part of the statement of the hon. member's question, but we will obviously check into it. But many of us are aware that a lot of Newfoundlanders went to Fort McMurray and are actually working in Alberta. And we may be just trying to repatriate some of our own workers, Mr. Speaker. I will check on it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, last week in the Legislature I asked another minister a question, and he said he would have an answer for me in one hour, and I am still waiting for that answer. It had to do with Air Services. Now the minister just indicated -

MR. DAWE:
You were not here in the

Legislature.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am being rudely interrupted by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) who has not yet supplied to me the answer that he promised on Friday past.

I want to ask the Minister of Labour -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This is a final supplementary. Would the hon. member please pose his question?

MR. CALLAN:

I am attempting valiantly to do so, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Labour will he, then, guarantee that he will check on this advertisement which was placed in that paper on April 14 of this year? And will the minister, as he promised several months ago, table on a timely basis safety inspections results that have been done on that site? I have seen one; the day after the minister promised to do it he tabled one. And will the minister promise on a timely basis to table anything that pertains to the Come By Chance oil refinery, especially anything that has to do with taking jobs away from Newfoundlanders and giving them to these bad old Mainlanders? Will the minister promise to do that?

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, it is rather hilarious that the hon. member says that we are taking jobs away

from Newfoundlanders when there are approximately 550 Newfoundlanders employed at the Come By Chance site at the present time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:

- and most of them are from the hon. gentleman's district.

However, Mr. Speaker, the simple answer is: Yes, I do promise that I will check on the thing. I said that when I answered his previous question. I am not aware that I promised to table everything in relation to Come By Chance. Mr. Speaker, I will table the latest inspection reports, the relevant ones that have been done quite recently. If there is any specific one that the hon. member has in mind, he can certainly bring it to my attention and I will be happy to table it.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

That was a final supplementary.

MR. CALLAN:

I did not say so.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I had a question or two for the Minister Responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn). Since the question relates in large measure to the so-called women's issues, I would like to put the question to the Minister of Career Development

and Advanced Studies, who has responsibility to the House, I believe, for women's issues. I want, then, to put a question on the very important issue of public housing.

First of all, I ask the minister, is there any conscious effort, any concerted attempt by government to provide public housing in rural areas, say, in communities of under 5,000 population?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

That question is not just a women's issue, it is a question of housing that relates to rural people in the Province. There are several rural housing projects which I am sure we would be glad to get the brochures we have and the information for the hon. member. I am sure the Minister of Housing would be glad to do it. If it was just a women's issue, then I would be glad to answer it. But, again, I say that we, as a government, have many areas of responsibility, in my case for women, through Social Services for housing, through the Department of Justice, for some of our transition houses and those types of things. If the member has a specific request about an individual community, then I will be glad to answer it if I can.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my preamble it is a housing

issue but, I say to the minister, it is particularly a women's issue when you look at the profile of people who occupy public housing, mainly elderly women, handicapped people of both sexes, but especially low income single mothers. So it is a question that has particular import for his responsibilities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I carefully put the question about what initiatives were taken in communities under 5,000 population, because I wanted to ask the minister - and I shall now do so - is the minister aware that of the more than 4700 public housing units in this Province, fully 90 per cent of them are located in communities of 5,000 population or larger? Is the minister aware that 90 per cent of all public housing in this Province is available to just 46 per cent of the population? How can he and the administration explain, Mr. Speaker, how he and the administration justify this neglect of public housing needs of more than half the entire population of this Province?

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, if I could reply in behalf of my colleague, the Minister responsible for Housing, I might be able to enlighten the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

The statistics he gave may well be accurate.

MR. SIMMS:

They are.

MR. WINDSOR:

The decision as to whether or not or where public housing units are constructed is based upon need as identified by ongoing studies of the need for public housing units. The hon. gentleman must also remember that there is a Rural Remote Housing Programme, very similar to public housing, which applies only in rural Newfoundland and Labrador in communities of a population, I think, of less than 5000 which is a similar programme which is in fact more beneficial. There are other ways and means whereby people in rural Newfoundland can find homes that are not available to people in urban Newfoundland. So I simply say on behalf of my colleague, who is not here, that the needs are addressed as they are identified. There are ongoing studies done on a continual basis to determine where the greatest need is and, naturally, I guess, because of the social implications of the larger communities, the greatest need has appeared in the larger centers.

If I could address for just a moment the previous question as it relates to women, particularly single parents, not only mothers with children but single parents generally, there is a growing need because obviously today that is an area that is becoming much more predominant. We are finding that more and more smaller units, such two bedroom units, are being required. Again, the decision as to whether to build two, three or four bedroom units is made based on the need as identified in a waiting list. There is an effort made to identify units that are suitable for that type of single parent families.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the President of Treasury Board for responding to the question. He should not, however, I suggest to him, confuse the issue of the so-called RRAP housing, which is not subsidized rental units in any context. There are subsidies available for capital construction improvement, but it is quite a different issue than the one I am talking about now. We are talking here, Mr. Speaker, about public housing provided for availability for rentals across the Province. The figures, and I assure him they are correct figures, have been prepared independently for me and I can provide him with a copy of the tables that relate to my questions. The figures indicate that 90 per cent of all the public housing, all the public housing available for renting to those categories of people I mentioned earlier, including single parents, the elderly, the handicapped and so on, 90 per cent of it finds itself in communities of 5000 or more. My question to the minister, finally, is this: How can the minister justify what is obviously quite a blatant, quite an inexcusable discrimination against those low income people who happen to find themselves in over half the Newfoundland population which resides in communities under 5000 population? Mr. Speaker, is this just another example of the callousness, the uncaring attitude of this government that is so completely out of touch with the realities of the crushing poverty that is the daily lot of those people? Mr. Speaker, could the minister respond to that and could he, more to the point, give us

some assurance that this serious discrimination will be addressed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that the hon. gentleman, who has been in this House and in the Parliament of Canada for so long, does not know the difference between a rural RRAP Programme, and a Rural Remote Housing Programme. A Rural RRAP Programme is one for repairing and upgrading homes. A Rural and Remote Housing Programme is one whereby a person actually builds a homes and the mortgage is subsidized based on the income of the family, exactly in the same manner public housing is in the larger urban communities.

MR. SIMMONS:

Public discrimination.

MR. WINDSOR:

If there is any discrimination, Mr. Speaker, it is against the larger centres, because people in larger centres go into public housing, they pay a rent based on their income, but they never own the unit. In rural communities a home is actually constructed for them, the mortgage is in their name, the mortgage payment is based upon their income and they actually own the unit. So if there is any discrimination, Mr. Speaker, it is in the reverse of what the hon. gentleman is saying.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). It has to do with the question of provincial pensions and the reduction that occurs through the CPP offset, as it is called. My question to the minister is this: In January the Canada Pension Plan became more flexible and allowed superannuates to receive their pension at age sixty. Why did our provincial government decide to reduce the provincial pension to our pensioners in that category when the federal government, in the same situation, did not and virtually all the provinces in Canada decided not to reduce their provincial pensions and made amendments to legislation in order to ensure that these individuals would continue to receive the benefit both of the CPP at a full level and a provincial pension until they got to age sixty-five?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I can only presume that the hon. member is trying to get out a hole that he dug himself into and is trying to justify the inexcusable press release he issued a little while ago. Because I wrote the hon. member, I think it was on May 6, and laid out exactly what was going on here. Now, Mr. Speaker, the pension arrangements we have are integrated, the Canada Pension Plan and the CPP are integrated. Now one of the aspects of integration is that there is a lesser contribution required from the employee than if they were not integrated. In other words, if they are separate plans, to get the benefits that the member is going to receive when he retires, he would have to pay more out of his salary each fortnight or each

month, however he gets paid.

The act is written that way. It says when the retiree becomes eligible for CPP benefits the reduction factor slips in and the particular contribution to his pension from the provincial pension fund decreases. As the CPP is made more available to him, as he is more eligible for it, the act says that our contribution to his pension declines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, previously the eligibility only came in at age sixty-five, but it was recently changed so that as of January 1 the eligibility could come in at age sixty. Anyone who is on early retirement, we could have taken out of his pension, as of January 1, a certain amount - there is a formula involved - because he is now eligible. We could have done that. It was quite legal to do that:

Mr. Speaker, we elected not to do that. We did not take out anything. We are going to bring in an act, which is on the Order Paper, which will prevent us from taking it out. We are doing it now voluntarily, not reducing the pension, and when this act comes in we will not be permitted to take it out on the basis of eligibility. We will only be able to put in that reduction on the basis of actual receipt of CPP benefits. This is all related to the integration of the two pension factors. Now if the hon. member does not understand that, I will write him again. But I certainly did not get back anything from him which said he did not understand my original letter, and it was a quite clearly worded letter. There is absolutely no doubt that the average person would understand it. But I will write

him again if he feels he does not understand it. I presume he does understand it and he is just flogging this thing because he got himself into some sort of hole with this ridiculous and slanderous press release that he put out.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Sit down, Peter.

MR. FENWICK:
I had a one sentence question.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. FENWICK:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
I fully realize that it is in the Speaker's discretion to recognize speakers, but the tradition has been that you get at least one supplementary question when you rise to ask a question. You have not even given me one supplementary to ask to the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Windsor -

Buchans.

MR. FENWICK:

I do not believe it.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). I would remind him that when Kruger bought the Bowater mill it committed itself to a five year modernization plan. The modernization plan has stopped -

MR. BAIRD:

It has not stopped.

MR. FLIGHT:

- there have been layoffs, people are on notice of layoffs, and there is widespread uneasiness in Corner Brook. So I would ask the minister why the Board of Directors of Kruger have not approved the funding that would be required to take on the second phase of modernization and its completion?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, my understanding of the situation is that the Kruger people are in the process of putting together design plans for the next phase of modernization. They certainly have not been instructed by the government or anything not to proceed. It is a private company's decision as to how they proceed with their modernization. In fact, they have spent more, I think, and moved a lot quicker on the modernization plans to date than they ever have.

The other thing that I would point out to hon. members, and I would

assume being the Forestry critic the hon. member is well aware of the amendment that is on the Order Paper, and has been there for quite some time, Bill No. 25, which requires a minor amendment to the Kruger - government agreement. The hon. member might want to take the time to just refresh his memory on that one. That is another matter, but I do not think it is really a matter that is significantly holding up any progress with respect to modernization.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the Province committed \$7 million to that mill modernization. I would ask the minister, has the Province paid over to Kruger all of that \$7 million? Because, among other speculation, there is the one in **The Humber Log** which states, "The company may be experiencing difficulty" - this are **The Humber Log's**, not my words - "in obtaining financing for its upcoming work," the continuation of its modernization.

