



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 69

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas

Wednesday

6 July 1988

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, during the past number of weeks, Government has introduced a number of significant social policy initiatives that will bring lasting benefits to public employees in our province

I refer, of course, to a pension plan for part-time employees and the introduction of equal pay for work of equal value. As you are aware, we have recently successfully negotiated an agreement for the implementation of pay equity within the Public Service. I am sure all hon. members will agree that these initiatives are very positive.

Today, I am pleased to announce another major social policy initiative which Government has had under active consideration for a period of time. I refer to the Political Activity of Public Employees.

Newfoundland and Labrador, and all other jurisdictions across Canada, have traditionally preserved the political neutrality of their public services by restricting the political rights of individual public employees. The guidelines by which we have been directed date back some thirteen years, to 1975. Once considered to be fair, these guidelines no longer reflect the realities of our post Charter

society, nor the realities of what is occurring in other jurisdictions across Canada.

Government recognized that the time had come to review our own policy to ensure that its restrictions were warranted and legitimate. Therefore, some months ago, Cabinet directed me, in my capacity as President of Treasury Board, to undertake a complete assessment of our policy and to recommend appropriate changes. In undertaking this review, I was asked to ensure that an appropriate balance was reached between two basic interests:

(1) the right of the public to be served by a politically neutral public service; and

(2) the right of individual public employees to exercise their democratic rights and freedoms.

I directed an intensive internal review, assessed trends across the country, and consulted with various interest groups, including the Human Rights Commission, Government Managers Association and union leaders who had expressed an interest in this issue. As a result, Government has approved a number of changes to the policy on political activity for public employees. We consider that the new policy achieves a balance between public and individual interests.

Government's new approach recognizes two groups of employees: those whose responsibilities must restrict them from engaging in political activities; and those who need to have few restrictions placed upon them.

The vast majority of employees

will be politically nonrestricted, and I am pleased to announce today that all bargaining unit employees will, in future, no longer be required to resign their positions in order to run for federal or provincial elected office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Rather, Mr. Speaker, they will be granted unpaid leave of absence from their positions, and will be required to resign only if they are elected. In addition, the period of time involved will not be considered to be a break in service.

The politically restricted group includes management and nonbargaining unit employees. Government has decided that, in order to protect the political neutrality of the Public Service, existing provisions will be maintained with respect to this group. However, a further review will be undertaken immediately to ensure that as few employees as possible, in that grouping, have their political activities restricted.

Therefore, until this review is completed, all management and nonbargaining unit employees, who wish to seek federal or provincial elected office, will still be required to resign their positions. However, the following new provisions will apply to those to ensure that they who do not get elected receive fair and impartial consideration for re-instatement to their former positions:

(1) No action will be taken to fill their positions until the election results are finalized;

(2) Candidates will now apply directly to the Chairman of the Public Service Commission for reinstatement to their former positions; and

(3) The period of time involved will not be considered to be a break in service.

The new policy on political activity also clearly enunciates certain standards which are designed to protect both the public interest and the individual public employees. These standards include the following, Mr. Speaker:

No employees shall in any manner be compelled to take part in any political undertaking, or to make any contribution to any political party, or be in any manner threatened or discriminated against for refusing to take part in any political activity;

No employee shall directly or indirectly use, or seek to use, the authority or official influence of their positions to control or modify the political actions of any other person;

No employee shall, during the course of their hours of work, engage in any form of political activity;

No employee shall at any time take part in political activities as to impair their usefulness to the positions in which they are employed; and

All politically nonrestricted employees, which I have described earlier, will have the right and freedom to participate in any election campaign, and all employees will have the right to attend public political meetings, make contributions to the parties

of their choice during elections and, of course, have the right to vote in any election.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I have been directed by Cabinet to ensure that all public employees working in government departments are made aware of these provisions. In that respect, we will be sending a brochure to all of the employees in the Province. Furthermore, I will be contacting all Crown Corporations, Boards, Commissions, and Agencies to acquaint them with the directions which government is taking, and encourage them to implement similar policies. Necessary regulatory and legislative changes will be made to implement the new policy.

Mr. Speaker the issue of Political Activity by public employees is an important one for all concerned. We are convinced that our approach to such a serious issue is one that is fair and equitable, both to the people of this Province and to its public employees. Indeed, this is, as I said, another significant major social policy initiative that is of extreme importance to all our Provincial Public Employees, and one that this government is very proud to announce today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we welcome the announcement made today by the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Simms). It is, as he says, a significant and major social

policy initiative, but, I would say to the President of Treasury Board, it is long overdue. It is something the unions in this Province, particularly those people who represent public employees in the Province, have been pushing for for sometime.

MR. POWER:

They were not even allowed to have a union when you were in power.

MR. TULK:

Is the hon. gentleman feeling nasty about something today? If he is, I will send him over a candy.

It is something that is long overdue, and it is something that unions representing public employees in this Province have been pushing for for some years. I notice with interest that the ministers says, 'Once considered to be fair, these guidelines no longer reflect the realities of our post Charter society.' That is true, and I suppose today is as good a time as any to pay tribute to a great libertarian, by the name of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, for seeing that that Charter was put in place in this country. I think we should go on record as doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I just have a couple of questions I would like the minister to address at some point.

MR. BAIRD:

What do you think we have Question Period for?

MR. TULK:

'At some point,' I said, old landslide from Humber West.

'The politically restricted group includes management and nonbargaining unit employees,' he

says. At some point, I would like him to address why nonbargaining unit employees are exempt from the policy he is now putting in place. I would point out to him that a lot of those people are in junior positions in the civil service and, to me, there seems to be no justification for leaving those people within the boundary whereby they are not enabled to get involved in political activity. He says, 'A further review will be undertaken immediately to ensure that as few employees as possible have their political activities restricted.'

MR. SIMMS:

Including those you just mentioned.

MR. TULK:

I know, including those I just mentioned.

I wonder how long that is going to take. I hope it is done before the next election is called, because the hon. gentleman and his party are famous for making certain commitments on the eve of an election, which I suspect we are trying to build up to now. They are famous for making statements before elections, particularly to labour people in this Province, and as soon as the elections are called and over with, then they try to revert back to something else. Of course, I say to the hon. gentleman, that will not be a problem after this election, because they will be sitting over here and we will be sitting over there, and we, indeed, will implement those kinds of social policies.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we welcome this statement, and particularly we welcome the statement that people will not be threatened or discriminated

against for refusing to take part in any political activity, or, indeed, for taking part in any political activity. In view of what we have seen - in the past, we have seen cases where Social Services officers have been forced by the present government of this Province to deliver cheques to welfare people in this Province - we hope that that kind of pressure will be alleviated by those types of guidelines that we are now seeing. We also hope that if people decide to run for parties other than the governing party, the problem will not come back to haunt them at some point in the future.

I want to point out one other thing to the minister, and that is that in one of the standards he outlines he says, 'No employee shall at any time take part in political activities as to impair their usefulness to the positions in which they are employed.' Obviously, there is a form of adjudication. I understand the point he is making, but at some point I would like the minister to tell us who determines whether the civil servant, in this particular case the public employee, has taken some political action that is going to impair his service in this Province. I hope it is not a political figure. I hope it is somebody within the Public Service Commission.

Mr. Speaker, one other thing, and I will clue up with this. The President of Treasury Board says, 'Necessary regulatory and legislative changes will be made to implement the new policy.' Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. gentleman that I believe that this might very well be, if the Premier can get his popularity up to the point where he believes he has a

chance of winning an election. He knows now he does not, and that this will probably be the last sitting of this Legislature. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he would see that any regulation and the necessary legislation is passed in this sitting of the House, so that we do not have the government calling an election with the hope that they do not have to implement those policies if they win. I can tell you that that is a small 'if', but I would hope that the hon. gentleman brings in the legislation now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I think I am going to call this the Jim Brown regulations. In the last election, in 1985, we had a vocational instructor in Placentia, who wanted to run in Placentia, by the name of Jim Brown. Unfortunately, we found he could not take any leave, he had to quit his job in order to run and so on, and it was quite a mess, Mr. Speaker.

In a sense, there was not only himself but others, like Sam Connors, for example, who tried to get the nomination in St. John's East Extern for the PC Party, and Lenora Fagan in the Waterford - Kenmount by-election just recently. There have been a number of public employees who have tried to get involved in the political process and have been forced to resign their positions

and apply back and hopefully be reaccepted. When they ran for the PC Party, of course, this was usually a pro forma situation. I am not sure if the Leader of the Official Opposition has had this problem, but I know, myself, that in encouraging public employees to take full part in the political process, including being candidates, that this is a very major concern and one that we have been addressing for quite a while, and I am glad to see that government has taken about three quarters of the steps required to rectify the situation.

Mr. Speaker, in retrospect it should be realized that this jurisdiction is quite a ways back. Nova Scotia, for example, has had this right for two or three years, I think, when a legal case established the precedent that public employees do have that right. In a sense, when the Charter of Rights was passed in Canada, about five or six years ago, it, in fact, made it impossible for governments to be really heavy-handed on their employees, but the problem was the employees had to be fired and you had to go through arbitration to try to get their jobs back in order to establish this right. The fact that the government has said this ahead of time, I think, will make it much easier.

Mr. Speaker, it means that in excess of 20,000 people in this Province are now in a position where they have full political rights, whereas yesterday they did not, and I cannot help but say that this is a long awaited initiative. I have, in my filing Cabinet in my office, Mr. Speaker, a file of letters between myself and the Premier of this Province, over the last couple of years,

urging him to take this particular step, and letters he has sent back to me indicated that it is only lately that he has obviously come to the conclusion that the Charter rights people have should be given to them.

Lastly, I would like to address the question of restriction on management employees. If I recall, in the research that I have seen on it, the management employees who should be restricted are those who take part in the formulation of government policy. I think that should be, as they say, the Occam's razor that would be used to separate those who should be allowed to participate in the political process from those who should not. This would mean, obviously, deputy ministers, and perhaps a few people below them, should be involved in a restrictive sphere. Others, I would argue with you, should be allowed to carry on professionally, and they should use their own discretion in terms of rights.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
But, Mr. Speaker, this is a great day. It means there are 20,000 more people who can take part in the political process. In terms of recruiting candidates, I would like to thank the Government House Leader for making my job much, much easier.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Before calling for Oral Questions, I take pleasure in introducing the Hon. Patrick McCowan and the Hon. John Lisnick, State Representatives, from the State of

Maine in the United States.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, my question was going to be for the Premier but he is absent, so I will ask the Deputy Premier (Dr. Collins) instead.

I wonder could the Deputy Premier tell me how many consultants have been and are currently retained by the Department of Energy and by the Offshore Development Board to advise government on any matters pertaining to offshore development?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, there is Mr. Lougheed and his firm, and Mr. Cabot Martin, and quite off-hand I cannot recall any others but if there are others I will have to get back to the hon. member.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:
In view of that fact, I wonder would the Deputy Premier provide a list of all the consultants and would the Premier provide a

breakdown year by year?

MR. LUSH:
Deputy Premier.

MR. GILBERT:
Actually, I knew the Premier was not here but I thought he should be.

Now, would the Deputy Premier provide a breakdown year by year of monies paid to the former Premier of Alberta, Mr. Lougheed, and his firm, since he was first hired by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador?

In other words, would he provide a breakdown year by year, not segments but year by year, for every year since they hired Mr. Lougheed? Would he provide that breakdown?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, as it is an area that I am not personally directly involved in, I will take that request as noted. I could point out that the hon. House Leader will have some information related to this - I am not saying all the information but information related to the topic - which he will give in Answers to Questions.

MR. GILBERT:
In view of the fact I have had it on the Order Paper since last year.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is also

for the hon. the Deputy Premier.

The Deputy Premier will know the Premier has been trying to deflect from the main issue of this Lougheed affair the main issue being how much money has been paid to this gentleman. The Premier talks about fiscal years and calendar years and of that foolishness.

Will the Deputy Premier tell the House specifically how much money Newfoundland has paid the legal firm Bennett Jones of Calgary since November 4, 1985, either by way of special warrants, directly from the Department of Finance, through the Petroleum Directorate, or any way whatsoever? What is the bottom line? How much has Mr. Lougheed's firm cost Newfoundland since the eve of Bonfire Night, 1985?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, since members are insistent on trying to get the information now as opposed to waiting for Answers to Questions, when the Premier did take as notice a question related to since by the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), I may as well try to provide the information now so you do not waste your time during Question Period.

Mr. Speaker, first of all it should be pointed out very clearly that there was an implication in the newspaper report, in **The Evening Telegram**, of course, in response to a question from the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), that the Premier was confirming \$400,000 had been paid to the Lougheed law firm last year. Of

course, that is inaccurate and I trust that the appropriate medium will make that correction. The Premier did not say or confirm that that was the amount. He said he would check to see what the amount was and took the question under advisement, took notice of the question.

So the question that the member for the St. Barbe asked said, "Will they be paid this year anywhere near the \$400,000 paid last year?" That is not correct. That is incorrect, misleading and all the rest of it. I will now try to provide the information for the hon. member, so that the hon. member knows full well what the amounts have been over the period of time.

First of all, dealing with the specific question that the member for St. Barbe raised, last year the amount that was paid to the Bennett Jones law firm in the 1987/88 fiscal year, which was the question the member for St. Barbe asked, was \$51,804.11. So it was not \$400,000 last year, it was \$51,804.11 to the law firm.

In 1986/87, a matter which has already been made public I think, through the Estimates Committees

MR. GILBERT:

Was that to Premier Lougheed as well or just his law firm?

MR. SIMMS:

The question related to the Bennett Jones law firm.

- the amount paid then was \$291,905.53. So three fiscal years ago, 1986/87, this year, 1988/89, has already been answered by the Premier. There has been none paid to the law firm to this point in time, although we do

expect there will be some expenditures for this fiscal year.