I would ask the minister, has the Province of Newfoundland paid over all of the \$7 million that it committed to Kruger for the modernization programme?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I am not sure how relevant it is to get up

in the House and ask a question pertaining to a quotation that was in a newspaper. Surely the hon. member has access to research people in the Opposition office who perhaps could be a little more specific and clear.

From my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that is not accurate. The allegation or whatever it is contained in that quotation is not accurate. That pertains to additional funding that Kruger needs to do additional work, above and beyond the modernization programme that we all have heard about. They want to do more. That is what that particular quote refers to.

MR. BARRY:
(Inaudible) 50 per cent.

MR. SIMMS:
Sorry! I do not want to quell the enthusiasm of the member for Mount Scio, but I do want to just continue, if I might be permitted.

The question with respect to modernization is, in fact, a question that is not a question in our minds. It is proceeding. In fact, they have gone faster than they had even planned to in the first place. So I think they have given every indication that they intend to proceed. But there is a matter of doing some design work and the like. That is the only problem.

The other part of the question was whether we have paid out \$7 million with respect to our commitment under that agreement. I would have to confirm it with the Minister of Finance. It does not come out of my department, but I would assume we have. I do not think that is a problem.

MR. FLIGHT:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, the minister might think it is not important, but if he were in Corner Brook and had a firsthand feeling for the uneasiness and the concern among unions and the people in Corner Brook, he would know it is relevant.

So my final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is: Will the minister move to end this speculation and uneasiness, which I referred to, by telling this House and telling the people of Newfoundland, since we have a big stake in there, when - we know that Kruger have not approved the funding that would see the completion of the modernization programme - we can expect Kruger to approve the funding for the rest of the modernization and its completion, which, by the way, is going to cost \$80 million? Will the minister tell us when Kruger will do that?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the short answer would be as soon as they get all of their planning and design work and that sort of information put together and finalized. Kruger has certainly shown every indication to me of their interest in proceeding as quickly as possible. It is rather ironic that all of a sudden members of the Opposition are showing a great deal of interest

in the Kruger take-over in Corner Brook, since I recall a couple of years ago there was not all that much enthusiasm or support from the Opposition for what the government was trying to do with respect to Kruger.

The member for Windsor - Buchans and the members opposite can be assured that the modernization programme that the government entered into with respect to an agreement with Kruger will be undertaken, will be completed, that people will be employed and it will be some, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the initiative of this government. And that is something that should not be forgotten by the hon. member when he asks his questions.

MR. BAIRD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question also to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, this one concerning the Green Paper on the outfitting industry, as the deadline is the 31st. of the month and I think there is a fair bit of interest being shown across the Province, and particularly in my district,

MR. FLIGHT:
Will the minister extend the deadline?

MR. BAIRD:
I ask would the minister extend the deadline by approximately a month?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forest

Resources and Lands.

MR. FLIGHT:
The minister asked me to ask that question a week ago.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:
I think it is ridiculous, the comment I just heard there that the minister asked him to ask that question a week ago. Well, the deadline is three days away and a lot of people are concerned. I think the member should be ashamed of himself.

MR. FLIGHT:
To the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
To the point of order, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, it may be ridiculous in the mind of the member, but the fact is the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands did indeed ask me to ask that question a week ago and I refused to ask it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I asked him to ask me because he asked me outside the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

The member asked me, outside of the House three days ago, why do you not extend the deadline? And I said maybe I will. Why do you not ask me a question some day in the House? But it goes to show, Mr. Speaker, how much interest he has because he did not ask the question. That is the point.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, who cares about that! I mean how foolish, how foolish. The minister over there told me to ask the question - na - na - na!. How silly.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is that the dates for the deadline were approved by Cabinet so, therefore, in order for me to change the dates of the deadline I will have to confer with my Cabinet colleagues before I can do anything with respect to a firm decision. But I can assure my friend for Humber West and my friend for Windsor - Buchans, and all of those who have an interest in this discussion paper, which I agree there has been a great deal of interest in and I am delighted to see it - I just hope that they will use their energies in replying to the department rather than just venting their frustrations out on the minister or the government, I hope they will write - that I will confer with my colleagues in Cabinet overnight and will advise the hon. member tomorrow morning in the House. Perhaps I will do a little statement, or I might not. I might wait for the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans to finally ask me the same question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance a question which he has not asked me to ask. I would like to ask the minister whether he is aware that Mobil Oil are moving employees out of the Province from their head office, which is located here in Newfoundland, moving some employees, I believe, to Calgary and other parts of Canada? Would the minister tell us whether he or members of Cabinet are aware of this, and whether that forebodes anything for the negotiations between Mobil, the Government of Canada, and the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is obviously extremely interested in this area, having been Minister of Energy. I think, as hon. members know, the present Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer) is currently in New York. He will be back tomorrow. He has been having discussions with Mobil to get himself updated on the thinking in the company there.

I think that hon. members know that Mobil decided some little while ago - I am pretty certain it was Mobil - to move some of their Canadian head office from the Central Canada area, the Toronto area, back out to Calgary, because it is just administratively more effective in their mind. I do not know if there is a movement. I have not heard it, quite frankly.

If there is some movement of employees out of St. John's, I do not know whether or not it is related to that same frame of mind they have that led them to move from Toronto. But, in any case, I am sure that the hon. Minister of Energy, when he comes back tomorrow, will be able on Monday to give an updating on his perception of things.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the minister would confirm that he will raise this matter with the Minister of Energy and have it checked into? Will the minister also indicate that he, as Minister of Finance for this Province, will not be satisfied with a mere decision by Mobil, for administrative convenience or whatever, to attempt to operate East Coast offshore operations out of Calgary? Is this not a somewhat significant departure from the previous approach of this administration?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, of course our main concern is that the companies make a decision to release the project. Now, how they do, shall we say, their management or their internal administrator arrangements are of lesser concern to us. Obviously the more employment here the better, that is definitely a concern of ours, but our main concern is that the

companies finally come to a conclusion whereby they can release the project, because we feel that out of that is where the bulk of the employment is going to come in terms of the offshore. The relatively small amount of employment that comes from their administrative offices here, in the absence of a project release, is of some concern to us, but certainly not nearly the concern that we have that they would actually come to a decision to release the project.

I will raise those matters with the hon. the Minister of Energy.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies in his capacity as the Minister Responsible for the Status of Women in the Province. In his absence in the last week or ten days, when he has not been here, there have been several discussions in which other ministers have responded to the problem of domestic violence and battering of women. I would like to ask the minister is he reviewing the need for monies to be made available for a public education programme and for staff people to be put to work to carry out this education programme?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon.

gentleman for his question about the status of women's rights in this Province. I am glad to say that we are assisting the role of women in this Province in many and varied forms whether it is through our training programmes, our transition houses, access to day care or whatever. We also, Mr. Speaker, will be having very shortly a brochure completed that will be distributed to agencies and individuals in this Province about wife battering and about physical abuse within the family itself. We hope to make this brochure available, as I say, to all agencies and individuals in the Province who might be concerned. We have staff available in our department presently to develop and distribute that brochure, and we hope that it does make a significant improvement in this very difficult area.

MR. LONG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would tell the minister that women who are working in this field, volunteer and as full-time people, have a concern that this brochure is simply not enough to meet the needs of the Province. I would like to ask the minister, in view of the announcement that he made today about funds for the private sector programme, and there is at least \$4 million left in that programme, could he not find money in that employment programme to be made available to put women to work in this Province taking care of battered women?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely surprised that the spokesman for the NDP, who portray themselves in Canada and Newfoundland as being the only persons who support women's rights and women's issues in this country, has such a shallow and narrow-minded approach to wife battering in this Province. Anybody who fully understands the issue realizes that the issue is very often economic as well as social or cultural. The fact that there is a tremendous amount of wife battering is associated with unemployment, and social problems such as that in Newfoundland, where there is alcoholism, child abuse and wife battering. They all very often tie themselves in with the unemployment and economic situations. The \$5 million that we are spending in a very worthwhile programme to create employment in this Province is not simply for the sake of the individuals who are employed, it helps the family of the employed as well, and, hopefully the family of the employed in this case will be women who may be the subject of wife battering or children who are the subject of child abuse. We just hope, Mr. Speaker, that the whole range of programmes that we are doing will assist in the overall so that women's rights in this Province can receive the full merit that they deserve. We think we can do that in many different ways, and the employment programme is one of the ways to assist women in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. WARREN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of yesterday's Hansard here and on Page L2613 it states: "AN HON. MEMBER: No." That is followed by "MR. FENWICK" and debate goes on for the next page and a half. I would like to refer to you the first couple of sentences, "Well therefore, why in the heck are you supporting Ed Broadbent and his cronies up in Ottawa against the military? This is what you are doing, Sir." Now, I am sure, with all due respect to my hon. friend from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), he did not say those words. Those words came from myself and I would like for Hansard to correct that.

My second point of order, Mr. Speaker, is to my hon. friend from the The Evening Telegram. Today's edition states: "The government and the LIA support social economic development and low level flying, said Mr. Warren." In Hansard, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Warren, on page R2614, said, "The Labrador Innuit Association has some concern about the possible long term effects of low level flying on the caribou herd and the environment, they are apparently more concerned about socio-economic issues and its land claims." I never mentioned low level flying so I would hope that the The Evening Telegram and my good friend will make the correction tomorrow.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) for raising what he characterized as a point of order.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as his second and specious point of order is concerned that he would do well to take pen in hand and write a letter to the editor because that would be the appropriate way to deal with that particular matter since, as much as the Premier would like it and the member would like it, The Evening Telegram is not answerable to this particular House. He should deal with that in that particular way. It is not, therefore, a point of order.

The first one, Mr. Speaker -

MR. WARREN:

That is for the Speaker to rule.

MR. SIMMONS:

The Speaker will rule on it but I can certainly argue the point as I am sure he is not wanting to deny me that yet.

As to his first point, Mr. Speaker, I suggest he take a trip upstairs and talk to the people in Hansard. They are a reasonable crowd of people -

MR. WARREN:

It is already done.

MR. SIMMONS:

- and that they understand the member is evidenced by the fact that they actually record some of

the things he says in this Chamber. If he would take a dodge up there -

MR. WARREN:

You are only a 10-day wonder.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to help the member.

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has stated his point of order without interruption. I would like him to give the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) an opportunity likewise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was about to conclude anyway. I could pursue this at a time when the gentleman is not so upset, if that helps the cause. On his first point of order, he should talk to Hansard and he has done that so that drives him up in my estimation to where he was before.

Secondly, he should write letters to the editor. We would be happy

to help with the corrections, the grammar and that kind of thing.

Otherwise, I thought he set a beautiful precedent in this House today because it gives the member a fairly extended period of time to state what is obviously not a point of order. It is instructive for the future for us over here.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I will check into the matters that the hon. member brought up, but there does not appear to be a point of order.

Notices of Motion

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Minister of Justice to give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In the Statute Law."

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to give answers to questions which I gave notice to on a question asked by

the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) last week. There were essentially three questions regarding the hiring procedures at government Air Services in terms of the number of Newfoundland pilots on staff, the number of female pilots on staff, and the number of grievances filed regarding pilot hiring.

Mr. Speaker, during these questions, of course, the member for Bellevue put some doubts out to the public as to the quality of the men working in the Air Services and I think that should be retracted, as I indicated during Question Period.

But to answer the questions, Mr. Speaker, government Air Services currently has twenty-three pilots on staff. There are two vacancies and they are being filled through public interviews at the present time. According to the department personnel files, twenty-two of the twenty-three pilots are Newfoundlanders. One pilot out of twenty-three that are presently hired is from outside the Province. There are no female pilots employed by government Air Services, Mr. Speaker. I did not check to see how many had actually applied for positions but that may, in fact, have been an interesting exercise as well. For my own use, at least, I will look into that.

With regard to the question of grievances, at the present time there is one grievance that has been filed to the knowledge of the department with regard to an individual who applied within the service, who applied for a position of pilot, and was unsuccessful in that application and is grieving the decision. There is one complaint that has

been lodged, and a complaint - grievances are internal - but there has been one complaint, an external complaint filed as a result of external application for a pilot's position, in which this particular individual was unsuccessful.

Mr. Speaker, rather than trying to cast doubt and innuendo on the Air Services Division of my department, it would have been a simple matter for the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) to have asked me the questions and he could have had the answers. Instead, he tried to discredit the members of the Air Services Division, Mr. Speaker, which I think is a disgrace for any member of this Legislature to do. These people have an excellent record and are, as I indicated last week, the best in the country.

Petitions

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to present and speak in support of a petition from seventy-six residents of what is known in Happy Valley-Goose Bay as the Labrador Linerboard housing area. It is now a misnomer actually, but it is an area in which economic housing are supplied by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, to make it more specific.

The prayer of the petition reads, "The petition of the undersigned

residents of Happy Valley - Goose Bay hereby showeth that we protest the 10 per cent rental increase on the economic housing units which we rent from the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, on the basis that it is an unfair and unjustified increase brought about by the high demand for housing and the shortage of same; and the fact that NLHC rent increases may be based on rental rates by private owners which have become inflated because of the lack of social and economic housing in the town;

"And that we request that the provincial government cause the NLHC to freeze the rent at the present level for at least a twelve-month period or until the private rental rates stabilize as a result of the high demand in this area while adequate housing is not available."

As I said, Mr. Speaker, seventy-six residents signed this petition. I think it is in the proper format, as Your Honour will see. All but two live in the housing area I mentioned. The other two live in Hamilton Heights, but also occupy Crown-owned housing rented from the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. I understand that there are additional petitions from those other parts of town on the way to the House of Assembly for presentation as well.

I would like to give a little explanation as to what the residents are getting at here. Many people may believe that a 10 per cent rental increase is not that much, and I suppose by some standards, in the more affluent areas of our town and more affluent segments of our society that may be quite true. But when

we are talking about the economic housing units in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, a great number of these are occupied by people on low income, fixed income or seasonal employees who depend on U.I.C. benefits for a good part of the year.

What is happening up there, and it was alluded to in an earlier petition, is that there is an increasing demand on the available housing in our area. Because there is an increasing demand because of increased military presence and so on, housing, when any is available, the rentals on those are being pretty well drastically increased by the private sector. Now, I have no argument with free enterprise and so on, but the fact that we do not have enough social housing in Labrador is bringing about this sort of a situation where the shortage of housing causes the private sector to increase rents and the agency responsible for providing social housing, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, is increasing their rents based on the private sector increases. It is sort of a vicious circle that the low income and fixed income people and people on U.I.C. are caught in.

Then the other point is quite a simple request. I would like not only to table this petition in the House for the House of Assembly but also to have the House provide a copy to the Minister Responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn) so that he can take some positive action. I believe the second part of the prayer of the petition asks for a freeze on any rental increases for a twelve-month period until the falsely inflated rental rate situation stabilizes.

We have a great number of new private housing units about to be built and that will take some of the strain off the market. We do have twenty-six other units, through the Melville Native Housing Association, eight, NLHC, eight, and the Paddon Memorial Home. Twenty-six other units will additionally take the strain off. Once the strain comes off or is relieved a little, Mr. Speaker, that would cause the private sector to stabilize their rents and would then, of course, as it is being used as a yardstick, would also cause the NLHC to stabilize theirs.

So I make that plea to the House of Assembly for their support, and also to the minister responsible for Housing to take that into consideration. If necessary, arrange meetings with his officials and representatives of these petitioners to discuss it a little further and give due consideration and full consideration to their request that they roll back the 10 per cent to start off with, eliminate that, and put a freeze on the existing levels until such time as the market stabilizes and the supply comes close to meeting the demand.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland). After first hearing it, it is a

very reasonable request to ask of the government to look at a freeze for a twelve month period to see how the rents will stabilize or not. It is a very reasonable request by people who are on low income living in this area of Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasures I have in rising today to tell the government that they should be looking at this request comes from just recently when the Minister of Housing (Mr. Dinn) and his Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation suffered a defeat at the hands of the people of Stephenville when a decision was rendered by the Western Residential Tendencies Board which pretty well lambasted the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation for, first off, its financial outlook and the financial position that it portrayed to the Board.

It also talked about the information on the buildings and the amount of money that was being kept in the Stephenville operation. A lot of information was presented and a lot of it was questioned by the Board. The final result from the Board, which was a long time coming, was a decision after seven months which was to roll back the increases and give the people there an excellent decision. It was one that vindicated the views that they have carried for many years.

It is an exact reference to the member for Naskaupi because it is the same type of operation. Newfoundland and Labrador Housing up in Happy Valley - Goose Bay are attempting to do a similar thing, increasing the rents and not giving the tenants a chance to have a say and to present their

views. They are not asking to stop the rents forever. They are asking for a freeze which is a very reasonable request by the people of the area since there is a great deal of activity going on in the member's district. I think it is one that the government should look at.

Since the recent decision by the Tendancies Board in the Westernpart of the Province has indicated many concerns to the corporation about the way they present their views and their financial statements to the Tendancies Boards around the Province, I think they should take this under consideration and the minister should take it under consideration with the view of freezing the rents for at least a twelve month period and do a full re-evaluation for the seventy-six people who are very interested in this petition.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to rise and speak to the petition that was ably presented by the hon. member for Naskaupi. Mr. Speaker, I am sure it was not an omission on the hon. gentleman's part, but I notice from the petition that the hon. gentleman has not signed his signature to it, in support of it. I think it is just an error on the hon. member's part.

However, Mr. Speaker, I realize,

in fact, as the hon. gentleman does that -

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, if the petition does not have the signature of the individual member who is presenting it on it, it is clearly out of order. You ruled one of mine out of order a number of weeks ago on that same grounds, on two grounds, but that was one of them. I mean I have no objection to it. I would even like to speak to the petition and I support the petition. But, Mr. Speaker, rules are rules. If you enforce them in our case when you said they were out of order, then I would suggest you have a look at the petition and see whether or not it is in order as well.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! I am not quite clear about the point that the hon. member is making.

MR. FENWICK:
The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), in looking at the petition, indicated that the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) has not signed the petition which is required under our orders in this House. Since you ruled one of my petitions out of order that way, I would suggest you have a look at the petition to see whether it is in order. That is not to say I do not support it, I do. I think it is a good petition and it should be addressed. But, Mr. Speaker, if the rules are rules for us, they are rules for everybody else too.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like to have a look at that petition.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, just briefly to that.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I have that petition in the meantime.

MR. KELLAND:

May I put a signature on it now if it is necessary?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, that was a partial petition. Some sheets of the identically worded petition are still being circulated in the other portions of town so there is adequate opportunity for me to sign. I was not totally aware that my signature was required on that or any sheet or every sheet. In fact, if I am not mistaken, I have seen quite a number of petitions presented in this House that may not have borne members signatures. However, I will leave that in the hands of Your Honour to make a decision on it. I would be more than happy to apply signature right now, Your Honour, in the event that it is required.

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

I do not believe that there are petitions that have are accepted in the House that have not been

signed by the member presenting a petition. That is clearly one of the rules but perhaps the hon. member could be given the opportunity to put signature to the petition. It is clear he wants to do it. Maybe to simplify matters and to allow the debate on the petition to go on, why not? It is a minor point. Unless the hon. member is not prepared to do it, well, then the petition should be ruled out of order, clearly.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, it is up to you.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the point raised by the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is well taken. I refer hon. members to our Standing Orders. The first Standing Order under "PETITIONS", page 31. I will read it: "A petition to the House shall be presented by a member in his place who shall be answerable that it does not contain impertinent or improper matter; and every member offering a petition to the House shall sign it with his own hand."

MR. WARREN:

To the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am now dealing with the point of order.

So this petition is not in order because it is not signed by the hon. member who presented it. If it is agreeable to the House that the hon. member will sign it now and the House will accept it on that basis, I am quite happy about that, but as it stands at the moment, it is not in order.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Since I was the one who raise the point of order, I am perfectly willing to see the petition signed by the member for Naskaupi and therefore become in good order so that it can be addressed.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is agreed that the hon. member will sign that.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

The member for Naskaupi and I were on the town council in Happy Valley - Goose Bay when the linerboard housing - and he was a good mayor, I must admit. I suppose the town council in Happy Valley - Goose Bay at that time had one of the best mayors on record and also one of the better councillors. So we will put that aside.