DR. COLLINS:

He wants to know about last year.

MR. SIMMS:

Last year, 1987/88, \$51,804.11.

MR. GILBERT:

To the law firm?

MR. SIMMS:

To the law firm.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What was the previous year?

MR. SIMMS:

The previous year, 1986/87, \$291,905.53. This year, none to date.

With respect to Mr. Lougheed himself, his consulting fee I think was the other part of the question, was it? Or was it not?

MR. DECKER:

The total, the bottom line.

MR. SIMMS:

Well I just gave it to him. He can add it up, I am sure.

MR. DECKER:

How much salary?

MR. SIMMS:

He just said he is not asking for Mr. Lougheed's consulting fee. It is not related.

So I hope that answers the question.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

The minister is saying he paid the firm \$350,000 total, which does not explain the Special Warrant for \$400,000, which we have a copy of there.

Now a supplementary to the Deputy Premier, or the House Leader, whoever.

MR. SIMMS:

Could I see a copy of the Special Warrant the hon. member is referring to?

MR. DECKER:

Yes, it is here.

Now that the Government House Leader has attempted to give us a figure as to how much we have paid Mr. Lougheed's firm, will the House Leader now tell the people of Newfoundland what the Lougheed firm has done for this \$350,000? [I put in brackets: Plus - \$400,000, whatever the Special Warrant was.] What has the firm done to earn this money? In other words, will the House Leader table the statements that were submitted by the firm, statements which should outline the work which was performed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker. I think it has been said in this House on numerous occasions that this particular law firm is recognized as an expert in the field with respect to offshore oil negotiations, and has built up quite a reputation in that regard. They certainly are one of the top in the country. There is no question about it.

DR. COLLINS:

Oil negotiations generally.

MR. SIMMS:

Generally. But they deal with very specific matters such as those types of things that we would be involved with with respect to Hibernia. For example: royalty regimes are very technical, complex issues and matters, yet this particular firm is noted as a firm that has a strong reputation in that area. So I can tell you those are the kind of things that the law firm are involved in, and have been, as you can see, for at least the last three years. One of these days, if we are fortunate enough to work out something that is satisfactory in terms of an arrangement, then the hon. member will be able to see, and will understand a little clearer, the complexities of what is involved here. This law firm clearly has a very, very strong reputation in Canada - and throughout the world, I understand, but certainly in Canada - as being a firm that is extremely qualified, and extremely reputable in dealing with the complexities of this kind of a topic, royalty regimes and other matters of that nature.

May I just say, by the way, while I have the floor, with respect to the warrant they are referring to, of course, this warrant here for \$400,000 is not necessarily all for that particular item. As a matter of fact, if he read it he would see there was a transfer for a specific amount of \$250,000. That was the amount, under the warrant, that was required for the law firm, the other matters.

MR. WELLS:

The \$250,000 was already there?

MR. SIMMS:

No. The approval that had been given at the time was for up to \$400,000 depending on what the amount was going to be. At the time we were looking for -

MR. SIMMONS:

A blank cheque.

MR. SIMMS:

Not a blank cheque, although you can call it a blank cheque or whatever you wish to call it. At the time we did not know what the amounts would be but we had a rough idea, and the estimates might have been up to \$400,000. As it turned out that was not the case, in fact, it was considerably less, so only \$250,000 of that warrant was applied to the law firm.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Somewhere \$200,000 budgeted in that same year is after going astray, Mr. Speaker.

The Government House Leader, Mr. Speaker, was not listening to my previous question, because he did not say whether or not he will table the statements, as I asked. He said, 'Certainly,' but does that mean he will table the statements backing up what the firm did? That was the previous question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When the House Leader is tabling the statements, will he also table for this House the job description of Mr. Loughheed? Because the previous Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) said that he was not hired because he was a lawyer, he was hired for other reasons.

Will the hon. the Deputy Premier, or the House Leader, or the Premier, or someone tell the people of Newfoundland just what are we paying this hon. gentleman for? Is it because he is not a lawyer? Is it because he is an oil expert? Or is it because he is a former Tory friend of the present Premier?

MR. CALLAN:

Neither one.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the question is really loaded politically for obvious reasons, and we all recognize what those reasons are. Everybody recognizes that Peter Loughheed is a very reputable individual, is a very reputable lawyer, is a very reputable oil expert, and has considerable influence in the oil industry. The fact that he happens to be a former conservative Premier is not related here. It is not related at all. He is reputable. He does have influence. He has connections beyond anybody's wildest dreams, and is very, very helpful to us in dealing with this particular very complex problem.

And so I can assure him that is the reason he was hired as a consultant.

With respect to the original

question about statements, I am not quite sure what he means, but if he wants me to I could provide him with a written description of what the firm does and what kind of work it is involved with, what kind of work Mr. Loughheed would be involved with in a general way. I mean, I cannot give him specifics, if he picks up the telephone to call the president of one of the main oil companies, I am not going to mention that kind of stuff.

MR. BAKER:

We paid him \$350,000.

MR. SIMMS:

We paid his firm.

MR. DECKER:

Give us the statement. What was it for? That is all I want to know.

MR. SIMMS:

We will provide the hon. member with an explanation of what the expenditure was for. Absolutely, no problem at all, Mr. Speaker.

If that is all he wants, he could have asked for that in 1986-1987, three years ago. No problem.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I have a problem for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), and it concerns a number of complaints that have been registered to his department concerning the Labour Standards Division.

Recently the minister stated that he was going to call for an

enquiry by his Deputy Minister to check out these complaints that have been registered, and so on. Could he tell us what the mandate of this enquiry is? When does he expect this situation is going to be resolved? Could he also tell us when he is going to bring into the House the Labour Standards Review report that was done two years ago?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for his question. He refers to an enquiry, but I think where the enquiry comes from is perhaps some rather unusual kind of reporting by **The Sunday Express**. I talked to a reporter from **The Sunday Express** and I told her I was going to ask my Deputy Minister to do an internal examination, or the word 'enquiry' might have been used, to enquire into the incidents of delay into complaints under The Labour Standards Act. I had in fact asked my Deputy Minister by then to look over the records, to check with the Labour Standards officers. Since the reporter mentioned would waiting a year be acceptable to me, I said no, not at all. As a matter of fact, waiting six months would not be acceptable to me. My Deputy has looked into it, Mr. Speaker, and a report is in the making. As a matter of fact I saw some rough notes on it today.

With respect to the second part of the hon. member's question, when is the remainder of the report of the Labour Standards Board going to be announced, just as soon as possible. It is a source of concern to me that it has not been announced, but just as soon as

possible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Could the minister tell us that once his Deputy Minister does an enquiry and prepares a report for him as to this situation concerning the Labour Standards Division, will bring it to the House so that the people of the Province will know that these problems are being rectified? And will he also tell us, and give us a definite date, as to when he will table the Labour Standards Report that he has? Because that has been said a number of times over the past year and a half and many people out there would like to see it. Also, does the report contain any recommendations about the Labour Standards Division of which he is the minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, to the last part of the question, it contains many recommendations but, as the hon. gentleman knows, not all of it has been made public yet. But that will be done, I can assure the hon. gentleman, as soon as possible. And with respect to telling the House what the extent of delays are, Mr. Speaker, sure, that is the reason why I asked that it be done. Needless to say when complaints are made, when telephone conversations take place between the complainant and the Labour Standards officers, that is part of the investigation. Specifically there was one in

Labrador, in the case in point, to which the hon. member refers, and I had thought at the time, Mr. Speaker, that the extent of the delay was that there had been no contact made. In actual fact there had been several telephone conversations wherein certain matters relating to the complaint were extrapolated and everything is being done to facilitate that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I will ask just one more. Would the minister tell us when he will be tabling that report of the Labour Standards Review which has been in his hands for at least a year? Also, would he tell us if he will be tabling the report, recommendations and review of The Workers' Compensation Act? Also, could he tell us if he is going to appoint a Vice-Chairman for the Workers' Compensation Appeal Tribunal?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

The answer to the last part of the question, Mr. Speaker, yes, the appointment of a Vice-Chairperson is in the making. As to when the report of the Workers' Compensation Legislative Review Committee will be tabled, I am unable to give the member any specific date. It is a major document, 120-odd recommendations have to be examined. I have asked the Workers' Compensation Commission to do a sort of an executive summary for me, but that is not yet done. Obviously it has

to be looked at, Mr. Speaker, and in good time it will be announced.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member of Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Housing (Mr. Peach), but in his absence I will direct it to the Deputy Premier, or whomever happens to be filling in for the minister. On Monday of this week I met with Mr. Gary Santini, the President of the National Home Builders Association, and their prime concern, their number one priority this year is the forthcoming tax on building materials, 3 per cent initially and eventually added 9 per cent, 12 per cent in total, thereby escalating the price of housing by 12 per cent nationally. What has the Provincial Government done or is planning to do to intervene on this Province's behalf to see that this tax is held off?

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker,

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I think the latter point, that 9 per cent related to the possibility of a business transfer tax or a value added tax being brought in. So really the gentleman was, I guess, making a point in case something happens, really a hypothetical point. And I am sure the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor) can add to what I say on this, but in my period in that portfolio we made

many, many representations to the federal government over the possible imposition of a VAT in place of the federal sales tax and the provincial retail sales tax, and we asked for much information about studies they had done or were contemplating as to implications and so on.

So I am sure that this matter will go on. I do not believe that the federal government are intending to bringing in the so-called phase two of tax reform for a little while yet. I do not know if they have confirmed in their own mind what form it will be. The hon. member may remember that initially there was some thought that any such taxes if brought in would be applied to food, things like health services and so on. And the federal government later made the point, very specifically, that it would not apply to those particular items. So they may well come out with other exemptions, as far as that goes, before they make up their minds.

So I think the gentleman was making a point and perhaps a legitimate point, but at this stage it is hypothetical. We are making continual representations over the tax reform matter.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:
Would the Deputy Premier keep us informed and perhaps table correspondence to date in the House? The other point made was that the Canadian Home Builders Association -

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please ask his question?

MR. GULLAGE:

I have to have a preamble, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member will please ask his question or I will recognize somebody else.

MR. GULLAGE:

Is the Deputy Premier aware that the stand of the Canadian Home Builders Association is that governments should not be holding lands and should be, in fact, tendering them out to the private sector, in the opinion of that association? What is the government's opinion on lands presently held by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation that could possibly be tendered out to the private sector?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many people have different views on that. I think the view that motivates this government more than anything else is that having land assemblies has a beneficial effect in two ways: One, it makes land available, whereas in many years past suitable land just was not available: Secondly, it has some sort of influence in stabilizing land prices. So I think that is a broad statement of the reasons why, for quite a number of years, and I think many people have applauded this, NLHC have been into the land assembly business.

MR. GULLAGE:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. GULLAGE:

The other comment made recently by the President of the Newfoundland Home Builders Association, Mr. Gary Reardon, is that presently the real need for Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, which had a previous need in urban areas, is in rural Newfoundland and, except for land banking, should not be active in the market in urban areas. Would the minister like to comment on that stand taken by the Newfoundland Home Builders Association?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think what I should do is to make sure that Newfoundland and Labrador Housing sends the hon. member further information, because they have had many programs and have been instrumental in putting quite a large number of houses in rural areas, especially in isolated areas. I think the fact that they have built in urban areas is just one part of their mandate, and if the hon. member scrutinizes the information that is available on NLHC, I think he would be reassured on the basis of it.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Russell) relating to the jet fuel spill at

Goose Bay Airport, the estimated size of which has been projected upwards in recent days to as much as 800,000 litres, or more than 50,000 barrels.

First of all, would the minister indicate to the House whether he is satisfied that Shell Oil, the company responsible, had done the required monitoring of the inventory?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. RUSSELL:

No, Mr. Speaker. The information that I have been given by officials, who coincidentally happened to be in Goose Bay when the spill was discovered, indicates that perhaps the company was negligent in this area, and we are currently trying to get more information from them.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I believe the minister will be aware that there are indications that the spill may have taken place over a period of several months, possibly going back as far as last October or November. If that is indeed the case, can the minister indicate why the shortfall in inventory had not been detected earlier by the company?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment and Lands.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot indicate that at the present time. We have asked them to give us all their compliances and all the balancing sheets they have done on that. The hon. the member I think is correct in that it may have occurred as far back as last Fall with a valve being left open.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, the company until now, or a couple of days ago, was rather reluctant to give us some of the basic information that we were looking for and we had to threaten to subpoena them to get it. I think now they have come around somewhat and I am awaiting the final figures and balances and so on for the spill itself.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a requirement that the monitoring be done on a fairly ongoing basis. Could the minister indicate whether his department people have in turn discharged their obligation insofar as monitoring this inventory is concerned? Why was it only in the last few days that it came to the attention of the department? Is that normal in the circumstance, or was there some negligence on the part of departmental people who ought to have been monitoring the situation? How could this situation have gone on so long without it coming to the minister's attention?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is the responsibility of my department to go around all over the Province, this spill, as I understand it at least, was in federal jurisdiction, basically speaking, in Goose Bay - to look at each and every valve, and everything that is around, to see if it is closed.

I would like to think that the company in question should have done that, although obviously they did not. I think it was their responsibility to do so. If they discovered a spill or leakage or whatever prior to its being reported, then it was their responsibility to report it. I am waiting to get a final report, if you will, and if there is some negligence on the part of the company then I will not hesitate to lay charges.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Brett). The minister is aware that we have many, many unincorporated towns in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, many of which have no convenient or safe supply of drinking water, and they are now awaiting the announcement of the minister's programs particularly designed for unincorporated areas. The waterworks program, I believe the department calls it.