I am quite familiar with the linerboard housing but I think we must realize at the same time, and I believe the hon. gentlemen agrees too, that the rent in those units for the past number of years -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I know the hon. member was interrupted but his five minutes has elapsed so unless he has leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave is granted.

MR. WARREN:

I will be only another minute, Mr. Speaker.

I know the rent for a number of years has been below standard rental by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing in other parts of the Province. I think probably too asking for a 10 per cent increase all of one time is a bit much for the tenants to take. I am willing as a member on this side to take a petition and ask the minister to address it to the tenants concerns.

We must realize that we are having increased military activity in Goose Bay, there is a big demand, as the member said on housing in Goose Bay and we are going to need - and I think the member for Menihek said some time ago - we are going to need a large infusion of funds in Happy Valley - Goose Bay to contend with the uprising, with the increased activity, with the extra people working and all of these things. Hopefully, we can see that we can adjust the rent structure to meet the demand and the needs of the individual.

I will take it to the minister concerned and I will do what I can on behalf of the petitioners.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to address the petition since we have a spirit of co-operation here.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member for Menihek have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER:
No, no leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
No leave.

MR. FENWICK:
Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Are there any further petitions?

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to present a petition that was sent to me from Bay St. George concerning the Department of Social Services cutting back thirty-five positions around the Province. Mr. Speaker, they are very, very concerned and they are still getting petitions with names on them and sending them to me. I feel that this issue should be kept alive in the eyes of the Province as it is a deplorable situation to see layoffs in the Department of Social Services when they have not even got enough staff to do what is required and to meet the needs of the people of this Province.

When I see the minister of T.V. talking about \$700,000 they are going to save, I get really upset and actually poisoned, Mr. Speaker, because there is no need. Government has to have priorities. While they can get up and talk about spending \$300,000 or something a day on the social services to this Province, when you have a crisis situation in this Province, you do not get up

and blatantly just not bother with an explanation for why you would make such a move which is so detrimental to many people around this Province, especially to the ones who can least afford to lose the services.

Many times, Mr. Speaker, the people who are affected, and especially in this case, are the people who are disabled, the people who are having a hard time trying to put their lives together, and the people who are unable to cope many times, Mr. Speaker, with the basic arrangements of living life. I feel that it is time that the department kind of woke up instead of bragging about the jobs they create and talk about the good things that they should be going at when it comes to rehabilitating people and getting them feeling good about themselves and seeing them back into the work force.

The Department of Social Services has taken over the mandate also, Mr. Speaker, of expanding its services into the area of senior citizens and other groups. Also foster parents in this Province who are trying to help the situation by taking young foster children have been trying to get legislative changes. They have been trying to get improvements in the policy of government. Yet, this is being put by the wayside and social workers now are getting double the capacity of their workloads and are expected to deal with the problem.

So I do not see any justification for it, Mr. Speaker. I think it is a shame. I think it is a shocking statement to have to make, that we are going to lay off thirty-five social service workers around this Province who deal with

the people who are discriminated against and people who are in this Province least able to afford it. It is time that we had priorities. I know we are under fiscal restraint, but there are a lot of other areas that you can cut back and this is not the area to do it in. This is not the department to do it in. They should be expanding their mandate and they should be putting funding in to deal with that mandate.

One of the reasons we have so many people on social assistance is because they cannot find jobs anyway, Mr. Speaker, and they do not want to take the blame for that over there. They do not want to take the blame for the cutbacks because they talk about the millions of dollars they are spending.

One of these days, Mr. Speaker, maybe they will take the blame and be accountable to the people of this Province for the record they have. When it comes to the Department of Social Services, the good work that they are attempting to do, the social workers out there, is getting overrun by the number of people that they have to deal with.

So I would suggest to the minister and his officials, we are going to keep bringing this issue up as much as we can because it should be kept in the public eye out there, Mr. Speaker, because it is one issue that is a shocking statement for society in this Province today. It is time they dealt with it and it is time, Mr. Speaker, instead of giving \$800,000 to Lougheed up in Alberta, you took the \$800,000 and put it back in the Department of Social Services.

Thank you, 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 rise in my place in support of the petition so ably presented by the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), and would continue to support, for our part, all efforts to keep this issue in the public eye as the member said, and to hold the minister accountable.

This is an absolutely disgraceful situation that the minister is trying to deny as an issue. His approach to the issue when raised by the media and here in the House, is to simply disregard the concerns that are being brought forward and to suggest that there is not going to be any further strain placed on the social workers who are working across the Province, trying to cope with the difficulties that exist. These people are on the front line of providing human services to people who are on social assistance, people who are unable to find work over long periods of time, and people who are suffering the social ills of alcoholism and family violence. The people who work with these people, the people who are taking care of the people in our Province, and counselling and ministering to them, the social workers are now being asked to -

MR. HISCOCK:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:
The member for Stephenville got up and presented the petition, and the rules of the House that I know are that two members from the same side can support it, and one from the other side, mainly government. The member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) got up to support their petition and was not recognized. I am wondering if we are changing our Standing Orders.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order. The Standing Orders as far as petitions say that there is one speaker from each side. So I have recognized the hon. member for St. John's East as being on my right hand side, and then I will recognize someone on my left if they wish to speak.

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

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) was not paying attention, but clearly the member for Port de Grave was not on his feet as quickly to speak to the issue. I do not know if it is a matter of trying to deny the support that we are offering to the petition so ably presented, but I would continue to say that for our part we share the concerns that the official Opposition is bringing forward on this issue.

As I was saying, the situation that the social workers in this Province are being put in and are being asked to accept, namely the cutbacks in the numbers of people

who are working, taking care of people in this Province, is a terrible situation for the workers in the Social Services Department.

I have also been told, Mr. Speaker, that the suggestion by the minister that these are only temporary employees is simply not based on fact. In fact, I was talking to a woman in the city the other day who was one of the thirty-five who is being cut back. She had been working in the Department of Social Services for eight years. Now the question the minister must be obliged to address is what is the definition of temporary. If these are temporary workers who have been working in the Social Services Department, working as social workers for eight or nine years in this Province, and they are considered temporary, with no job security, no seniority for the years of work that they have put in, then that is a terrible situation. It speaks to the lack of respect that the minister and his department has for the people who are on the front lines.

I would say, in closing, Mr. Speaker, that we will be doing everything we can to continue to raise this issue and particularly in light of the other money that is being spent.

The Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) came in today and let us know that there was still \$4 million in his purse waiting for applications to come in for a private sector programme, and here we have the Minister of Social Services cutting back. It is unfair to the people who are losing their jobs. It is going to increase unemployment amongst social workers in this Province. It is

unfair to the people who will be left in those offices, having to carry the increased strain, and it is unfair to people who are on social assistance in this Province.

It clearly points out the contradiction in other statements by this government and from other ministers about what they are doing to generate employment in this Province. The priorities that completely turned around. There is a dogmatic allegiance to the private sector and absolutely no long term view, no sense of developing the human services in this Province to take care of people who are hurting and to show some respect for the social workers and other professionals who are on the front line taking care of the people. We will be continuing to call for the government to change its priorities.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I rise in my place as well to speak about a petition with respect to -

AN HON. MEMBER:
By leave?

MR. FUREY:
No, this is a new petition.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Is the hon. member presenting a new petition?

MR. FUREY:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
The weather must be getting to some of these people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my comments and voice the concerns of the undersigned fifty petitioners with respect to the significant cutbacks at the Department of Social Services. I concur with most speakers here today, particularly on this side of the House, that you can hardly cut back such an essential service without creating a negative ripple across that particular sector and that particular group of people that desperately need that service.

Mr. Speaker, I know for my own district in the district of St. Barbe where we have three particular offices under this agency of Social Services, one in Flowers Cove in the North, in Port Saunders in the Central part of the Northern section of my district and in Bonne Bay in the South, that all of these social workers, each in their own way, work extremely hard, in extremely trying and difficult circumstances, for long and tireless hours. If you include into that the travel and time that they are away from their homes to reach many parts of this rural riding, you know, you really and truly have to take your hats off to these people, Mr. Speaker.

They are good and dedicated civil servants and workers with an extremely hard job under trying circumstances and very nerve wrecking circumstances, in many cases, where they are trying to do their best to be sensitive and sensible in their adjudication of the needs of people who come under

the umbrella of Social Services. So, my hat goes off, Mr. Speaker, and we give on this side full commendation and merit and credit to all social workers in this Province who work in very difficult circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that this layoff which was announced recently by the minister responsible for Social Services, this removal of thirty-five good and competent and trained social workers from that division is bound to have a negative and detrimental effect on the service itself right across the Province.

Mr. Speaker, if you take those thirty-five jobs away, if you take away those people who are responsible for these significant case loads and add them to the numbers of social workers that are left behind, there is no doubt that there has to be an additional amount of pressure, and additional amount of frustration and aggravation by adding to their already overburdened case loads in some regards.

I think about the Bonne Bay Office where Mr. Seaward is currently the manager, and his social workers Mrs. Noel and Mrs. Parsons and Mr. Martin and other social workers, my God, they are working from daylight til evening trying to help all of the people who are burdened in that area with - and there is a high case load of social services which is directly proportional, Mr. Speaker, to the very significant and high unemployment rate. I mean we have to be very careful when we tamper with a department as sensitive as the Department of Social Services.

We see, Mr. Speaker, the

government coming under considerable criticism for the removal of these workers, because we are told it is not just thirty-five workers that have lost their jobs, but they are taking the knife out to pare back even further and maybe cut another thirty jobs. Just imagine if they cut another thirty social workers on top of the thirty-five social workers and add all of those case loads to an already overburdened group of individuals in our society who are trying to deal competently with the situation that they are faced with as is.

Mr. Speaker, I refer you to the chairperson of the Community Services Council, the Executive Director, Mrs. Rowe, who recently said the Provincial Department of Social Services must have been mismanaged in the past if it can layoff thirty-five social workers without changing the level of service. She alludes to, and I allude to and agree with this question: Is the department admitting that there were people not doing work and that is why they are removing them? Are they saying that these thirty-five never had anything to do? If they did not have anything to do, for just how long were we paying these people for doing nothing? The logic is absurd, Mr. Speaker. Of course they had something to do. Of course they had case loads. Of course they were part of the group that were burdened down, who were trying to be sensitive in an area that dictates and demands absolute sensitivity.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
By leave for a minute? By leave to conclude?

MR. WARREN:

No, no.

MR. FUREY:

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that the government ought to take a second look at this particular situation and be sensitive, unlike the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in my place this evening to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague from St. Barbe, and to make a couple of points that have been made, but you have to keep making them over and over again, Mr. Speaker, because the recent cutbacks in the Department of Social Services have had a major affect, not only in the area on the West Coast, the St. George area and the St. Barbe area, but also on Central and Eastern Newfoundland.

I have had a number of calls from the social workers in my district and in the district of Harbour Grave where the people are explaining that, yes, this cutback is causing a major problem with the already overburdened people in those offices. With the type of work that these social workers have to do, the day to day consultation with the people who are always demanding, and the type of living that they are on, I suppose some come to the point where they probably reach the burn

out point. This is a very serious thing, because the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) himself stood in the House the other day and one of the things he said was that the point of the layoffs was to cutback to save money.

Last year, in 1986, they hired them on because the social workers who were already there could not handle the case loads. Yet, at the same time, he very clearly said in answer to a question of mine, when I asked him if there were there as many people dependent on social services in 1987 as in 1986, and the minister very clearly said, yes, there are. As far as he could tell, there are possibly even more people dependent on social services this year over last year. So, for that reason alone, there is no justification for the thirty-five layoffs.

It is going to do several things to the people, Mr. Speaker. Just this morning I had a call from one particular social worker in connection with one of my constituents that I had called two weeks earlier for her to look into a problem with a young boy with down syndrome. She told me today very clearly, because of the recent cutbacks and because of the layoffs that her extra caseload has become so burdened that she has not been able to, for the past week, go to see this particular family and probably will not for another week. Now, the layoffs have only taken place over the past couple of weeks and already the caseloads are starting to pile up.

Now, my colleague from St. Barbe just alluded earlier to the fact that there is possibly going to be

another thirty jobs cut back in the Department of Social Services. This is what is coming out of the regional and district offices right now. I hope this is false information. If there is any consideration at all for any further cutbacks, well, the strain that it is going to put on those people, what you are going to see are those social workers will not be able to carry out their jobs and they are going to get confused and frustrated to the point where they are just going to throw down their jobs, either leave the position or they are just going to sit down and you are going to see the services in social service deteriorate in such a fashion that there is going to be mass and total frustration, not only among the social workers, but among the people who need the services themselves.

It does not take a mathematician to figure out where else the \$700,000 could be saved. I will give you one example. Just recently the Premier announced that there is a five-member committee going to be appointed to monitor government spending. Here is an example of where we have one of the largest cabinets in any provincial party or any provincial government in Canada with twenty-two cabinet ministers. We have a Department of Finance which is supposed to be capably run, and the genius of all finance ministers is suppose to be at the head of it, and Auditor General's Department, and here we are going to appoint a five-man committee which is going to cost the taxpayers of this Province an extra \$500,000 to tell the cabinet ministers and to tell the Department of Finance how to spend money.

MR. LONG:
Where to cut back.

MR. FUREY:
Where they are screwing up.

MR. EFFORD:
Where they are already shafting. I will not use the word my colleague for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) used.

To make matters worse, one of the people who are on that committee is the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs who we already saw last year - there had to be a task force or a committee set up to tell the Department of Municipal Affairs how to spend money. We saw an example again this year where 95 per cent of the money went to the Tory districts and about 5 per cent to the Liberal districts, so we see the committee that he is now on acting the same way. We can see the advantage that it is going to be to the monitoring of government spending and we can see exactly what is going to happen again in 1987.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there are many areas where the government could put their priorities in the right place and cut back on government spending instead of in the Department of Social Services. We, as the official opposition, implore the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) and all ministers to take this under consideration and not to layoff, and possibly even to hire back those already cutback.

MR. SPEAKER:
Before going to Orders of the Day,

I would like to say that there are two questions for the Late Show. One is from the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) who is not satisfied with the answer he has from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on pensions and the second is to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) from the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) who is not satisfied about the recruiting of personnel for the oil refinery.

Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, just a word of explanation. We are going to call Order No. 2, which is Committee of Supply. We were previously in Committee of Supply dealing with Consolidated Fund Services and, I believe, the Executive Council is also done in the Committee of the Whole. I did not happen to be here on that particular day. I think it was early April when we had a short period in Committee of the Whole on these various heads, so we will call Order No. 2, Committee of Supply and go into the adjourned consideration of Consolidated Fund Services.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Supply

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Chairman, I am going to first of all talk about an issue that is dear to the heart of the Chairman, the gentleman who represents so ably in this Chamber the district of Terra Nova, the gentleman who is showing promise, Mr. Chairman, of being a man who will one day soon follow the clarion call of his conscience and find himself seated with his political fellow travellers, the Liberals. Mr. Chairman, like most people in life, he wants or he has need of a straw to break the camel's back, as it were. I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, that the straw that breaks the camel's back for the gentleman for Terra Nova is Sprung. He is to be commended, I think you will agree, Mr. Chairman, for the restraint he has used on this particular matter. He knows more than he is saying out loud and he, like I, must find some real vindication from an item in **The Evening Telegram** today. I was just a little disappointed that my good friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), being the faithful scribe that he is, being one who directs our attention to every 't' that has not been crossed and every 'i' that has not been dotted, today he rose in the Chamber and he drew attention to something that was in **The Evening Telegram** which did not suit his fancy or, to take him at his word, on which he had been misquoted or misrepresented. Mr. Chairman, I wonder why that same member did not bring to our attention the

matter of **The Evening Telegram** lead editorial today, because this is most instructive on the subject before the Committee at the present time.

I believe if you reflect for a moment, Mr. Chairman, on what the member for Torngat Mountains did here this afternoon here at 3:00 p.m., he rose to correct an inaccuracy. The hon. gentleman from Torngat Mountains rose to correct an inaccuracy about something he had said and one must assume from that that he takes as gospel all the other things that were in today's paper.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Page if she would come here, because I have got something that every member of the House should have and I would ask her to place it on the benches of all the government members and the two gentlemen who sit down in the far corner to my right, but philosophically about ten miles to my left, thank God. I should ten say ten miles and thirty miles respectively to my left, 40 per cent of the caucus ten miles to my left, the other 60 per cent of that caucus sits thirty miles to my philosophic left. I should say to the members for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) and St. John's East (Mr. Long) that I pride myself on being a left-leaning Liberal, which must never be confused with being a confused socialist. A confused socialist - it is a misnomer. How can you be other than confused if you are a socialist? That is another issue, Mr. Chairman.

I want to draw the attention of the House to this particular editorial in **The Evening Telegram** today. I notice that no member on the government side rose to take exception to it, so we

must assume that they agree with the heading on it, that the media has been fair. I am sure that the gentleman for Terra Nova would agree with that. There are a couple of instructive things in this particular editorial which I think are worth reading into the record.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Who wrote that? Not that Mainlander.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, I did not know that the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) was into classifying journalists as being from Newfoundland or otherwise. Certainly that would not be a very fair categorization, I would assume. Some of my best friends are Mainlanders, I say to him.

But in this editorial here I love the third and last paragraph which says, "If the Premier has no better reason than he did Monday for calling a press conference, don't call us, we will call you." I suggest they might not call him soon, Mr. Chairman. They are grateful, just the same, that he did not call the press conference at five in the morning.

My, oh, my! What have we come to? This once promising Premier is now reduced to midnight musings, to four of the clock morning ravings. I say to the gentleman from Terra Nova, he has a lot on his conscience, you know. Imagine what he has done to his Premier to keep him awake at nights wrestling with the matter of his own sanity, writing statements saying, "Where did I go wrong?"

MR. BARRETT:

Give him credit. He is a hard

working man.

MR. SIMMONS:

The gentleman from Terra Nova is a hard working man. The gentleman from Terra Nova is, first of all, a gentleman, he is secondly a hard working man, and, thirdly, he deserves better treatment than he is getting on the Sprung deal. And he is as baffled as we are as to why that did not wind up out in Terra Nova or maybe out in Cormack, out in one of those places where they get some half decent weather, and which places are relatively near international airports if we are going to fly all this stuff to the United States and Japan and so on and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, some day the story on Sprung will come out. By that time, I would suggest the gentleman from Terra Nova will be sitting with his philosophic sole mates. I make that prediction. I do not want to reveal any confidences, any off the record chats, I just want to say that the gentleman from Terra Nova is about to do something momentous and, at the same time, something that he can live with the rest of his life.

In terms of process he might want to seek advice from the gentleman from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), or the gentleman from Torngat Mountains, both of whom could advise him on the considerable ramifications of making the Damascus Road trip.

Mr. Chairman, the other issue I wanted to talk about in these few remaining minutes is called the Dr. Doug House Royal Commission Report. And this really relates, this connects up very well with what I was saying about the gentleman from Terra Nova a minute

ago. If he feels abandoned on this issue of Sprung, his sole mate on this one is called Dr. Doug House. He now knows what Dr. House felt like after being abandoned so badly on the Royal Commission Report, where the taxpayers invested \$3 million, where Dr. House and his commissioners came up with some first-class recommendations about how to revitalize rural Newfoundland, including Terra Nova, and then not only was the report completely ignored, but we get Sprung and we get a number of job creation endeavours, all of which are urban oriented and which fly in the face of the House Commission Report as though the government even needed that report to tell them where the need is in this Province. And so I say to the gentleman from Terra Nova, perhaps one of those evenings, on a quiet evening before he makes that momentous move that I know he will make, he should first go and talk to Dr. Doug House, because there he would get a non-partisan view, a substantive view of what it is like to be completely abandoned by a bunch of opportunists who had pretended erstwhile that they were your political friends and supporters.

Sprung and the House Commission Report go hand in hand because, Mr. Chairman, the first is a complete contradiction of the second. Sprung is a complete rejection of everything that the House Report stands for; it is public testimony that the \$3 million invested in the House Commission Report was money absolutely wasted, thrown to the four winds.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, just a very brief word on this Sprung issue. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure what the Opposition is up to on this, quite frankly. I suggest that the reason why the official Opposition has been in opposition for so long is that they have no long term plan. Because if the Opposition had a long term plan that went beyond, say, a month, they would know that they are digging themselves into such a hole that when this venture is completed and comes off, they are going to have to try to eat all these words, where they have said the whole thing cannot work; it is nonsense, and all this sort of thing. They are clearly falling into a trap set for them by vested interests who are scared to death that Newfoundland is putting in place a totally new venture in the high-cost agricultural field, the high-cost type of product, the products that will not interfere with our traditional agricultural undertakings here, such as turnip, potatoes, cabbage, carrots and so on, or with livestock, milk production, egg production, and so on and so forth.