Can the minister indicate what time that program will be announced for these unincorporated

communities throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. BRETT:

Very soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

The season is advancing and these people are without drinking water. It is a very serious problem. So, can the minister not be more precise in terms of addressing the needs of these thousands of people throughout Newfoundland who are today awaiting a supply of safe drinking water?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. BRETT:

It should be clued up before the end of the week, Mr. Speaker. It is not exactly like the large water and sewer vote or the firefighting vote.

Last year money for that particular vote was issued over a period of a number of years, much like the Capital Recreation Grants, and we are doing the same thing again this year. So there is a multitude of little small grants that are going out and each individual local service district will be advised. I think the whole thing should be done by the end of the week.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Can the minister indicate precisely what amounts of money will be allocated for these waterworks programs? There must be a figure on that, so can the minister indicate what kinds of money these people in these communities will get?

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

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, not the individual amounts, because obviously I would not have them. I do not know how many requests were in, but certainly many, many requests, and all of them were not approved, obviously, any more than for any other program. The amount allocated in the budget was, I think, something like \$800,000. Of that amount, I think about \$395,000 was committed from last year, so that left us approximately another \$400,000, and that is the figure, that is the amount that will be divided up among the local service districts now.

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:
My question is to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, with regard to school bursaries.

Black Tickle, Pinsent's Arm, Norman Bay and other communities in my district have never in their history had a student pass Grade XI or Grade XII. The main reason is after Grade VIII, students have to leave those communities and go outside to complete their education. A lot of parents find it financially difficult to support students, despite the bursary of \$175 for students in Grade X and XI and XII. I suppose over the history of these communities approximately 1,200 to 1,500 students have started school and never finished.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:
Will the minister undertake a review of school bursaries? We could have a conference on the Labrador Coast, at Port Hope Simpson, and bring in teachers, educational specialists and community leaders to focus on the idea of the need for continuing education and the need for extra financial support.

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

MR. HEARN:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. Certainly he raises some very legitimate concerns. There still are many isolated communities in our Province where students who attend school have perhaps had less than equal opportunities in the past. Certainly through many endeavours we are improving things, certainly transportation systems have alleviated a lot of the concerns and have narrowed down the numbers of such communities.

For those that still exist, quite often the programs needed to complete high school cannot be delivered properly in these small communities, mainly due to the numbers concerned, so bursary programs are offered to the students to go to larger centres. This sometimes does not work because the students are very young and quite often they give up and go back home. Undoubtedly that is one of the reasons why we have had a low success rate in many communities. We are very much aware of that.

We have increased the bursaries in recent years to help out, in fact, increased them tremendously to help parents finance students going outside, but between our Distance Education Programs and a review of the whole set up as it affects smaller communities, hopefully we can address positively many of the concerns raised by the member.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I have to bring up a point of privilege at the first opportunity and I want to bring it in relation to a number of facts which have been put before this House. It has to do with the statement that was given by the Premier of this Province on March 6, 1987 in reply to a question -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Is this the earliest opportunity?

MR. TULK:
Yes, and it is background material, Mr. Speaker. It was an answer to a question by the former member for Windsor-Buchans, Mr. Flight, on March 6, 1987, Hansard will clearly show it, in which he asks a question of the Premier concerning Mr. Lougheed, and the Premier makes the reply, "It is not Mr. Lougheed that the \$400,000 has gone to." I would ask the President of Treasury Board to pay particular attention to this, -

MR. SIMMS:
Oh, of course.

MR. TULK:
- "It has gone to a law firm of I do not know how many who have been working on economic analysis and legal opinions for the Province on the various proposals."

On the same day, March 6, the Premier in reply to a question from the same gentleman made the following statement: "Now, Mr. Speaker, let me finish answering the question because there were three parts to the question, one was that Mr. Lougheed was getting \$400,000. That is erroneous. That is going to the firm." Bennett Jones is obviously who he was referring to.

The President of Treasury Board (Mr. Simms) comes in here and tells us government paid \$291,000 in 1986/87 to Mr. Lougheed's law firm, Bennett Jones. He also points out to us or says, "The Special Warrant "

MR. DINN:
Where is the point of privilege?

MR. TULK:

I will get to the point of privilege in a second, as soon as I lay out the facts so the Speaker can see whether it is a point of privilege or not.

This Special Warrant is dated January 20, 1987, a few weeks before the Premier made his statement. "Ordered that approval be given for an expenditure of \$400,000 for the services of the legal firm Bennett Jones of Calgary."

Mr. Speaker, my point is this House has been misled either on March 6, 1987 or it is being misled today by the President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the hon. gentleman wanting to cut down on the figures he is paying to Loughheed, to the former Tory Premier of Alberta; I understand it would cut down on the embarrassment of the amount of money this government has laid out.

Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege is simply this: I believe somebody has deliberately misled this House, either the President of Treasury Board, because I do not believe he can have his facts mixed up in that regard, or the Premier of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
I say that that is not good enough. Indeed, he has to give us the correct information.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member knows full well he cannot accuse an hon. member of

deliberately misleading the House and this is what the hon. member said. I would ask him to withdraw it.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, on a point of privilege you can.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I am making a point of privilege that I believe that the hon. gentleman or somebody has deliberately misled this House. I would say to Your Honour that under a point of privilege, if your Honour finds that there is no prima facie case, then I would say to Your Honour I would probably have to withdraw it. But under a point of privilege, certainly I can say it. It is the basis of my point of privilege, that the hon. gentleman, through making the statement he has made today, that in 1986/87 the government only paid the firm of Bennett Jones \$291,000, and since the Premier made the same statement saying that in 1986/87 they paid \$400,000, somebody has deliberately misled this House. I can see not other reason for what is happening. That is the basis of my privilege.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:

The Speaker does not have to listen to the hon. gentleman. The truth of the matter is that the hon. gentleman would like for the Speaker to listen to him so that he could sweep this under the rug, so that he could sweep this huge expenditure of God knows how much, maybe \$600,000 or \$700,000, under the rug.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:
Are you finished now?

MR. TULK:
Yes, I am finished.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:
I thought the hon. member was going to go on forever, Mr. Speaker, it seemed like.

First of all, two things: One is with respect to the very strong case that the hon. member has put forward to try to establish a prima facie case of breach of privilege, I would have to say to Your Honour, you will not have to recess the House, you will not have to spend much time consulting with the law clerks or anything else to determine whether or not there is a prima facie case established.

MR. SIMMONS:
(Inaudible) like that.

MR. SIMMS:
I will make my argument. The hon. member will not have to worry about it at all. I will make my argument in the same way as the hon. member did, however, I will not be unparliamentary, as the hon. member for Fogo was.

Mr. Speaker, obviously there is no prima facie case. This matter is not so important as to forget all the rest of the business of the country and the Province to get onto it. That is all Your Honour is asked to rule on. It is not on the substance of the issue, but whether there is a prima facie

case.

MR. TULK:
The substance is there.

MR. SIMMS:
It is not. The Speaker's role in determining whether there is a prima facie case is limited to deciding the formal question, not the question of substance. So the hon. member is wrong. Now, that is point number one.

So with respect though to what he was trying to say and the foolish old argument he was trying to make in terms of wasting the time of the House, let me just address it very briefly. First of all, Mr. Speaker, you should be aware that the hon. members opposite had this case all prepared, all typed up, passed out and everything, ready to go, no matter what the questions and answers were during Question Period. Everybody knows that. You can see through them like a glass window. So that is point number one.

Point number two, I have already explained, Mr. Speaker, the question they raised during Question Period and related to what he tried to tie into March 6, 1987, over a year ago, a year and a half ago almost now.

DR. COLLINS:
He might have said 1986.

MR. SIMMS:
1987, I believe he said. It was 1987, so it was over a year ago, it is obviously not something that is very current and very topical. They seem to think it is. They are trying to generate another issue which is their role every day in the House of Assembly.

I have already explained, Mr.

Speaker, the situation with respect to the amount of money that was paid to the law firm. I explained it very openly here today. There was no big fuss, no big racket over it or anything like that. I explained it. If the hon. member does not understand it or does not believe it, I cannot do anything about that, I can only tell him what the facts are. At the very most, what the member has raised is not a point of privilege certainly -

MR. DJINN:

A difference of opinion.

MR. SIMMS:

Unlikely a point of order, but more along the lines as my colleague, the Minister of Mines just said, merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members as to the facts. That is all. There is no big deal here. We have explained it. It is all up front and straight forward.

DR. COLLINS:

Get a pocket computer.

MR. SIMMS:

There is nothing to it at all, it is not even worth debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, I am going to look into this matter and I hope to be able to rule whether there is a prima facie case or not later on today.

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I table the answer to question number twenty-seven in the name of the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a further answer to a question from the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) as promised yesterday in relation to the educational section of the \$5 charged for a big game fee.

The member asked what has been done. Besides what I told him yesterday, which was rather comprehensive and certainly worth the amount of money involved, I would just add to that that the fee, when it was announced, it was stated that revenue generated would be used to offset the cost of the big game licence draw, to engage and equip additional wildlife protection officers, and to enhance and expand the information and education programmes of the Wildlife Division.

The big game licence draw is pretty detailed, and basically \$100,000 has been spent to set it up. Three additional wildlife protection officers have been added, and since 1983, the budget of the Information and Education Unit of the Wildlife Division has been increased by almost \$100,000 a year, which is very significant. To get specifically to the education component, the project Wild, which is a programme to integrate wildlife conservation with the school curriculum, has

been developed and has been tested in twelve schools throughout the Province. I am sure the member did not know that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You did not, either.

MR. HEARN:

I just did not know the number of schools. I thought it was ten, but it is twelve.

With the Department of Education and school boards, once it is fully evaluated it will be implemented through teacher workshops. The activity based resource will involve children and their teachers in all grades with real life concepts and problems, and the goal is to foster, of course, responsible behaviour towards our environment.

In addition to this, as I mentioned yesterday, the Wildlife Division has also contributed to the Environmental Science course taught in the schools. Also, comprehensive guides, and so on, have been developed as an education programme for the hunters. So I think we certainly got the worth of the \$5 charged, and I will table it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday, in answer to some spurious allegations made by the hon. member for Port de Grave, that I would table a letter I got in looking into the matter, a letter to me by Mr. John Hearn, Associate Executive Director of the General Hospital. I did say I was going to check with Mr. Hearn just to see if he had any problems. He said he has no

problems whatsoever, so I now table the letter.

Orders of the Day

DR. COLLINS:

Motion 1, Bill 41. We did not quite finish the schedule of Bill 41.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of Supplementary Supply to Her Majesty, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Supply

MR. CHAIRMAN (Parsons):

Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, just to refresh people's minds, when we went through this particular resolution and the bill subsequent thereto, there was some question raised about an item in the Schedule with regard to the Department of Finance, and that item in the Department of Finance related to the equity investment in Newfoundland Enviroponics. Specifically as to the amount that was assigned to the land portion when the announcement was originally made, the equity that government was putting into the project was \$2.5 million in cash and \$1 million in land. The point was brought up that subsequently

the land was assessed at \$150,000, so there was a question about the \$850,000, which is the difference between \$150,000 and \$1 million.

Mr. Speaker, as I explained just at the end of the day, the other day, there was some misunderstanding about what that \$1 million was for. It was not for land, it was for serviced land. I might just point out that in a statement made by the hon. the Premier on May 8, 1987, in part he says, 'This contribution' - that is the \$1 million - 'consists of providing the joint venture company thirty acres of serviced land valued at approximately \$1 million.' As I explained the other day, the \$150,000 applied to the assessed value of the raw land.

It was originally contemplated that government would keep up its undertaking by bringing that raw land up to serviced land status by further expenditures, and it was estimated that those further expenditures would bring the whole total up to \$1 million. As it turned out, to be practical about it, it was decided that rather than government bringing the land up to this serviced land status, it would be best if we just handed over the raw land and supplied the funding for the contractors and the other people already on site, or going on the site for the purpose of building the structure, to do the servicing. So the money that government would have spent doing the servicing itself was supplied to the project people, who did the servicing. There is no disparity between what was announced in terms of equity contributions and what was actually done, it was done in a slightly different manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Chairman, somebody has greatly misled the hon. the Deputy Premier. Quite clearly, somebody has greatly misled him. There is no way in the world that anybody can agree that the value of thirty acres of prime land in the middle of Mount Pearl, with the services running by it, fronting on a serviced street, is worth \$150,000 or \$5,000 an acre. It was worth approximately \$40,000 an acre in the condition in which it was. If you ran services throughout it for a subdivision, it would be worth a great deal more. But that land was worth something in the neighbourhood of \$1 million to about \$1.3 million. I am prepared to accept the rounded figure of \$1 million that the Premier originally announced. I do not really quarrel with that, that that is the real value of that piece of property.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the land, as far as this usage was concerned, was serviced; the services were in the street, fronting on the land. If you were going to develop the thirty acres, you would probably get 130 or 140 building lots. Maybe if you were going to put residential streets and that in it, then it was not serviced for that purpose.

MR. WINDSOR:

It was zoned agricultural.

MR. WELLS:

The zoning does not matter.

MR. WINDSOR:

It does not?

MR. WELLS:

The zoning does not make any difference.

MR. WINDSOR:

It certainly does. It makes a big difference in the value of the land. The hon. gentleman knows enough about law for that.

MR. WELLS:

The zoning does not make any difference to the value of that raw land and what it was worth. Newfoundland and Labrador Housing own that land, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, whose primary function is to provide raw land not for farming in the middle of the now city of Mount Pearl but for housing and commercial and other similar development. That is the function of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing. They were marshalling that land for that purpose, not to run a farm. The real value of that land, Mr. Chairman, was, at the very least, a full \$1 million.

DR. COLLINS:

Who said that?

MR. WELLS:

The Premier did.

DR. COLLINS:

No, he did not.

MR. WELLS:

Yes, he did. He was going to put in serviced land, and for the use to which it is being put, that land was serviced.

DR. COLLINS:

No!

MR. WELLS:

Yes, it was.