Now, how can one conceive that people ranging all the way across Canada are so concerned that the Newfoundland Government might be making a wrong investment? Has there ever been a concern expressed before by people when we

went into something, saying, 'Oh, we must protect the Newfoundland people from their government?' It has never happened before and it is not happening now. It is clearly ridiculous to think that the Minister of Agriculture in Nova Scotia, for instance, God bless him, is so concerned to protect Newfoundland people that he has to come out against this type of thing, or that the greenhouse owners in Ontario are so concerned about the welfare of the Newfoundland people that they came out and had to protest what the Newfoundland Government is doing. I mean, it is so clearly ridiculous to think that way, and the Opposition are going along with this.

Now, sooner or later they are going to have to try to explain these attitudes they are having, and they are inexplicable. They are going to get themselves into such a hole, as they did over the fishery restructuring, over our controversy with the Trudeau Liberals to get our rightful management place with regard to the offshore, and over many other things like that. They are killing themselves, they are cutting their own throats, they are their own worse enemies in these sorts of attitudes they are taking. I appeal to them, because we need an official Opposition in this Province which is a credible alternative. It is not really a credible Opposition if they are not a credible alternative to the government.

Now, with the attitude the Opposition is taking, they will never be looked upon as a credible alternative. With these sorts of foolish approaches, this sort of being taken in by vested interests who really have no concern, who

have no brief for the welfare of the Newfoundland people, what that means is that you end up with a government that will be here forever, and I do not think that is a good thing. We are going to be here well into the next millennium if the Opposition does not get its act together, does not evolve some long term strategy whereby they will not be continually caught out by taking short term, indefensible positions that blow up in their faces after a period of time.

MR. SIMMS:

What about the NDP position?

DR. COLLINS:

Well, I hesitate to talk about the NDP position because I do not think they have a position. At least the Liberals have their own sort of sense of short term survival in mind. We, on this side, have a very perceptive long term strategy and long term plans for the benefit of this Province. The NDP? You do not know what they are. This day they are going one way and another day they are going the other. The NDP are consistent in one thing: It does not matter what a law is, it does not matter what an arrangement is, it does not matter what an agreement is, if they suddenly decide we do not like it, they are going to take an entirely self-centered view. For instance, a clear example: It was illegal to have a strike in the public service without the designation of essential workers. That was written into the law. Now, you may not agree with it, but it was written into the law. In our society you abide by the law unless the law is changed and, if you do not like it, you work to change the law.

Now, that was written into the law and the leader of the NDP did not agree with it. Did he try to change to it and that was the approach he took? No, he defied it. Now, if you defy laws you have anarchy. But the NDP are consistent this way. They are totally self-centered. They will take a position that has nothing to do with the understandings in society, with the obligations in society, with the statutory instruments we put in place for the conduct of society, they will take a totally self-centered view of things and that is consistent. I have to say that for the NDP, they are consistent in that approach. Now, it is consistently bad, of course, for the running of society. And God forbid that the NDP would ever take over in this Province, because they will do what they did when the equivalent of the NDP took over in Britain, i.e., the labour group there, the socialists there. They ran it into the ground.

MR. BAIRD:

And in British Columbia.

DR. COLLINS:

In British Columbia they did the same thing. In Manitoba, one of the more mixed, better economies in the country, they are now looked upon as the most underfinancially managed province in Canada. Their debt is skyrocketing. The credit rating agencies are tearing their hair out over the management of the economy in Manitoba. So, I am just saying that because they have no concept of the ordering of society but only take a very short-term, self-centered, navel-watching view, they are a menace. But I am sure the good people of Newfoundland will not allow themselves to be taken in by

such a menace.

But I am concerned about the Liberals, because the Liberals are the natural alternative in this Province and they getting themselves into such holes with these short-term policies that blow up in their faces that I am afraid they will never be in a position to challenge us seriously.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. FUREY:
How much time is left?

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The time is up.

MR. FUREY:
Just a quick point, Mr. Chairman. It is almost laughable to hear the Minister of Finance talk about and use the word 'credibility'. He talks about credibility and his dynasty that the Tories will have in this particular Province. He should know that dynasty comes from the Greek 'dynastites' which means supreme ruler, and a ruler is one who controls rather than serves people.

But I want to ask the Minister of Finance while he is talking about the word 'credibility', perhaps in his own way he can stand in this Chamber and define credibility in terms of current account deficits. Perhaps he could tell us why he, the man responsible for paying the light bill for Newfoundland and Labrador, has overrun that by \$172 million. If that is the kind of credibility we have to look forward to, God help us all in this Province.

DR. COLLINS:
We could turn out the lights.

MR. FUREY:
What kind of fiscal mismanagement, what kind of convoluted thinking, what kind of Arabas are you using to add your numbers up on that particular side of the House? I mean, my God, when your light bill and your general maintenance - repairs etc. - bills across this Province were predicted and projected to be \$40 million and escalate to \$172 million - can you imagine? - and he has the gall to attack to attack my socialist friend down there and to attack the Official Opposition.

Imagine having the gall to even let the word credibility drop from his lips. It is ridiculous!

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:
I wonder how he can even look at himself in the mirror.

On motion, Consolidated Fund Services, total carried.

On motion, Executive Council, total carried.

On motion, Legislative, total carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. GREENING:
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters

to them referred and have passed without amendment the estimates of expenditure of Consolidated Fund Services, Executive Council, and Legislative, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, on Order 3 the time is up but we need to move the Concurrence Motion, Government Services Committee.

On motion, Concurrence Motion, Government Services Committee, carried.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, Order 9. Bill No. 10.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Veterinary Medical Act, 1971." (Bill No. 10)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I guess this bill, in terms of what we do in the House of Assembly, could be considered a housekeeping item but it is a very important item for the Newfoundland and Labrador Veterinary Medical Association. The request, as explained in the bill, is that we reduce the quorum which presently exists in our act so that the association can have meetings. The present quorum is 50 per cent plus one. They have requested that we reduce that quorum so that they could more conveniently have their annual meetings and conduct the business of their association.

Mr. Speaker, we have approximately twenty-eight vets in this Province and, because of the nature of their business, it is very difficult for all of them to get together at the one time. They are spread all over the Province. The way our vets work in this Province, especially the ones who work with my department, is if one leaves their practice, they are usually covered by a second vet so that if any emergencies come up, they will be looked after.

Mr. Speaker, the association has requested this, and a council of the association recommends a figure of about seven for a quorum. You will note that the amendment suggests that "At any meeting of the association a quorum is required to conduct business and a quorum shall exist if: six members of council and at least one other member of the association are present; or ten or more members of the association are present. That would be the change brought about by the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it is to allow them to operate their association more efficiently, and it is a request from the Veterinary Association. I could have this letter copied and sent around for anyone who would like to see it. I move second reading.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a brief comment on Bill 10. I understand, of course, the point being made by the minister, that,

as in any association or any group, it is very difficult, especially with such large numbers, to conduct the business if you have difficulty in being able to seat a quorum at any given time, and it is frustrating for those members who wish to conduct business and who are able to make scheduled meetings.

The only thing I would have liked to have seen, or that the minister might have considered from the point of view of just strengthening the amendment only, would be if there were some way that wording could have reflected that when they are talking about, 'and if a quorum does not exist - the figures under the new amendment - 'the meeting shall be deferred to a later date,' which, of course, is basically the same as it is now, except that the amendment is reducing the quorum and, therefore, increasing the chances of having a meeting in which business can be conducted.

It is too bad there could not have been some wording there that would say, 'and wherever possible that the rescheduled meeting would be not more than thirty days from the previously scheduled meeting in which they could not conduct business'. I make that as my only suggestion. There is certainly nothing negative about the amendment, from my point of view, which would indeed allow the veterinarians of our Province to conduct their business for the good of our population.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Veterinary Medical Act, 1971," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 10)

MR. SIMMS:

Order 12. Bill No. 11.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Encouragement And Regulation Of An Aquaculture Industry In The Province." (Bill No. 11)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to introduce for second reading today Bill No. 11, respecting the encouragement and regulation of an aquaculture industry in the Province. We, in the Department of Fisheries, began, I guess, probably two or two and a half years ago to try to encourage the development of an aquaculture industry in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Of course, for us in this Province, it was a new venture. Up until two or three years ago, there had not been very much work done on aquaculture in the Province and, as we began to encourage the development of aquaculture, we very quickly began to find out that - there were people who wanted to get involved in aquaculture activity, whether it was mussel farming, or salmon grow-outs, or trout farming or whatever - there was really no legislative framework existing in one place to encourage and enhance development of that particular industry. In fact, there were various regulatory regimes, both in the Department of Fisheries, in Forest Resources and Lands, in Environment, in Federal Fisheries and Oceans, in Federal Environment, you name it, there were a half dozen regulatory regimes under which people had to go for individual licences and all of that kind of thing.

As we began to develop the framework for an industry, we also began to develop the framework for an act, an act that will hopefully have one-stop shopping in terms of anybody who is interested from a regulatory perspective, that is, and anybody who is interested in getting into the aquaculture industry in Newfoundland and Labrador. And that is what this act does: it places legislatively in the Department of Fisheries the one-stop shopping approach whereby all of the regulatory regimes and all of the regulations and licencing and everything else will be brought together under this one particular act, under the Provincial Department of Fisheries.

We have also been able and have been successful in negotiating with the Government of Canada a delegation of authority from the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans to the Provincial Government, and we will be signing an MOU in that regard over the next few weeks. But negotiations are completed and are incorporated in this act - the delegating of authority over aquaculture activity from the Government or Canada, or any authority that they might have, to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador for enforcement in this Province.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, worthy of notice is that the aquaculture industry in Canada, certainly in Eastern Canada, is as new to most provinces as it is to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and we are the first jurisdiction to move in a comprehensive way to bring in an act that will hopefully encourage and enhance the further growth of this industry.

In doing that, Mr. Speaker, we

tried to consult - when I say, we, my department - with everybody who would have any interest whatsoever in this Province in the aquaculture industry. In fact, there were eighty-eight separate consultations made with individuals and groups in all parts of Newfoundland and Labrador; every development association were asked to submit their views on the draft act.

The Marine Institute, the university, the Aquaculture Society, the Newfoundland and Labrador Rural Development Council, all of them, those who were involved in the industry itself, and what we see here today, Mr. Speaker, is an act that has the total support, as far as I know, of everybody who has had any involvement in the industry or intends to have any involvement in the industry. It has been total, wide open consultation with all those groups, and various drafts and various changes have been made to this legislation before it came here to the House of Assembly as a result of that widely spread consultation among eighty-eight individuals and groups.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important piece of legislation. I might not appear to be so today, because we are into a very developmental phase of the aquaculture industry in Newfoundland and Labrador. But as we go down the road in this industry and as it is proven, as the scientific and developmental bugs are worked out of aquaculture in Newfoundland, as we are able to better develop strains to deal with our particular water temperatures, with our salinity problems, as we are better able to deal with diseases and things of that nature, then I think down the

road this piece of legislation will hopefully be a very important piece of legislation. I am briefly going to run through the various clauses and highlight certain things in certain of the clauses, Mr. Speaker.

Clause 2 in the act is the Definitions Clause which defines what is meant by the various terms in the piece of legislation. I will tell the House now that there are a couple of minor wording changes that will require an amendment to this piece of legislation that I will be introducing when we get to Committee, in third reading, and one of them is in clause 2.

In clause 2 at the moment in the definition of aquaculture is says: "'aquaculture' means the cultivation of aquatic plants or animals up to the point of their release, and includes sea ranching, but does not include..." and going on from there. It is my intention to move that that be amended to read: 'aquaculture means the cultivation of aquatic plants or animals and includes sea ranching,' so that after the release is done you are not involved in sea ranching. It puts the definition backwards and we want to, according to the legal expertise, bring it forward rather than having it defined after the fact, as is the case in the present wording of clause 2 (a).

The rest of the definitions are pretty clearly set, Mr. Speaker, and I just wanted to highlight that one because there is a very minor wording change in the amendment that I have referred to.

Clause 3 defines the purpose of the Act and, of course, as I indicated, the purpose is to

regulate and hopefully encourage and enhance the development of an aquaculture industry in the Province.

Clause 4 deals with aquaculture licences for carrying on aquaculture activity in the Province and defines the specific type of licences that are required and how they can be obtained. Regulations on sites and all that kind of thing are all defined in clause 4 of this piece of legislation.

We also deal with, in clause 5, personal property rights. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very important part of this particular piece of legislation. There was a lot of legal discussion on whether this should be considered personal property or civil property, and with the best legal advice available to us, in an effort to grant the best possible protection to individuals who will hopefully invest in the aquaculture industry in this Province, we have opted for personal property right protection so that the animals, the fish or whatever are deemed to be the personal property of the individual licensee, of the individual farmer. This is also deemed to be the case as long as those fish are within, in terms of the legislation, 100 meters of the boundary of the site. That is important because, as members may know, it is quite possible that there could be a break in the cages or the nets and some of the fish may wander off. But it is the experience of other jurisdictions that the fish tend to stay very close to the cages because they are used to being fed. So it is not because there happened to be a break in the mesh and few fish get out and stay around the periphery of the cage

that somebody else can say that is now public property. In fact, as long as they are in within 100 meters of the site, they are deemed to be the personal property of the particular farmer.

Section 6 deals with the inspections and gives in detail the rights of inspectors under this act and under those regulations to enter onto the farm site. This does not include a person's personal dwelling, by the way, but onto the equipment and the buildings and the site that is used for conducting the farming to ensure that the farm is being operated within the proper regulatory frameworks, and to make sure that disease is controlled in an attempt to prevent any spread of fish diseases and so on.

So all the duties relating to inspection are outlined in Section 6 and, as we go through the debate, if there is any particular section or sub-section here that a member has a question about, then, of course, I will be delighted to answer it.

Section 7 deals with the reporting of diseases, makes it mandatory to report the outbreak of any diseases or parasites to the inspector and to the minister. Obviously we do not want a major spread of fish diseases, particularly in the area where there may be a lot of farms.

Section 8 deals with the introduction and transfer and transport of fish so that we can control the bringing of fish into the Province, or from one part of the Province to another.

Section 9 allows the minister to designate a person in the Department of Fisheries to be the

Registrar of Aquaculture so that all of the development plans, the licencing, all things of that nature can be controlled through the registrar.

Section 10 allows for the appointing of committees of officials to advise the minister on appropriate laws, regulations, policies and programmes related to the further development of aquaculture.

Section 11 is really the important section in this bill, I guess, Mr. Speaker, in that it defines the type of regulations that can be made under this particular act, and it is the regulations in this kind of industry that probably have the meat in them, more than the bill itself.

Section 11 details the type of regulations that will be permitted to be made under this act for the development, the encouragement and the building of an aquaculture industry in Newfoundland and Labrador.

The other minor amendment that will have to be made, Mr. Speaker, will be in Section 11 (e) of this bill where it says, 'The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may prescribe the use, content and enforcement of management plans for sites.' 'Management plan' is a typographical error. It is supposed to read 'development plan'. As we get into Committee, I will be proposing that very minor amendment there, because there was a typographical or a printing error when the bill was being printed.

Section 12 deals with prohibitions under this act. Section 13 deals with penalties for offenses under the act. Sections 15, 16, 17, and

18 are other consequential amendments that must be made to other acts like the Department of Fisheries Act, and so on, The Oyster Fishery Act, which was introduced years ago, The Trout Fishery Act, and Section 18 is the Commencement of the act.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the gist of this piece of legislation. I think it is a very important piece of legislation. Hopefully the importance of it will be more realized down the road, as the aquaculture industry gets off the ground and gets further developed in this Province. I am therefore pleased to move second reading.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
I adjourn the debate. We will pick it up tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER:
It is 5:30 p.m. We will adjourn this debate. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition would like to move that.

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I thought I just did move the adjournment of the debate until tomorrow morning as you recognized me to speak on the bill. Is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER:
It is now five-thirty, so according to our Standing Orders we move into our Late Show at this stage.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition adjourned the debate.

Late Show

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek is not satisfied with the answer he got from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on pensions.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, the provincial government here, unlike other provincial governments in this country, unlike the federal government, has taken advantage of a change in the way in which Canada Pension Plans are being paid to people to virtually take from their pensioners, between the ages of sixty to sixty-five, thousands and thousands of dollars that they have no moral right whatsoever to take.

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable that our government, among all the governments of Canada, should be the ones who would take this particular road. The Public Service Pension Plan is, as the minister said this afternoon, an integrated plan. That is true. The idea would be if you retire at age sixty you would receive your full provincial pension eligible at that time and then when the Canada Pension Plan cut in at age sixty-five, it would be reduced because you would have more Canada Pension Plan and Old Age Pension benefits in order to stack up on top of it.

So our legislation was written with that clearly in mind, that at age sixty-five it would be reduced. Other provinces have the

same kind of integrated plan. They wrote their legislation slightly differently, but basically the idea was that you would need a bit more prior to age sixty-five because you did not have CPP or Old Age Pension to rely on.

Now what happens? The Canada Pension Plan was changed on January 1 of this year. How was it changed? All that was done was it allowed you to retire five years earlier or five years later. You did not get more money in total, because if you retired five years earlier you lost 30 per cent of your Canada Pension Plan. If you retired five years later, you would get 30 per cent more. So the idea was it was spread out longer. There was no additional benefit, no additional premiums, nothing, and particularly no additional contribution by the provincial government to anything that was going on here. What this government did, unconscionably back in January, was decide that because our legislation was worded awkwardly and could be misinterpreted, and it was, they have decided to go and steal thousands and thousands of dollars from the individual pensioners who are under the age of sixty-five. That, Mr. Speaker, is unconscionable.

All the rest of the provinces in Canada, and we have checked all but two at this point, have decided that the pensioners should receive the total amount between age sixty and sixty-five, that no reduction would occur. The federal government has decided in its wisdom that even though it has an integrated plan, it would not take the money back.

Mr. Speaker, what is even more

morally reprehensible is that the M.H.A. Pension Plan, which covers all of us hopefully eventually, and covers the Minister of Finance, was not reduced if you are receiving a pension between age sixty and sixty-five, because the legislation sets it up differently. Mr. Speaker, to look at another group in this Province, the teachers in this Province, whose pension plan is also not integrated, also did not receive any reduction between the ages of sixty and sixty-five as well.

It is only the unfortunate public employees in this Province who are covered by the Public Service Pension Plan, and I think the Uniform Service Pension Plan as well. So, Mr. Speaker, it is morally wrong for this government to take money from these pensioners under a legal fiction when no other provinces have done it, and to take it despite the fact that it has done nothing to contribute to the changes that occurred in the Canada Pension Plan.

Mr. Speaker, there are tens of thousands of public employees in this Province who are extremely upset that this government has decided to take these thousands of dollars from the pensioners and put it in its own coffers without having earned one cent of it.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I ask is that this government live up to the obligations and the sense of morality displayed by the other governments in Canada and make sure that they stop taking this money away from their pensioners.

Mr. Speaker, there is a slightly related item I just want to put in which I had hoped to be able to put in on a supplementary question

but I did not get a chance to ask it. The private pension plans in this Province are also under attack. Our private pension legislation has to be changed in order to protect private pensioners who have the same kind of bridging prior to age 65 and receive additional benefits. These individuals can now have their employer come down and if their plan is written the same way as the Public Service Pension Plan to allow this kind of deduction, private individuals can lose some of their benefits as well. I was going to ask the minister why does he not change that legislation in order to protect the private pension plans as well because these ones are also under attack.

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, we have just seen an absolutely typical example of what I call the NDP mentality. It is morally unjustified, it is law, it is past, it is a statute. The statute says that when a person becomes eligible for CPP benefits, because the plans are integrated, whether they becomes eligible because of early retirement, medical disability, or whatever reason, his benefits from the provincial side of his aggregated plan diminish because he is getting the CPP thing. That is law. That was understood when it was made law. It is still law until we bring in this Bill.

So, for the hon. member to get up and say it is an immoral thing and you should not do it, it is law! This what the NDP does not pay any attention to. It does not matter what law is in place. It does not

matter what agreement is in place. It does not matter what the obligations on the other side are because, of course, the other side of the question is, because they are integrated, the contributions are less.