MR. WINDSOR:

Not when it was bought (inaudible) development.

MR. WELLS:

Indeed it was.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It was for agricultural.

MR. WELLS:

Indeed it was. It was serviced for the use to which it was put.

MR. WINDSOR:

It was serviced by the Housing Corporation.

MR. WELLS:

It was serviced.

Mr. Chairman, clearly the value of that land was, at the very least, \$1 million. And when you look at the documents, and the statements made by the hon. the Premier, that is very clear. He made it clear that the total equity of the government would be \$3.5 million - the total equity of the government would be \$3.5 million.

Now if the Deputy Premier is correct in his assertion, and the Minister of Finance is correct in his support of it, then the Premier would have said the real equity of the government would be \$4,350,000, because we are going to put in \$150,000 of raw land; \$3.5 million in cash, and we are going to spend \$850,000 to service it.

DR. COLLINS:

That was not done.

MR. WELLS:

That is what you are saying. That is, in fact, what was done.

DR. COLLINS:

It was not.

MR. WELLS:

When you look at the figures and look at the agreement dated the

25th day of June, signed between the government and the Sprung Group of Companies, it clearly provides that the Sprung Companies were to construct the facilities on the land as defined, that is the land conveyed or to be conveyed by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, for \$14,325,000, and it also provides that they were to be responsible to construct a facility on the land. Also, Mr. Chairman, the construction contract signed later provides that they were to do all the work, and they were paid specifically for doing the site preparation work; they were to get a payment of \$1.5 million on the signing of the contract, and \$2.6 million when the site preparation work was done. That is to be found in Clause 4.2 in the payment schedule. "\$2.6 million by installments in accordance with a payment schedule to be agreed upon following receipt of site plans and designs duly stamped by a qualified engineer entitled to practice in Newfoundland. In this paragraph, site plans and designs shall refer to all site preparation including cleaning, levelling, road construction, installation of water and sewer hook-ups." Under the construction contract, that work was to be done by the Sprung Group of companies.

The real value of the land and the real equity the government of this Province has in that investment, Mr. Chairman, is \$4.3 million, and we ought now to recognize it and know, when we are voting on this bill, exactly what we are doing.

It is not accurate to say that the value of that land was \$150,000, for which it was conveyed. The value of that land was, at the very least, \$1 million, so the real equity the government of this

Province has in that, Mr. Chairman, is \$4.3 million, and we should know exactly what we are doing when we do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

I assume the hon. the leader of the Opposition is genuinely confused on this matter. I am assuming that. The point is that this land out there was outside a municipality, it was raw land, it was essentially bog land; it was unusable bog land in the state it was in.

The original arrangement was that land would be supplied to the project on which they would construct the structure. To do that, government had to do two things: Firstly, it had to procure the land from NLHC, and, secondly, it had to do certain things. I am going to use the word 'servicing', because that is what the hon. member said in his statement. I am not going to read the whole thing, but his statement reads as follows: "To help establish this \$18.4 million facility in the Province, I am pleased to announce the contribution by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. Firstly, the Province will provide an equity contribution of \$3.5 million. This contribution consists of providing to the joint venture company thirty acres of serviced land valued at approximately \$1 million. The balance of the Province's equity contribution of \$2.5 million will be in the form of a cash advance to the joint venture company."

That was the way it was going to be done. The land was to be procured from NLHC, and NLHC

charged the government \$150,000 for the land. Government was then to put it in such a form that the project could use it. It was estimated that that would add an extra \$850,000 to the cost, making a \$1 million contribution.

Now when we got down to cases on it, it was clear that it would be pointless to have two separate construction projects going in there: one construction project putting up the facility, and the other construction project servicing the land.

So arrangements were made that the raw land, valued at \$150,000, would be passed over together with an amount of money, that the contractor doing the project, the facility, would put the land into shape to make it serviced land. And Newfoundland Enviroponics, by the way, decided to go ahead on that basis, that the inclusive figure would be \$1 million. In actual fact, it turned out that it cost them more than \$850,000 to take raw land and put it into a shape that was suitable for the facility. It cost them more than that.

MR. WELLS:
What did they do that cost that much?

DR. COLLINS:
What did they do? It is on their books.

MR. WELLS:
But what did they do that cost that much?

DR. COLLINS:
Not being a construction person, I cannot answer that. But I know that I visited the project very early on, before there was any structure on the place, and I can

tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition that there was land moving equipment, backhoes and trucks, and concrete things and pipes all over the place out there. I am quite sure that something was going on. I can assure him of that.

That is the explanation, and the total equity put in by the Newfoundland Government ended up at \$150,000 in raw land, sufficient monies that it was agreed they would put in to make the land serviced, \$850,000, and \$2.5 million in cash, and that was matched by a similar contribution by the other side of the bargain.

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

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Chairman, there is no way in the world it is going to cost \$850,000 to put in a waterline for a single usage, for one unit. If you had to service it for lots, I could understand it being substantial.

Now, then, if there is any credibility to what the Deputy Premier is saying, would he explain the Premier's statement, I believe delivered in the House - but it may not have been, it may have been delivered to the press - dated June 25, 1987, in which he says this, "As indicated at the time of our announcement in May, government is making the following contributions to Newfoundland Enviroponics: an equity infusion of \$3.5 million, which includes the land and related infrastructure."

DR. COLLINS:
Right!

MR. WELLS:

And related infrastructure which includes it. The \$3.5 million includes it. Now if it was necessary to put in another \$850,000, why did he make the statement that it included the related infrastructure? Would he explain that?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

What the hon. member just said validates what I said. The total contribution of the government was \$3.5 million, made up of cash and land. There was no extra \$850,000. The fact that the land in the raw state cost \$150,000 and to bring it up to usage cost another \$850,000 totalled, therefore, \$1 million, and the cash amount was \$2.5 million, making a total of \$3.5 million, is what I have been saying all along. The contribution was \$3.5 million, including the raw land and the structures, or whatever that statement says, that were necessarily related to it.

MR. DAWE:

Comme ci comme ca.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Did they take any steps to have an evaluation done of the land before they allowed it to be conveyed for \$150,000, public land?

DR. COLLINS:

The land in question was purchased by NLHC. It cost \$150,000, I believe.

MR. WELLS:

It was expropriated. I will

produce a copy of it.

DR. COLLINS:

I am not going to get into that aspect of things. I am going to say it was acquired by NLHC and, I understand, at a cost of \$150,000.

MR. WELLS:

\$160,000, to be precise.

DR. COLLINS:

They had done nothing with the land from the time they acquired it until the proposal was put to them that this would be used by Newfoundland Enviroponics, so they transferred it to the Province for that purpose at its purchase price.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

The land was expropriated in total, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. CARTER:

Only a corner of it. Did you not hear the minister? Only a corner of it. My God! I would not hire you.

MR. WELLS:

From one Albert Eales. I have the expropriation order, and it is the exact description. I have the expropriation order here. Twelve hectares, that is about thirty acres, is what was expropriated, done by Brown and Cave Surveys.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the expropriation took place in 1973, fifteen years before. That is what the land was worth in 1973.

Now you convert those 1973 dollars into 1987 dollars, Mr. Chairman, and with the change in circumstances in Mount Pearl you will come out with that land having a real value for public

housing purposes in this Province, for which Newfoundland and Labrador Housing marshalled the land for which they marshalled it a real value of \$1 million. Now the reality of it is we put that land into that for \$150,000. That is what we did, and the government got \$25,000 for engineering services.

DR. COLLINS:

What did it cost the Newfoundland Government to buy the land?

MR. WELLS:

Well, it cost it at least \$160,000, which was the amount paid at the time of the expropriation, in 1973.

MR. TULK:

That is all it cost.

MR. WELLS:

In 1973, that is what it cost. Now the value of it increased greatly since then, to the point where the hon. gentleman knows that the real value of that land, in the heart of what is now the city of Mount Pearl, is, at the very least -- at the very least -- \$1 million, as the Premier originally stated.

DR. COLLINS:

It was zoned, for God's sake. It was never zoned for residential.

MR. WELLS:

By putting it in in this way, for \$150,000, there has been an additional equity infusion into Newfoundland Enviroponics out of public funds, whether it is through Newfoundland and Labrador Housing or any other public agency, of about \$850,000. Now that is the reality of it.

MR. J. CARTER:

No, it is not.

MR. WELLS:

That is all we are saying. The deed is done. No doubt this House is going to approve of it, but let us do it knowingly and have the people of this Province recognize what we are doing with their money. And that is exactly what we have done in this particular case.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to try to convince the hon. Leader of the Opposition otherwise than what he just stated. If he has decided that is the way he is going to look on it, it is a free country, let him do it. All I am saying is that the Newfoundland Government paid out to NLHC \$150,000 or \$160,000, or whatever it was NLHC was charging government for the land, and it then paid out to a contractor \$850,000 to service the land, so that the total packet added up to \$1 million, which was part of its equity in Newfoundland Enviroponics.

Now if the hon. Leader of the Opposition says that someone should have gone out and appraised the land differently, that is his opinion and he is welcome to it. All I can say is that he knows as well as I do that if you sell a house, there is no fixed value on the house. The fixed value on the house is what someone pays for it. And the price one might put on a house when you go to the market is what the fellow down the street sold his house for and what someone up the street sold his house for, which might be entirely different from what a fellow two streets over sold his house for. So it is all related to the buyer and the seller. There is no price

or value of land as the hon. member is suggesting. He is suggesting that there is a value for land, it is worked out in dollars and that is the end of it. There is no such thing. The value of land is what a seller and a buyer decide one will let the land go for and the other one will purchase it for.

In this particular case, NLHC said we will give the government this land for the value that we put into it. We have done nothing with the land in the meantime, we have frozen the land and it cannot be used for any other purpose.

It is like the land in Pippy Park. You might say, someone has a house down on Elizabeth Avenue and the land down there is worth \$60,000 for a thirty-foot lot. In the Pippy Park, just across the way, that has nothing to do with it, it is frozen land.

In the same way, this land was sequestered by NLHC. To do that it cost \$150,000; it was not going to use it for any purpose other than this particular purpose, and it let it go for that value.

Now the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has a different opinion on it. He is welcome to it, and I am sure one will never shake him from it. I am just telling him the facts of the case.

MR. WELLS:

Before you sit down, will you answer one more question?

DR. COLLINS:

Yes.

MR. WELLS:

Why would Newfoundland and Labrador Housing spend \$150,000 expropriating useless land?

DR. COLLINS:

Why did NLHC buy land and fifteen years later not do anything with it? Why did they want to sit on land for fifteen years and not do anything with it? They decided that they were not going to do anything with the land.

MR. J. CARTER:

Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Look, the transfer of land from one government agency to another is not the same thing as transferring land on the free market. That is the first thing. The second thing is that the hon. gentleman owns a house in the centre of St. John's that is zoned residential. Now if by some chance it were to be rezoned commercial, if his piece of property instead of being located where it is was located on the corner of Elizabeth Avenue and Portugal Cove Road, it would be worth roughly five times what it is worth.

The hon. gentleman would certainly be the first one to agree there that for some reason or other, the Council in this city, when there are corner lots, they somehow will allow zoning to change and you get service stations on each corner; it has happened on the corner of Newfoundland Drive and Portugal Cove Road, it has happened on the corner of Elizabeth Avenue and Portugal Cove Road, and it has also happened on the corner not too far from the hon. the leader of the Opposition's house itself, right at the top of Robinson's Hill. If the property was zoned differently, then the leader of

the Opposition would be absolutely correct.

This goes back to 1972, and I think the Eales family were treated quite generously. I am sure it was not a willing transfer of property, because there is an expropriation order. If they had willingly parted with the land, there would have been no expropriation. This government, and I am very proud to say so, whenever it has expropriated land it has always used the principle a house for a house. Now it is hard to extend that to, perhaps, thirty acres, but they still have done it. In other words, they have said what would be the cost of buying thirty acres, twelve hectares, or whatever it is, of land in a comparable area in this town or in this area, and they paid the person accordingly. But when it was bought it was bought as farmland; the zoning was never changed. And, by the way, not only was it bog land, it also had an extraordinary amount of rock sticking up through it. So the improvements, I think, cost rather more than \$850,000. And Mr. Sprung himself told me that the costs associated with improving that land were far beyond what initial engineering studies indicated, so there has been a lot of money poured into trucking, filling, blasting and bulldozing and all the rest of it.

I appreciate that the Leader of the Opposition has to make some political points, but if I thought for one minute that he really believed what he was saying, I would suggest that he give up his law practice and turn in his credentials, or his sheepskin or whatever it is they have, tear down his name plate and try his best to remain as Leader of the

Opposition for the rest of his career. Now I can assure him that we will do our best to promote this change in his status. He can be Leader of the Opposition for as long as he wants, and I will support him in that role from any direction possible.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Waterford - Kennount.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Chairman, just to pursue the line of questioning for a moment, the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) just made an interesting comment, that the government has always taken the stand of a house for a house.

When you consider that that land, valued supposedly at \$150,000 in 1973, would in no way be valued at \$150,000 today because we are only talking about \$5000 per acre, which is almost ridiculous. If you are talking about a house for a house, the transfer value would have to be at least, I would suggest, at least in the vicinity of \$500,000, even if you just wanted to take a minimal inflation value and apply to the original \$150,000.

MR. WELLS:
I do not know if the \$150,000 was the correct figure.

MR. GULLAGE:
Whatever it was, if you applied the principle, as the member has said, of a house for a house, then the value of that land would have to be considerably higher than indeed was decided over to this Sprung group of companies at \$150,000.

DR. COLLINS:

What value would be put on, say, thirty acres of serviced land?

MR. GULLAGE:

I would think thirty acres of serviced land would be in the vicinity of \$1 million or more.

DR. COLLINS:

Right, so that is it.

MR. GULLAGE:

But if I heard -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

DR. COLLINS:

It was not serviced.

MR. GULLAGE:

If I heard the Deputy Premier correctly in that the amount applied was in the vicinity of \$1 million, but it was decided that \$150,000 would be used, granted \$150,000 was the transfer amount between Newfoundland and Labrador Housing and the government, but using the \$150,000 and then saying that infrastructure was considered to be the other \$850,000, well, if in fact the land is worth a lot more than \$150,000, even if it is only a dollar more, my concern is we are not talking about a situation where government only is involved. To say that you can transfer in this situation, the same as you would between government departments, where we have a person involved from the free market sector, the Sprung group of companies, in partnership with the government, is blatantly wrong, because you are saying you will transfer at a very minimal value, a 1973 value, if you accept \$150,000 - assume it is \$150,000 for a moment - you make the transfer at that value and all of the added value, whatever it is,

whether it is \$1.00 or \$850,000, will be shared in the future, depending on the break down of shares in the joint venture, by the Sprung people, and I think that is wrong. That is blatantly wrong.

Added to that you are saying infrastructure is on top of the \$1 million, assuming the land has a value of \$1 million. So we are talking \$3.5 million. Assume for a moment that it is \$1 million and it is deemed to be a \$1 million value because services were to the site, and now if I heard the Deputy Premier correctly, you are adding infrastructure costs, development costs, and running the lines to the buildings, and so on, on top of that again, unless I heard him wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. GULLAGE:

Okay. If that is not what he said then, we are back to the value of the land, so let us stay with that. Assume it is \$1 million, or \$500,000, whatever it is over and above that minimal value transferred over to the Sprung group of companies, whatever the difference is, it is going to be shared eventually. If it works or fails, there is going to be an equity transfer by way of an increase in share value to the Sprung people. Now, that is blatantly wrong when you consider the government should not be transferring land for less than what it is worth when a private group of companies, or a private individual or individuals are involved outside of government.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to try to clear up some of the inaccuracies that are being put forward here today. On a minor point first of all, I want to inform the Leader of the Opposition that the Sprung greenhouse is neither in the City of Mount Pearl, neither is it in the district of Mount Pearl. It is in the area controlled by the St. John's Metropolitan Area Board, in the great electoral district of Kilbride. So let us set the record straight. It happens to be accessed from a street in Mount Pearl; the land is physically located in the St. John's Metropolitan Area Board, in an area zoned agricultural by the St. John's urban region plan a long time ago, back in the early 1970s, about the time that the land was expropriated by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation when they expropriated some 2,000 or 3,000 acres of property. Let me correct myself, they did not expropriate all that much. They expropriated part of it and the balance was Crown land, decided by the government of the day, of which the hon. gentleman may or may not have been a part, it was the same administration, but quite properly so, to the Housing Corporation to undertake this great expansion of residential, commercial and industrial development to accommodate the natural growth of the St. John's Metropolitan area.

That piece of land, as my colleague from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) correctly points out, was expropriated from the Eales family, which was part of a much larger piece of property of which

they still own by far the majority and still live on and still utilize that land. This part was a piece of land that was taken from it.

Behind the Sprung structure there was a trunk sewer that was constructed back in 1973 to accommodate all the sewage draining down from what used to be called the Newtown area. Now, the hon. gentleman has been in law long enough to know that when you divide a piece of property you very effectively decrease the net value and the usability of the balance of that property. At that point in time, obviously the right thing to do and the fair thing to do and what was eventually agreed upon, was to expropriate the whole piece of property, the property that was needed for the trunk sewer and the property left over in balance which at that point in time was not totally planned exactly as to what might happen to it.

Eventually, in fact, in 1973, the urban region plan froze all of that area as part of the agricultural zone in St. John's and this government has very deliberately and very tenaciously protected that agricultural zone because it represents one of the most prosperous or most prolific agricultural zones we have in this Province. So we have been protecting it at all costs.

Now the value of the land, Mr. Speaker, is a strange thing. What was it back then? If I recall correctly, and I stand to be corrected, I think the land that was bought at that time by Housing Corporation was well less than \$4,000 an acre that was actually paid for. Certainly the price of raw land bought by private

developers at the time was in the order of around \$4,000 per acre. As I recall the Housing Corporation paid somewhat less than that, it may have even been less than \$3,000 per acre. So that is what in fact was paid for as unserviced agricultural land.

What was the value today? Nothing, Mr. Speaker, absolutely zero, in fact, until the Sprung organization came along and expressed an interest in it because, as my friend said, the value of land is what you can sell it for and there was absolutely no market for that land simply because there was nobody interested in buying agricultural land.

Now, if government were to rezone that and make it possible to develop a residential area on it or a commercial area on it, that is a different quintal of fish. The same holds true of all land on Brookfield Road. That would be very valuable and there have been people over there - it has been a problem for me and my colleague from Kilbride (Mr. R. Aylward) for many years that people over there have had offers, particularly a few years ago when the oil companies were looking for large areas of land for pipe storage and things of that nature, there were very, very generous offers in the millions of dollars made to people in that area to sell land to be used for that purpose. This government very deliberately and very wisely would not allow any rezoning to allow that to take place, and we have been consistent throughout in dealing with the land in that area.

So as long as that land remained non-rezonable, as long as it remained as an agricultural zone,

then its value, because there are no farmers interested, or perhaps, in the position to even pay the normal agricultural price for the land, there really was no market for it, therefore, the value might be considered as nothing.

On the other hand, it was determined that unserviced agricultural land in this case would be worth, I think, the figure is \$150,000. I think is about right. If this were services residential or commercial land, it would be worth many times that. But it is not.

To suggest, as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition did that a difference of zoning of land does not make any difference to the value, I do not think the hon. gentleman really believes that. I think he was in error when he said that because he knows the difference of it. He knows it is just not true.

The cost of servicing, Mr. Chairman, that particular piece of property, as the hon. gentleman said, well, services were on the street. There were services on Commonwealth Avenue. There is a six inch waterline on Commonwealth Avenue. We needed an eight inch waterline to provide very considerable flows at peak conditions, particularly for the fire hoses.

The hon. gentleman may know something about law, but let me teach him something about engineering. Unfortunately, when you design a system to any major industrial area or any area, you do not design, unfortunately, for average flows. If we did, we would save ourselves a lot of money. You have to design for maximum flow, otherwise if you had

a fire then you would not have flow to deal with that situation. You look at any industrial building, go in to Donovans Industrial Park and there is one washroom there to service a half dozen employees in that building or warehouse. All that requires is a half inch cooper line. Every building in there has a six inch line going to it in order to supply the sprinkler system in the event of a fire and to have fire hydrants around the side of the building. So you design for maximum possible conditions, that it has been designed for here. An eight inch line was required and there was a considerable engineering problem.

It took some time to see, in fact, if the Town of Mount Pearl could provide the kinds of flows that were required here. We had to get consultants in to do a study on the existing system and to see what connections, if any, may have to be made. The hon. gentleman talked a few days ago about the new tank on Kenmount Hill which will increase pressures in and all along Topsail Road, and it even came down to the point of having to look at that to see if that might have to be done before proper flows were found. But, there were changes that were made in the overall system that were able to accommodate it and the town was able to provide the kind of maximum flows that are required for the development. But there were more and larger pipes required to make some connections there to deal with that.

Now, I mentioned earlier the trunk sewer that runs behind, that is where the sewage is going. So you have to run a long down to that trunk sewer, which is on the back of the property, and that is where

the sewage drains are.

There is a cost of running in transmission lines for power into the property. I understand some of that was included and general site preparations were the sort of thing that is considered in providing this as a service property for the development that was intended. That is why, I understand, I do not have an exact figure, but I understand the cost went well above the \$850,000 that was predicted. Much of that was predicted, by the way, on estimates done by engineers from the government, like the Department of Transportation, who did some very preliminary soil analysis and site analysis to see what the cost of running services might be.

It was on the strength of that that the government made the decision and we found afterwards, to the disappointment of the Sprung organization, that in fact it probably cost more than was predicted on the basis of very preliminary information gathered by engineers.

So, Mr. Chairman, we can sit here and we can argue all day about what was the actual cost, what was the real value and I would suggest to you that you had fifteen professional assessors sitting here and if you give them a different set of circumstances, they will come up with fifteen different values for that piece of property, depending upon the circumstances.

I would be the first to admit that if that property were to be rezoned to commercial or residential, it would be worth many times that. As it was, I would suggest it was not worth

five cents, because there was absolutely no market for agricultural land there, in fact, government has had to institute a subsidy program for farmers who have land, who want to sell it, because there is no market to sell agricultural land at a value of about \$1,000, which is about what farmers are about to pay and, obviously, that does not make it a feasible thing for people to sell property at that value. So we have a program in place in that area to try to help people who want to dispose of land and are having some hardship for the fact that they cannot dispose of it.

So the land has zero value. It might be millions of dollars in value, but I think the appraisal that was put on it was fair and reasonable and that the Housing Corporation recovered what they paid for, plus the carrying cost of the financing of that and some other things.

We can argue all day, Mr. Chairman. The bottom line is that the project is well underway and I think we should move ahead now with other business.

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Chairman, I have just a few more words to say on it. We can beat this around, as the hon. member says, all day. He is not likely to persuade me and I am not likely to persuade him, but you get down to one fundamental: Without regard to what the land was expropriated for, I do not know how much it cost when it was

expropriated and how much the sales were paid. That can be found out. Whatever it was, the reality is if Newfoundland and Labrador Housing has tomorrow to go out and expropriate land in that area to marshal an area of land for housing development, land in that state, in the condition in which that land was at the time it was divested, will cost about \$40,000 an acre. That is the raw cost of land in the middle of the city or adjacent to a city, right on a street, fronting right on a -

MR. WINDSOR:
It was zoned agricultural.

MR. WELLS:
Yes, I realize there is zoning and the difference zoning makes. I am very much aware of that. We are talking about Newfoundland and Labrador Housing marshalling land and if it is desirable that be used for residential purposes, it is not being used for agricultural purposes, it is desirable that it be used for residential purposes, then clearly government will see it is rezoned for residential purposes. Newfoundland and Labrador Housing has that property capable of being developed for residential purposes and it does not have to go out and pay \$40,000 an acre for it. That is what I am saying. That is its value to Newfoundland and Labrador Housing for housing purposes and that is what we have done.

MR. WINDSOR:
If it were rezoned.

MR. WELLS:
Well, of course, they are going to rezone it before they put housing on it.

MR. WINDSOR:
No, government has said it will

not be rezoned and has been consistent for fifteen years.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Chairman,

MR. CHAIRMAN:
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Chairman, the hon. leader of the Opposition pretty well made the point I have been trying to get recognized to make. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor) and the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins), the acting Premier, seems to be basing their case on the fact that the land was bought or expropriated in 1973 for a certain amount of money. Mr. Chairman, what they seem to ignore is the fact that the real value of that land now would more appropriately be based on its potential value and not on the value that it was in 1969 or 1973.

MR. WINDSOR:
It is zero.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor) says zero, well, that land, Mr. Chairman, thirty acres of land, and at the time when that land was expropriated or about that time the Housing Corporation was in the process of land banking, when they bought land in the Cowan Heights area and, I believe, in that area they paid well less than \$5,000 an acre. In fact, I believe in some cases it was probably less than \$1,000 an acre.

MR. WINDSOR:
Did they use it for farmland?

MR. W. CARTER:
No, of course not, Mr. Chairman,

but the land was expropriated at a time when it was probably designated as farmland.

DR. COLLINS:
But they did not use this land for housing.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Chairman, I wonder may I be allowed to continue without interruption?

DR. COLLINS:
You are not making any new points.

MR. W. CARTER:
That may be, Mr. Chairman, the view of the Minister of Health.

The point that I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that land was expropriated back in the 1970s or late 1960s for a stated amount of money. Granted it might be zoned as farming, but obviously there is no farming taking place in that area or the Acting Premier (Dr. Collins) today said the land is bogland. Somebody else said it contains a lot of rock. And, of course, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor) who is an engineer, realizes, as I am sure he knows and will admit, that that does not really matter today.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Rock matters.

MR. W. CARTER:
Rock matters, yes, but bog does not really matter. In many cases, the Housing Corporation have been known to develop land on which there is a large portion of rock, but they can still develop that land and sell it successfully.

MR. WINDSOR:
(Inaudible) ideal for residential development.

MR. W. CARTER:

No, it might not be ideal for residential development, Mr. Speaker, but the point I am trying to make is that the real value of that land is not based on waste bog land today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation is a government agency. They have certain powers, like the power of expropriation, which they have exercised and are still exercising. I believe the government certainly has the power to rezone an area as it sees fit. The municipality of Mount Pearl is a creature of the provincial government and if the provincial government, or its agency, want to rezone that land for apartment, high density development, or single family building lots, then I am sure they can do it. The fact that that land might have been designated as farmland, although there is no farming occurring in the area -

MR. WINDSOR:

There is.

MR. W. CARTER:

Not in that particular site, I am told.

MR. WINDSOR:

Right next to it is the big experimental farm.

MR. W. CARTER:

But there never was much farming taking place on the thirty acres on which the Sprung greenhouse complex now rests. In fact, there is probably none.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of

Finance and the Minister of Health can play around with it all they like but the argument they are using, that the land was expropriated in 1975 and that it was only worth amount of money now, based on the fact that it was expropriated as farmland, that does not hold water.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It does.

MR. W. CARTER:

The minister will have a chance to make his speech if he wants to but would he please let me make my few remarks.

If the minister wants to check the files of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation he will find out there was land expropriated by that corporation at about the same time, that was then designated as farm land -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Chairman, would you mind, Sir?

If the minister were to check -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:

I can keep going until 5:00 o'clock if you want me to.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Go ahead! Go ahead!