We could disintegrate the two plans, no problem, except we would have to go to the people in the public service and say, 'You are not going to pay 4.2 per cent of your salary for the provincial part of your retirement, you are going to have to pay 6, 7 or 8 per cent to fund the provincial part of your final retirement salary.' It is an obligation that we took on when we said we would integrate and therefore we would diminish, as you became eligible, and it was an obligation they took on that we would pay a diminished contribution because of this integration. Now, for the hon. member to get up there -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I only have a few minutes -

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave.

DR. COLLINS:

- but it is important that we bring these things out.

I received a letter from the hon. member dated April 8 and he says in his own sanctimonious way, in part, 'You have arbitrarily, though legally,' note that, 'you have arbitrarily, though legally reduced the pensions' and so on and so forth. Now, Mr. Speaker, I replied and I will give my reply in a moment.

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that he has quoted one line from the letter. I ask him to table the letter now in accordance with the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

The hon member was the author of another document in regard to this thing. This infamous news release. In the release it states, in part, 'The provincial government since January of 1987 has been stealing from their pensioners by reducing without legislative authority.'

In one letter you are doing it legally, on the same point, you are doing it without legislative authority. Now, there is a clear and unmistakable difference of fact. They both cannot be true. We cannot be doing it legally and otherwise doing it without legislative authority. One of these documents is a lie. They came from the same author and they are totally adverse to one another, so one must be a lie. Now, that is typical, of course, of what I say is the NDP mentality.

Mr. Speaker, I replied to the original letter and I laid it out in detail. I do not mind tabling this. I said the other day if the point of privilege had been

entertained, I would be willing to. I laid out in detail all about the integration, about the lower contribution rate, all about the thing where once the eligibility factor came in, the reduction factor came in, all clearly laid out there. There is nothing about stealing and all that sort of thing justified in this. It is clearly according to the statute.

And funnily enough, and the NDP does not understand that, most people abide by laws. Now, if they do not like laws, they go about changing them through the democratic process. They do not get up and make slanderous statements to confuse people and to rile up people and to try to get people out in the streets to do something to the law. They do not defy laws, even though you may have a responsibility as a legislator yourself; you do not go out and openly defy laws. This is the way to anarchy.

If we cannot depend on our laws and we cannot depend on the way we normally set about changing laws, but we do it through terror, and we do it through vilification, and we do it through mistruths, which is typical of the NDP approach to these matters, we are in for anarchy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Bellevue is not satisfied with the answer he got from the hon. the Minister of Labour on recruiting personnel for the oil refinery.

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen opposite are telling me this will be my last speech because I am going to be gone after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, if I can have the attention of my colleagues on this side and opposite, my friends and colleagues on both sides of the Legislature, I want to talk about the Come By Chance Oil Refinery and what has been going on there since - well, since the new year came in actually things have been going on there. The Premier made his blow your mind statement back on October 27, a blow your mind statement that Come By Chance would be reactivated. They said it could not be done. He was talking about his colleagues of course who said it could not be done, including the backbench colleague, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and others, of his colleagues.

The Liberals always said when Joey Smallwood had that idea and put the refinery there seventeen years ago, we always had the idea that it should and would work, Mr. Speaker.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to get on to today is this: Why is it that Newfoundland Energy, Newfoundland Processing, which is the same company, why is it that they are advertising in Fort McMurray, in Calgary, and in Toronto? They are recruiting ninety operators and fifty

maintenance personnel to operate that refinery once it starts operation, hopefully in another month or so.

Mr. Speaker, there are two addresses given in the ad where people can send applications. But, a recruitment officer followed the ad, Mr. Speaker. There was a recruitment officer, for example, in the Ramada Inn in Fort McMurray, I do not know how many gentlemen opposite have stayed in the Ramada Inn in Fort McMurray, but this gentleman by the name of Bob Hodgison,

MR. BAIRD:

Same as the disease.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, this gentleman interviewed candidates out there.

Now, this morning, Mr. Speaker, I talked to a lady in my district who has five sons who are presently employed in Fort McMurray, five sons. Naturally, like all mothers, she would like to have her sons back home in the district of Bellevue. Like all Newfoundlanders, her five sons in Fort McMurray would also like to be back home living in the district of Bellevue, one of the finest districts in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. The Premier was born there.

But, Mr. Speaker, that same lady also has sons who are now presently living in the district of Bellevue and who formerly worked at the refinery at Come By Chance. These gentlemen are now walking the roads. We do not have streets in Bellevue, we have roads, a lot of them dirt and potholey, but these gentlemen, her other sons, are unemployed. They were former employees of the

refinery prior to March of 1976 when the refinery closed.

So, Mr. Speaker, the question that I have to ask is, why is it that these gentlemen cannot seem to get any information? I do not know if anybody in the Legislature has phoned Newfoundland Energy down in the Royal Trust Building in recent days as I have. There is no way to get any information. You try to get information from the refinery and you get as far as the security and you are turned back. It is worse than the Boys' Home at Whitbourne, worse as far as trying to get the boys in there trying to get out. Nobody can get into the refinery to go and see Tony Curtis, for example, who is in charge of hiring out there and whose name, by the way, was also in this ad which appeared in the paper in Fort McMurray. **McMurray Today** is the name of the newspaper in which this ad appeared. Tony Curtis was one name that was given for people to contact and mail their applications to.

MR. WARREN:
Tony Curtis, sure he is on T.V.

MR. CALLAN:
There is another Tony Curtis, the Boston Strangler I think he played the role of but this is another gentleman.

Why is it, I ask the minister opposite, that local people - not necessarily from Bellevue, they could be from a thirty mile radius, they could be Clarenville, they could be from the member's district opposite, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), for example, they could be from his district, they could be down in Terrenceville or Monkstown - why are local people not hired?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:
Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Why is it that this company is allowed to go out to Ontario and Alberta advertising for personnel when we have them here in our own Province? If they are not trained, why is it, Mr. Speaker, that a training process was not started to re-train these gentlemen after the Premier made his announcement on October 27, that is seven months ago, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would not want the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) to think that I do not want to answer his question or anything like that but I would want to point out to him that it did occur to me to remind him when he asked the question this afternoon that technically it is a question for the Minister of Career Development of Advanced Studies. I just wanted to let him know what the structure of government is like. Mr. Power's department is responsible for employment. They have an Employment Services Division.

Nevertheless, I guess it has implications for labour unrest and I have no problem with answering it. I do have a problem, Mr. Speaker, with the idea that I

asked the hon. member for Bellevue what the name of the newspaper was where the job was advertised or that obviously he had a copy of an advertisement that he could let me have a copy of it to give me a lead because I was very anxious to get information on it to investigate it and to find out the validity of that statement. He has been quoting from a slip of paper over there but he informs me that he did not in fact have a copy of any advertisement in any paper in Fort McMurray and that it was telephone information.

So in reality, Mr. Speaker, although it is rather hypothetical and I am not sure what the substance of the question is, I can only tell the hon. gentleman that it is in the process of being investigated. Obviously we have to trace the source of it. The first time I heard of it is when he asked me the question in the House today.

Now, it does bother me somewhat though, Mr. Speaker, that during his remarks in the question today he referred to the big, bad company at Come By Chance, you know, that were out there not employing Newfoundlanders. I find it difficult to comprehend that because there are in excess of 550 Newfoundlanders, many of them from the hon. gentleman's district, working on the project out there now.

I have another point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker. Some time ago in *The Sunday Express* the aspiring leader of his party came out and referred to the hopeless economic situation in this Province. He said that he did not blame it totally on the Premier because the economic situation throughout Canada and the world

was pretty bad. But he said he did blame the Premier for not inducing outside capital to come to Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and the government has brought a company into Come By Chance and there are 550 jobs out there, Newfoundland jobs. This government has brought an operator in for the mill in Corner Brook, Kruger; Come By Chance, as I have just said; most recently Sprung, not to take too much time, all for technology and employment.

It seems to be somewhat incompatible, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member would, in asking the question - if in fact they are seeking employees in another Province, in Calgary - would somewhat derogate the project that is going on in Come By Chance almost in contrast to what his aspiring new leader is saying, that we are not trying to bring any new capital into the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I will simply say that I will most definitely have this matter thoroughly examined. Obviously, I do not want to minimize or have the hon. member think that we would condone any company, not just the company at Come By Chance, but any company in this Province going outside to another province and recruiting employees with the unemployment situation that we have in Newfoundland.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will have the matter traced and checked out, and I will report to the House later.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

It is moved and seconded that the House to now adjourn.

All those in favour, 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against, 'Nay'.

Carried.

The House stands adjourned until
10:00 a.m. tomorrow.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

May 28, 1987



*Tabled by Hon.
Minister of Transportation
28 May, 1987*

GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Minister
Telephone: 576-3641

ST. JOHN'S

MR. SPEAKER:

IN ANSWER TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN. THE QUESTIONS FROM THE MEMBER FOR BELLEVUE REGARDING HIRING PROCEDURES AT GOVERNMENT AIR SERVICES IN TERMS OF THE NUMBER OF NEWFOUNDLAND PILOTS ON STAFF; THE NUMBER OF FEMALE PILOTS ON STAFF; AND, THE NUMBER OF GRIEVANCES FILED REGARDING PILOT HIRING.

GOVERNMENT AIR SERVICES CURRENTLY HAS 23 PILOTS ON STAFF. 2 VACANCIES ARE BEING FILLED WITH INTERVIEWS BEING SCHEDULED FOR THIS WEEK. ACCORDING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PERSONNEL FILES, 22 OF THE PILOTS RESIDED IN THIS PROVINCE AT THE TIME OF HIRING AND 1 WAS A NON-RESIDENT. NO FEMALE PILOTS ARE EMPLOYED BY THE GOVERNMENT AIR SERVICES.



*Tabled by Hon. Minister of
Transportation, 28 May '87*

GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Minister
Telephone: 576-3641

ST. JOHN'S

IN REFERENCE TO QUESTIONS RE: GRIEVANCES AT GOVERNMENT AIR SERVICES - 1

GRIEVANCE HAS BEEN FILED BY A PILOT AT AIR SERVICES WHO APPLIED FOR A CAPTAIN'S
POSITION AND WAS UNSUCCESSFUL. 1 COMPLAINT HAS BEEN LODGED WITH THE DEPARTMENT
AS A RESULT OF AN EXTERNAL APPLICATION FOR A PILOT'S POSITION WHICH WAS
UNSUCCESSFUL.