MR. W. CARTER:

If you want to get this bill through, fine, but as long as you continue to interrupt, I will remain standing. It is up to yourselves. I do not care. I am prepared to stay here until

September.

MR. CHAIRMAN:
Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:
Are they prepared to remain silent and allow me to speak, Mr. Chairman?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Go ahead.

MR. W. CARTER:
Fine.

Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Finance were to check the files of the Newfoundland Labrador Housing Corporation he will find that at about that time, that period, there were acres of land expropriated that were otherwise used for farming purposes which at that time was zoned as farm land for which the Housing Corporation paid on an expropriation basis probably less than \$5000 an acre. I can tell you now that what is now known as the Cowan Heights subdivision is in that category.

Now, the point I want to make is this: When that land was expropriated, or purchased, it was expropriated, or purchased, as farm land. It was subsequently rezoned and land that they paid less than \$5000 an acre for, in that period, or maybe shortly after that period, was subsequently developed into building lots and sold for around \$30,000 per lot. Given the fact that there is four lots per acre, you can see, Mr. Chairman, why it is that we argue that land that was purchased then for \$150,000, with the potential of being developed into high density housing or single family units, certainly has the potential

to be valued at well in excess of \$1 million. I would suggest to you that that thirty acres, again, is not owned by a private concern which has to depend on the good will and the benevolence, maybe, of the government or the council to rezone. Government has the power to rezone that land and to do what it wants with it, but the fact that they did not see fit to rezone is no reason, even though the potential was there, why they should sell it for probably less than one-tenth of what it cost.

Mr. Chairman, the leader of the Opposition is correct. Today, that land has a potential value of, I would suggest to you, well in excess of \$1 million.

On motion, Department of Finance, schedule Bill No. 41, carried.

A bill, "An Act for Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Eight And For Other Purposes Relating To the Public Service."

MR. SIMMS:
I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern, I had a chance to look into this point of privilege raised by the

hon. the member for Fogo. First of all, I would like to quote from Maingot, **Parliamentary Privilege in Canada**, page 206. It is the first paragraph there, and I will read it: "If the conduct of a member is to be formally discussed or debated in the House of Commons, such as a charge of entering into a contract with the federal government for a fee, or of deliberately misleading the House, it cannot be done on a 'question of privilege' because until admitted, or, so found by the House, such allegations are unparliamentary and cannot be uttered and the fact that the accused member denies it is irrelevant."

I would further like to quote from Beauchesne, page 12, paragraph 19, subparagraph 1. "A dispute arising between two Members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege."

And a final quote from Beauchesne, page 114, paragraph 322, **Statements by Members:** "It has been formally ruled by Speakers that a statement by a Member respecting himself and particularly within his own knowledge must be accepted, but it is not unparliamentary temperately to criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible. On rare occasions this may result in the House having to accept two contradictory accounts of the same incident."

There is no prima facie case of privilege, and I call on the hon. the member for Fogo to withdraw his comments.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
The words 'deliberately misleading' I withdraw, of course, and we will consider -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
- whether we should put down the appropriate motion or not.

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

MR. PARSONS:
Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred and has directed me to report that it has adopted a certain resolution and a bill consequent thereto.

On motion, report received and adopted, resolution ordered read a first and second time, bill ordered read a first, second and third time.

Resolution

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1988, the sum of forty-five million eight hundred and sixty-six thousand five hundred dollars (\$45,866,500).

On motion, resolution read a first and second time.

On motion, a bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year

Ending the Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Eight And for Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service", read a first, second and third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 41).

Mr. Speaker, we move to motion 4, which is the Meech Lake debate and I believe it was adjourned by the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), who has about a minute left, as I recollect.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, I only have a minute left to speak on the Meech Lake Accord. I know members opposite were enjoying it thoroughly the last time as I was expounding my thoughts on the Meech Lake Accord.

MR. DECKER:

They should give you three or four minutes.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, I need at least a couple of minutes to sum it up.

Mr. Speaker, the Meech Lake Accord, the amendment put forward by the Opposition which would see a distinct society clause added to include Newfoundland and Labrador as a distinct society, I think, Mr. Speaker, is a very worthy amendment. It is one worthy of adoption by this hon. House, and I would hope members opposite and government will see fit to vote for the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland, as I have stated in my speech, is a distinct society. It should be recognized as being so and certainly should have the same representation or equal to any other Province in Canada.

So, if government decides to vote against this, Mr. Speaker, they are voting against Newfoundland as far as I and as every other Newfoundlander out there are concerned. They will know then, Mr. Speaker, what the Meech Lake Accord is all about.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would hope the words we have put forward in speeches and through our amendment will help the government consider their vote and position on the Meech Lake Accord, and what it says for this Province and for this country of Canada.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. WARREN:

Are you for Meech Lake?

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am quite pleased to be able to hear what the Minister responsible for Northern Development (Mr. Warren) ask me if I am for Meech Lake.

I am quite pleased that Meech Lake has looked at the possibility of bringing Quebec in and I think it

is important Quebec is brought into our constitution. Quebec was in the constitution, even though they did not sign it, but for political reasons, with regard to Mr. Levesque being asleep, the government decided have the agreement completed by Mr. Chrétien, assisted by the Solicitor General of Saskatchewan, Roy McMurtry. They came up with the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, it took us over 100 years to get a constitution. The reason why we did not get one before was, or the main reason was the provinces could not agree on an amending formula. The federal government, Mr. Speaker, referred it to the Supreme Court and asked the Supreme Court if the federal government had the right to repatriate the constitution on their own without any permission from the provinces. Once they found out they had the right, they bought back the constitution and then, of course, a debate went on for three or four years on what type of constitution we would have. There were meetings all across Canada, House of Commons meetings, Senate Committee meetings, and other public meetings. When I was studying theology at McGill, I was vice-president of a national organization. We prepared a brief which basically said that bilingualism should be in all the houses of families across Canada. We also said all legislation should be translated. In that national organization we formed we also said people with bilingual needs should have such facilities at court. If they were English in Quebec, if they were in Saskatchewan or Newfoundland and they wanted French, they should get it. I must say, in fairness to this government, Mr. Speaker,

that this Department of Justice has now made sure it can take place in this Province.

Of course, Quebec would never sign the constitution because of historical rights and reasons. Quebec is a very strong Province, Mr. Speaker, and Quebec always holds out for what it wants until it gets what it wants. It held out by not signing the constitution because of political reasons for the PQ, as well as the Liberals and the Union Nationale. Out of that came one thing. When they did hold out, they basically wanted more control over their immigration. They wanted to have more control with regard to the Senate, the Supreme Court and also with regard to the idea of recognizing the society as distinct.

When Mr. Bourassa became Premier, he basically set forward five conditions before Quebec would go back into Canada and sign the constitution. The rest of the provinces, Mr. Speaker, basically felt they had an opportunity now to rectify the original constitution. I remember this government getting up and lambasting the federal government and the constitution, saying, 'There should be no Charter of Rights. We should go back to the old British system of precedents and keep things without putting them into legislation.' I believe the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) said, 'Why should they cut in stone?'

This was the cry all across Canada from the Conservative provinces and the Conservative Opposition in Ottawa, 'No, we should not have a Charter of Rights.' Trudeau made the decision, which I think was quite correct. What are we going

to have in a constitution? Are we going to have a Cadillac or are we going to have a Volkswagen constitution? By that I mean, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to repatriate the constitution, it was just as well to have a Charter of Rights as well. The Charter of Rights now, of course, as the President of the Council did today when he stood up, is worthy of praise. Now legislation all across the country is being more equal and more fair because of the Charter of Rights.

But what do we have, Mr. Speaker, as the result of Meech Lake Accord? We had a group of premiers, the majority of them Conservatives, the Prime Minister who got elected in Quebec because of their favourite son, and we found ourselves in a situation where we should ask: Did they take the highroad with regard to Canada's constitution or did they take the low road? They took the low road. The main thing about Meech Lake was to bring Quebec on side and they brought Quebec on side at the expense, Mr. Speaker, of the rest of Canada and the rest of various minorities in Canada.

Did they refer the Meech Lake Accord to the Supreme Court? No, they did not. Did they have debates or hearings all across the country? Again, Mr. Speaker, they did not. Did they ask organizations to submit briefs? They met at Meech Lake over a weekend, came up with the amendment, signed it and then basically told the rest of Canada, 'This is it.' There was no national debate on this issue and no input in particular. Here we have, Mr. Speaker, our national constitution. I would go so far as to say, when you had the federal Liberal government, who

basically said, 'After one hundred odd years of having the constitution overseas, let us have a national debate and let us have national input, and with that, it took place. It was not perfect in any way, but it did come up with the basis of a firm foundation for the constitution. It was unfortunate Quebec did not sign it for political reasons. It is also unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that Quebec signed an agreement, a Memorandum of Understanding in the Victoria Charter with the present Prime Minister of Quebec, Mr. Robert Bourassa, and then when he went back to Quebec, the Opposition came so hard on him through the various newspapers and other people in Quebec, he reneged on it. He killed the Victoria Charter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where, if anybody questions Meech Lake, you are a traitor to Canada. You are a racist towards Quebec because you happen to be questioning Meech Lake. Yet the Prime Minister of Quebec turned around and killed the Victoria Charter, even though he agreed and signed a Memorandum of Understanding in Victoria.

What is wrong now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to Meech Lake? Well, as I said, number one, there was no debate, take it or leave it. Ten people have signed it without having input and now academic people across the country, trade union people, say there should be a free vote on the constitution of our nation. It has split political parties down various lines.

It is unfortunate we do not have the Minister responsible for Northern Development (Mr. Warren) in his seat now. We have an

agreement in which you have to have ten people agree if Northwest Territories or the Yukon can become part of Canada as a province. With regard to the way B.C. is treating their Native people and with regard to Quebec and Alberta, and as well as our own province, then obviously some of those provinces, well, if only one of them holds out, they can deny those people the right to form their own provinces.

The natives in our country of Canada feel they have been sold out and they have been sold out by not being included as distinct people, aboriginal people of our nation. A great injustice has been done to them in the past and it continues to be done to them. Why did the Premier of Newfoundland id not hold out to make sure that the Natives went into that agreement? None of them did.

We saw, Mr. Speaker, what happened at the National Conference between the premiers and the former Prime Minister, and also with the present Prime Minister; You cannot get the provinces to agree on national rights for the aboriginal people of our nation because of the narrow, petty, parochial view they have and that is the reason why Natives are not included.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be long, long, long while before this country of Canada has Native rights enshrined in the Constitution with their distinctiveness because of the provincial views of a lot of the Premiers.

The women in our country are upset with the Constitution because of what they believe happened under the Charter. Each province also

has the right, Mr. Speaker, to pass legislation to override the Charter. Legislators in this country can pass legislation which basically says, "You are Canadians but now we are going to pass a law and now we are going to make you second class Canadians" because of the narrow-minded view they have of their own region of Canada. They will not rise to the occasion and have a view of Canada itself.

Francophones in Saskatchewan went to the Supreme Court and they ruled that, under the Northwest Territory Act, all legislation has to be passed in both official languages and then the court gave them the right to say that you can pass another piece of legislation and declare all the laws before that were not translated into French and English valid. Of course, that is what they did. And when the Premier of Saskatchewan met with the Premier of Quebec, did we have the Premier of Quebec agree with Saskatchewan in protecting the Francophone rights? No, he said nothing, and the only reason why he said nothing is because the legislation before the Supreme Court of Canada with bilingual signs and other matters meant the people have questioned the idea of what type of Canada they want to live in and have basically remained silent on that.

So now we are going to see a Canada, people believe under Meech Lake, which is going to ghettoize French in Quebec and we are going to ghettoize English in the rest of Canada. We are going to get rid of the view of people on the Port au Port Peninsula, who are seventeenth century French, we are going to give up the view that they should be able to have the same national rights of their own

language, culture and religion, as any other people in Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, since I am talking on the Constitution, I would like to have a bit of silence.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Francophone and the English in this country, the view of Canada is not the view that is coming under Meech Lake, because now we are going to ghettoize different groups in Canada. For almost one million English speaking people in Quebec, I do not think it is fair to them and I do not think it is fair to the Francophones in New Brunswick or the Francophones in Northern Manitoba or in Saskatchewan, Alberta or Ontario as well as in our own Province.

I am totally against Meech Lake because I believe my view of Canada and the view of Canada the majority of Canadians have has been undermined by this process. Ten people have met, again, after long hours, threw something together and now we as Canadians have to accept it.

The view, Mr. Speaker, I have will long outlive the views of present premiers of this country, the present Prime Minister and other people. Canada will have its day again. Meech Lake and the Constitution again will be reformed in the future and will be fine tuned.

Mr. Speaker, the British Constitution is not a written constitution. Parliament is supreme and sovereign and what parliament decides is its constitution. They have the

habeas corpus tradition, the Magna Carta, the long Parliament and various other changes which have gone through their system. We have decided to put out a written constitution so that, over the coming generations we will find ourselves, Mr. Speaker, fine tuning our constitution for various times.

I believe very, very strongly that woe be the Prime Minister and woe be to the Premier and the elected people who do not allow their own people to have input into their own constitution. We are lucky we are living in one of the more highly civilized democracies in this world, that we we do have forms of official opposition, the press, and very fine pressure groups in Canada, aboriginal or Native groups, the National Council on the Status of Women, the Francophone Associations, and we also have two territories who are very violently against this. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, in the future we are going to see the constitution changed again.

I do not accept the view given by people in support of the Meech Lake Accord that there are a lot of good things in it. I am quite pleased and proud Quebec is coming into it, but we should never, ever take a narrow minded attitude with regard to Meech Lake that if we open it up, it is all gone, or nothing can ever be improved. Some say, 'This is the best that we have got, and if we open it up, we are going to lose everything and Quebec will not be into the constitution for another fifty, sixty, seventy years.' I say the answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is they do not have very much faith. They do not have very much faith into Canadians, and in the belief of what type of country we have,

what type of country the people went overseas in both wars and the Korean Conflict and fought for, what type of country we have, and what type of country we want. They say we cannot open it because it will unravel. Why of course it will unravel but it can be fine tuned. It can be done and we can be proud of what we have.

In relation to the Senate, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland has seven Senators. New Brunswick has eight, and you have other provinces which have small numbers, and you have Quebec and Ontario with large numbers. We do not have equal representation into our parliamentary process in this country, and as a result we find ourselves periodically having to go to the Supreme Court. We had to go to the Supreme Court for twelve years of a legal battle, twelve years of money, and what did we find? The Premier referred it to the Court and the federal government referred it to the Court and then, who owned the offshore, who owned the coastline? Did we bring it with us into Confederation or did we not? The belief was that we brought it into Confederation. Well, we did and we found out we bought three miles in and later it was extended to twelve miles, but we did not bring in the 200-mile economic zone.

A lot of people do not realize, Mr. Speaker, Canada does not own 200 miles, nor does the United States, nor does Australia, nor does any other country. We have control over 200 mile economic zone, and that is it. But we went to the Supreme Court to find out our constitutional rights and what we bought in to Canada. Of course, the Supreme Court struck our action down.

Why did they strike it down, Mr. Speaker? They struck it down because of their central belief in a strong Canada, and the belief if each province owned a coastline, then you would have Prince Edward Island making laws, Nova Scotia making laws, Quebec making laws, Newfoundland and Labrador making laws, and British Columbia.

Eventually, one could look to future generations, one hundred years from now maybe, and the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, when some of that coastline is opened up, also making laws. So we found out that the Supreme Court took a strong central view in the betterment of Canada, not in our interest. Now, of course, we have a political settlement and we are finding out that even with who owns it, there is no sense of having the water running over the lower Churchill and there is no sense of having oil out on the Grand Banks unless it is developed. Of course, now we have a development thanks to the former Liberal government. A very good package was given and we will hopefully see even a better package given now.

Now we have the right where the provinces can recommend Supreme Court Justices. The question which remains there is are they going to take the narrow-minded view the provinces took at the Meech Lake conference and at the First Ministers Conference. They said, 'No, aboriginal people cannot be recognized and cannot have their rights enshrined in the Constitution,' when they had that narrow-minded provincial view. No, they did not, Mr. Speaker, and I am afraid with regard to the Supreme Court instead of taking a strong national view of Canada, we will find our court getting into a

more provincial slant. It may help some groups sometimes but overall, Mr. Speaker, it is going to hurt Canada as a whole.

We find that Alberta held out for Senate reform but now we find out that in order for the Senate to be improved, or changed in any way, you have to get all ten provinces to agree. Why is Quebec going to give up twenty-four, if I am correct, Senators and why is Ontario going to give up twenty-four senators and go with equal numbers for equal provinces, probably ten each? That is the problem there with regard to the Senate.

I do believe very strongly that the Senate has to be elected but I also believe the Senate has to be subservient to the House of Commons. However, they do not have to be subservient to the will of the House of Commons when it comes to jurisdiction and the views of their own provinces. The Senate has to stand up for the rights of their own provinces and that is the reason why we had a double house in the first place with those checks and balances.

Mr. Speaker, we wanted to bring Quebec into it. Quebec is now going to be into it unless Manitoba and New Brunswick hold out. We know it is going to pass in this House because of the government's majority, but it is unfortunate to see that we are not including our Native people in this agreement. Francophones and our English people in Canada question it; our women question it; and the Northwest Territories and the Yukon question it.

The view we have of Canada now is being changed, Mr. Speaker. It was the Premier of Newfoundland

and Labrador who said he preferred the view of Canada Rene Levesque had, and that was a view of decentralized government instead of a strong central government. Now we have a Meech Lake Accord that is giving more power to the provinces and the provinces of Ontario, Quebec and Alberta like it.

But what is going to happen to PEI and New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and what will happen to the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, Mr. Speaker? We find out with this view of decentralizing, the question is who is going to stand for Canada because we found out what happened with Mr. Bourassa when he went to Saskatchewan. He was not standing up to the Francophones in Saskatchewan when he went there. And when Devine went to Quebec, he was not standing up for the English in Canada. He was just looking after his own regional area.

So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Constitution and Meech Lake, that is what I find. If we bring Quebec into the Constitution and recognize it as a distinct society, and there are many people wondering if it is just a word or a phrase, with regard to our own culture, our own view, we are distinct, but we found, Mr. Speaker, that when PEI was offered by the federal government a chance to have a causeway, what do they do? They had a referendum on whether they should have a causeway. What did we do, Mr. Speaker, with regard to our Terms of Union? Term 31, we know what we did on Term 29; we fought an election. We won the election and former Prime Minister Diefenbaker backed down and made sure that Term 29 would never, never be changed again.

We had Premiers in this House, former Premier Smallwood and former Premier Moores, and Mr. John Crosbie, the International Trade Minister, who have always fought on the view our Constitutional gave us certain rights. The Governor of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, Governor McGrath, when he was in Ottawa he believed we had constitutional rights with regard to Term 31.

Now what we have is a first class traitor, the Premier, who is selling out for political reasons, for re-election purposes, selling Newfoundland and Labrador down the drain for thirty pieces of silver, or maybe we could call them loony dollars now. It is not the question now, Mr. Speaker, whether the railway should have gone or should not have gone or what state the highway was in, or what state the railway was in, that is not the question anymore. The question is we gave in on a Term of Union, Term 31! We did not give in on Term 29, and now we have an amending formula for the Constitution and what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, we are going to keep Ontario and Quebec and their view Canada now. It is going to be very hard for us to take a stand on any other constitutional issue in the future.

That is the danger. That is why I called the Premier a traitor, that is the danger he has done. Because of Term 31, Mr. Speaker, of saying it had no validity, then we can also say that all the other Terms have no validity either, and there are no Terms of Union. We cannot take the federal government to the Supreme Court. We could do Hibernia, we could do the Lower Churchill or the Upper Churchill, but with Term 31, Mr. Speaker, is

not worth the paper it is written on. That is what the Premier has said. So Term 31 is not worth the paper it is written on.

What about Terms 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5? We found out what happened with Term 29. It was written and also, Mr. Speaker, with view of Parliamentary Procedure in the House of Westminster, just because it is written down and just because it is not written down does not mean it is a precedent and is a view of what the constitution and the country is about. This is where the Premier gave up and gave an undertaking for \$800 million, not even for a twinned highway.

We find out that \$70 million is the compensation package and the workers themselves paid in that money. That is not new money. That is another fraud. The \$70 million is not new money for compensation. It is their own money. We find out now, Mr. Speaker, there was not a constitutional provision paid for when they took the railway out of Carbonear or Placentia. Well, the Northern Peninsula Road was done and the Labrador Straits Road and we took off CN Marine's service.

Now the question I have to ask the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is do we have any constitutional right now for **Marine Atlantic** to continue to go up to Main or Black Tickle? The Terms of Union are not good enough for the railway, and that is in the same sentence, the railway and the coastal service. They can now get rid of the coastal service.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

This is what is happening, Mr. Speaker, by giving in on Term 31 and not taking a stand and calling an election - and he should have called an election on it, just like former Premier Smallwood. It is not everything I agree with that former Premier Smallwood did, but when it came to our rights -

MR. SPEAKER (Parsons):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, he did support our rights and called an election on it. That is why I call the Premier again a traitor for selling out for \$800 million. He should have called an election and, just like PEI, had a referendum on whether they should have a causeway to that island. Newfoundland should have had an election and had a referendum on it saying, 'Do you want to get rid of your railway and put the package there? Do you want to have a twinned highway? Do you want to have maintenance?' But we have not had that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, this day and this government is going to go down in history as being worse than Valdmanis and John C. Doyle, and worse than Prime Minister Morris, who built the branch lines in the first place.

So in concluding, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Quebec is in the constitution, but I do not think that we have to sell out our view of Canada, our Natives, our women, and our Francophone people just

because we need Quebec in Canada and have to undercut our own provincial rights and the rights of our Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the House ready for the question on the amendment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

On motion, amendment defeated.

Is the House ready for the question on the main motion?

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I only have a few comments to make, but I will be moving an amendment seconded, I believe, by an individual from the Liberal Caucus. I am not entirely sure who it is at this moment, but I have been assured there will be a seconder. In the amendment I originally wrote up, we expected to have the member for St. John's Fast here.

Mr. Speaker, since this is the first chance I have had to speak on the main motion, I would like to at least correct a number of inconsistencies or problems that have appeared in the media with regard to the position of the New Democratic Party in this Province towards the Meech Lake Accord. In other words, I would like to speak to it in general, just mention the amendments, then move the

amendments and get it over with.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, we are supportive of the process, we are supportive of the general thrust of the Meech Lake Accord. We are disappointed that it has not gone as far as we thought it should, we are disappointed that there are individuals who are overlooked in it, and we are disappointed that it did not accept the fact that there are Northern territories in this country which certainly have rights as well, but we will address those when we get to the amendments.

We do, Mr. Speaker, support the idea that Quebec should be part of the constitutional process, and as part of a nation building exercise, when the motion is called on the Meech Lake Accord in this House, we intend to vote for it. I say that despite the fact that there have been unsettling things that have occurred over the last six or eight months with regard to the Meech Lake Accord, specifically the travesty of what occurred in the Province of Saskatchewan, when the Francophones in Saskatchewan were, quite frankly, dealt what I thought was a cruel blow by the provincial government at the time, in the sense that their rights and their existence was not enhanced by actions that the Saskatchewan Government could have taken.

I think it is important that we realize that this is a bilingual country, or it should be a bilingual country. It is important to realize that Francophones should be at home in as many parts of the country as is humanly possible, and it is also important that as many anglophones should be at home in all parts of the country as is possible.

The Meech Lake Accord, to a certain degree, does accomplish that, and, to a certain degree, may be look on by certain individual as a comprise of that. But, in general, it does say that we are a country again. I would like to mention to hon. members here that although very often I have been referred to as a person from Ontario, that is really a -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Red herring?

MR. FFNWICK:

Well, it is not exactly a red herring, but, to a certain degree, is not quite correct. I was born in a place called St. Thomas, Ontario, but in my entire life I have only lived about a year to a year and a half in the Province of Ontario. In fact, I was raised in a place called Point Claire, Quebec, from the age of about two to about the time I moved to Newfoundland.

The reason I mention that, Mr. Speaker, is that Point Claire, Quebec, is an English community on the Island of Montreal and is a suburb of the City of Montreal. In growing up in that community, I grew up in an environment that tended to look upon the French language as not as good a language as English and not worthy of being learned by individuals in that particular area. When I was going to high school, French as a subject was considered to be unnecessary; the argument was that all managerial positions, even in the Province of Quebec, were given to English speaking people. So on that basis, why would you learn French? Because the only job you would get was a construction job, or as a labourer or something like that. This kind of improper attitude, quite frankly, given the

nature of Quebec, was one that I was raised in but realize now was the end of a particular colonial attitude that the English people in Quebec had towards the French.

I left the Province of Quebec in 1967, and I have been a resident of Newfoundland virtually all of the time since then. In that time, I have seen a major transformation in the Province of Quebec. The attitude I had in that English suburb would no longer be entertained by anybody in the Province of Quebec, because the Province itself has changed substantially. If it had not, the people of Quebec would have separated from the Province, they would have gone and formed a different country. And I do not think there is anybody, either in the Province of Quebec or elsewhere, who would have complained or would have argued that it was not a sensible thing for them to do.

One of the great accomplishments of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, who I believe will be looked on as one of the more significant prime ministers of this country, was that even though there was a very traumatic time period when he led the Liberal Party, he did accomplish one major thing, and that was he changed the nature of the country to make it acceptable to be a francophone and to be at home throughout the entire country, and that is important. Because if it did not work, then the country would not work.

And we can say that the new language law going through the House of Commons may be one that puts higher standards on people going into the federal civil service, but it is a necessary compromise if the country is to

work. We cannot have 25 per cent of the country, in the Province of Quebec, who speak French as a major language, feeling that this is not a country in which they can possibly live and raise their families and educate their children, in almost any part of the country where the numbers justify.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, we thought it was extremely important that a year ago the eleven first Ministers at the time got together in order to work out a system whereby the Province of Quebec's elected government could say, Yes, we are a part of Canada. We accept the role and the rationale of being a part of Canada, and we are prepared to look at the Constitution in the future in order to expand it and to change it in such a way as it more accurately represents the rest of the country.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, we can see no other choice but to support the general thrust of what is going on here. We wanted to make sure that that was on the record because press accounts, which have been inaccurate and have not come from us but have come from somewhere else, seem to indicate that we were not to support the Meech Lake Accord, which, in fact, we will. If it gets to be voted on before my colleague from St. John's East has returned, then I will tell you that it is also his intention to vote for the Meech Lake Accord. We would prefer to see it voted for with the amendments we are proposing, but if they are defeated, we still intend to vote for it because we feel that the basic thrust must be supported -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

which, Mr. Speaker, gets me to the amendments.

Although I have a list of six amendments, I would appreciate it if the House would accept them as one amendment. There are copies at the Table, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will read the amendments: I am not sure who the seconder will be, but I have been assured by the Liberal Caucus that there will be an individual available.

MR. SIMMS:

You just table them.

MR. FENWICK:

I will explain each one of them in turn, okay? Well, anyway, I move, seconded by the - do I have a name? By the way, the seconding does not imply an endorsement to all of it, but is just a means to get it up for debate.

MR. SIMMONS:

If the member would just yield for a moment?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

We realize that the member for Menihek is in and that he is rotating his caucus. Only half the caucus is here today, therefore, for the purpose of allowing him to get the amendments moved, I would take pleasure in seconding the amendments. Now that does not mean that I will vote for them. I want to hear what they mean first. But for the purpose of allowing the amendments to get on in the debate, I am

prepared and pleased to second the amendments.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:

It has to be understood and recognized that the method by which the hon. member wishes to introduce these amendments right now is not the norm. It is not usual to introduce six amendments like that. It is understood that this is the process he wishes to use in order to get on with his case and get a vote on it one way or the other. It is not a precedent setting thing, and in that sense we have no problem with it. It is more or less by leave, and we will go along with it.

MR. FENWICK:

I would like to thank the member for Fortune - Hermitage for seconding it, and the Government House leader for allowing what is a slightly less than normal procedure to be used.

If you look at them, Mr. Speaker, this is what they mean. The first amendment refers to Section 6 of the particular resolution we are debating here. It is 101C and it currently says: "Where a vacancy occurs in the Supreme Court of Canada, the government of each province may, in relation to that vacancy, submit to the Minister of Justice of Canada the names of any of the persons who have been admitted to the bar of that province and are qualified under Section 101B for appointment to

that court."

The proposed amendment would add the words 'or territory' after the word 'province'. The argument here is that the people of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon should have every bit as much right to participate in the selection of Supreme Court Justices as do the provinces and the rest of the country. I think that is a reasonable request.

The second amendment refers to Section 9. That Section 9 of the Meech Lake Accord be amended by deleting subsection 41 (i). Subsection 41(i) refers to the unanimity clause in terms of amendments. Section 41 says: An amendment to the Constitution of Canada in relation to the following matters may only be made when the House of Commons, the Senate and each of the individual provinces agree to it. Section (i) says, "notwithstanding any other law or practice, the establishment of new provinces". This, of course, is a major new change to our Constitution, and what it says is that in the future the establishment of provinces will be subject to veto by any one of the provinces of Canada.

This is a new precedent, and, as members are aware, if it had been in existence in 1947, 1948, and 1949, during the Confederation debates, it may have been used, for example, by New Brunswick, or Nova Scotia, or PEI to prevent Newfoundland and Labrador from being made part of the Dominion of Canada. On this basis, we are saying that this is an unnecessary extra restriction on places such as the Yukon or the Northwest Territories which may in the future have the resources and the population base required to become

provinces. As everybody knows, the population of the Yukon and Northwest Territories is in the range of 25,000 to 40,000 people and on that basis they are not ready for provincehood. They have always admitted that, but they feel that this is an insult to them, to have to go through a procedure that no other provinces have been forced through.

Amendment 3 says: that Section 13 of the Meech Lake Accord be amended by renumbering section 50 (2), subsection (c) to 50 (2) subsection (d), and inserting a new section 50 (2) subsection (c) "aboriginal rights, in particular self-government, with full representation by representatives of aboriginal peoples and territorial governments."

I should mention to Harry Stamp and the poor people working up in the Hansard Office, that there is a copy of these amendments available should they wish to have them when they have to transcribe this.

Section 13 refers to Constitutional Conferences. "The intention of this particular amendment is that in 50 subsection (2) (c) a new section be added that deals with "aboriginal rights, in particular self-government, with full representation by representatives of aboriginal peoples and territorial governments."

The argument there, Mr. Speaker, is that since senate reform, roles of the fishery and other matters will be subject to this, the insertion of this will mean that the aboriginal peoples of Canada will have some guarantee that there will be continuing discussions with relation to their

particular interests, which are, of course, to advance the cause of self-government for aboriginal peoples.

Amendment 4: That is section 16. This one is probably one of the few that is not at all self evident. That Section 16 be amended by replacing a couple of words and adding the word and number 'or 28' after the number '27'. If you look at page 15 of our Order Paper of today, you will see, **General:** It says, "Nothing in section 2 of the Constitution Act, 1867 affects section 25 or 27 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms." The new wording would say, "affects sections 25, 27 or 28." The reason we mention that is section 28 deals with the equality provisions and is an insertion to clarify that these particular amendments do not override the rights that women have gained in the 1982 Constitution to equality of treatment. A lot of scholars have argued that this does not actually change the particular Constitution itself, but it does make it much clearer that the rights, for example, of special status for the Province of Quebec does not mean that they can give inferior status to the women in their province, and it is specifically to that point that this particular insertion is addressed.

Amendments 5 and 6, Mr. Speaker, are inserted, with the concurrence of our caucus, at the request of the Francophone Association of Newfoundland and Labrador, and they reflect the status that the francophone community has within this Province right now. Section 2, subsection 2 says, and I will read it for you, "The role of the Parliament of Canada and the provincial legislatures to

preserve the fundamental characteristic of Canada referred to in paragraph (1) (a) is affirmed."

Now what that currently says is the bilingual nature of Canada, or the reality of French and English Canada is to be affirmed. What the Francophone Association in this Province is saying, and I think quite legitimately, is that they really have very little in the way of existence. The francophone communities in my district of Menihek are the second largest in the Province, and the largest are in places like Cape St. George and Mainland on the Port au Port Peninsula. There are very small communities scattered throughout the Province as well, but primarily there are two concentrations, and even those are only a couple of thousand people at best. So their argument is if you say preserve that, you are preserving virtually nothing. Their argument is it should be translated to say, "preserve and promote", and on that basis they would feel that there was actually a constitutional obligation to say that they have the right to be a French community in this Province and to exist and to flourish.

Amendment No. 6 goes along with that and deletes the words 'French speaking Canadian and English speaking Canadians' to replace them with 'French Canada and English Canada'. Again, the argument from the Francophone Association is that when you talk about English and French speaking Canadians, you are talking about individual rights. They feel the group rights of group such as the people on the Port au Port Peninsula or in Menihek or in other parts of the Province should have some sort of group rights in

terms of schooling, cultural institutions and so on. So they feel that language would be stronger for them under those circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, those are the changes I am proposing. I do not intend to take up any more time of the House. I appreciate the fact the Liberal Opposition has provided a seconder for the resolution. Again, as I said before, we would appreciate a vote on them. But, however, if they are not accepted, we will still vote for the Meech Lake Accord itself.

Thank you very much

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, just in concluding on the original amendment.

MR. SIMMS:

On the original amendment?

MR. HISCOCK:

Well, this is the part -

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) deal with the amendments.

MR. HISCOCK:

No, but that is the point, while you were there chatting, I wanted to get up and more or less - now you are back -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, he can, but if he would rather speak to the main motion.

MR. HISCOCK:

Well, to the amendments and that, I believe it is hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, to get into amendments when we realize we cannot change this. That is the reason why our

party, in particular, only brought in one.

The amendments, I think, in the long term will be addressed by other governments of Canada, but I do think, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier and all the Cabinet should be here voting on this. It is probably the most important piece of legislation we have passed in this House since the original constitution, with a strong view of Canada and having long-term implications.

So I addressed the majority of those amendments in my own speech, but what is the sense, Mr. Speaker, of getting into amendments when you know they are going to be voted down. It is just grandstanding. We feel if the NDP Party wants to be hypocritical and do it that way, we are not going to have any input.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, on these amendments here, I do feel the view of Canada is changing, but the Canada will have another day. By the Premier not giving in to our Terms of Union in our Constitution, what is the sense of passing Meech Lake because the Premier now does not agree with Term 31 of the Terms of Union. We now basically have said to the rest of Canada and to the Parliament of Canada our Terms of Union are not worth the paper they are written on.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, as has been indicated by the hon. member for Fortune Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), to enable the NDP member to speak to his amendments and move his amendments, we agreed to indicate he would second it, but solely for that purpose.

The amendments proposed do not in any manner really deal with fundamental problems of the Meech Lake proposal. While nobody can speak against the desirability of ensuring that we have the political approbation of the legislature and the people of Quebec, and the Government of Quebec, to the constitutional procedures which have been taking place in Canada over the last few years, nevertheless, there is a price beyond which we cannot go.

There is nobody in this Chamber, I suspect, that is not anxious to see the people of Quebec reasonably happy as residents or citizens of a province of Canada and have them pleased with their role and their place in Canada. There is nobody in this Chamber who would be opposed to that.

MR. TULKE:
Absolutely, nobody.

MR. WELLS:
But, Mr. Speaker, there should be nobody in this Chamber prepared to sell-out the constitutional future of this Province, or the constitutional future of the country for the sake of achieving that because it would indeed be very shortsighted, and that is my criticism of Meech Lake and these amendments. These amendments do not, Mr. Speaker, go anywhere near meeting the fundamental problems of the Meech Lake Accord.

If you look at the first amendment

proposed, it deals with enabling the governments of the Territories to have some kind of an input into the appointment process of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Now, in fact, most lawyers in this country, I believe, are opposed to this present proposal in Meech Lake. They do not think it will do anything for the Supreme Court to have the federal government confined to a list proposed by a particular province from which the appointment is to be made. That will do nothing for the court; it will add nothing at all to the quality of the court. We have a reasonably good court. It is functioning reasonably well over the years. I do not suggest it is perfect. The means of appointment has worked reasonably well, particularly in later years, and I think we have a reasonably good, well functioning Supreme Court of Canada at the moment.

This proposal allows the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario to effectively name the nominees. Newfoundland cannot do that. There has never been a Newfoundlander sit on the Supreme Court of Canada. There never has been. We have been a Province of Canada now for thirty-nine years and there has never been a Newfoundlander sit on the Supreme Court of Canada. To the best of my knowledge, there has never been anybody from Prince Edward Island sit on the Supreme Court of Canada. One judge by tradition and practice, one judge comes from the Atlantic Region, and that has been alternating ever since Confederation in 1867 between New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, or essentially that has been alternating.

Mr. Justice Ritchie, who recently retired, was a Nova Scotian judge. His replacement was from New Brunswick, Mr. Justice LaForest. There still has not been a judge from Newfoundland or from Prince Edward Island, and no indication we are ever going to have any real say in it. There is no indication that we are ever going to have any real say in that appointment. So from Newfoundland's point of view, this suggestion is meaningless. This amendment proposed by the NDP now would add the Territories. I suppose, if you must do what they did in Meech Lake by allowing the Provinces to provide the list, then in any kind of a sense of fairness, you would have to add the Territories as well.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. WELLS:
Pardon me? Oh, I could not possibly finish today. I have a few other things to deal with on the amendments.

In fairness, Mr. Speaker, if you are going to have this, if Meech Lake is going to go through, then you ought to add the Territories as well as the provinces, but that just shows how ludicrous the whole proposal is and the whole suggestion is. The only provinces that benefit from this are Ontario and Quebec. That is what is wrong with our whole approach to Meech Lake. Sure we have gotten more power and more influences for the provinces, but the only ones who get any real benefit or any real power or any real influence to wheel are Ontario and Quebec.

MR. SIMMS:
I wonder would the hon. member be prepared to stop the clock

perhaps, rather than interrupt his train of thought and carry it to another day. Maybe we could carry on with whatever it is he wishes to say today. We would be prepared to stay.

MR. WELLS:
I would take ten or fifteen minutes, but I would suggest we could do it tomorrow. I do not know if there are any others who want to speak. There may be more.

MR. SIMMS:
If the Leader of the Opposition wants fifteen minutes, we are quite prepared to stop the clock, so he can carry on.

MR. WELLS:
Yes, but there may be one or two others on this side. I would tell you that I would not anticipate that it would take very long tomorrow to finish it. I would expect that the debate will be finished tomorrow.

MR. SIMMS:
Whichever is better for you. I do not want your train of thought to be interrupted to carry into tomorrow. If you carry on today for fifteen minutes, we would be prepared to stop the clock.

MR. WELLS:
I suspect I can hold my thoughts in order overnight without them running wild.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:
In that case, Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the
Council.

MR. STIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to indicate that tomorrow we will hopefully make enough progress on Meech Lake tomorrow to conclude the debate and hopefully have the vote on it. From there we intend to carry on with legislation and for the most part we will try to stay in order as we have been doing in the past, but that is subject to some consultations that I want to have with some people. Generally speaking, that is what we intend to purpose for tomorrow.

I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday at 2:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, July 7 at 2:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

July 6, 1988

Tabined 6 July '88

Big Game Licence Application Fee

The \$5.00 big game licence application fee was introduced in 1983 and has not changed since.

When this fee was announced, it was stated that the revenue generated would be used to offset the cost of the big game licence draw; to engage and equip additional Wildlife Protection Officers and to enhance and expand the Information and Education Program of the Wildlife Division.

The revenue generated in 1988 is approximately \$250,000.00.

What Has Been Done Since 1983?

1. The Big Game Licence Draw has been made more acceptable by having it completed much earlier in the year and by changing the priority attached to the party licence application so that one person cannot use several others, who may or may not be bonafide hunters, to enhance his chances of getting a licence each year. This latter makes the acquisition of licences more equitable. The cost of the big game licence draw each year is approximately \$100,000.00.
2. Since 1983 three additional Wildlife Protection Officer positions have been created and staffed. Motorized equipment has been acquired for these new officers. Operation S.P.O.R.T. was implemented late in 1983. This is a program whereby citizens can report Wildlife violations through a toll-free number. This operation has led to a number of successful prosecutions; but, unfortunately, annual statistics are not immediately available.
3. Since 1983 the budget of the Information and Education Unit of the Wildlife Division has been increased by almost \$100,000.00. In 1982-83 that budget was approximately \$144,000.00, today it is \$239,000.00. Since that time a comprehensive Hunter Education Manual has been issued forming the basis of the Hunter Education Program. The Hunter Capability Test has been significantly improved and made more meaningful by the development of a comprehensive study guide discussing wildlife regulations, firearms and shooting safety and hunter ethics. New examinations have been developed and life-size targets are now used at the shooting test. In connection with the enhanced hunter capability test a program of training and instruction for Wildlife Field Staff on firearm safety, range safety and how to carry out the Hunter Capability Test was implemented.

Project Wild, a program to integrate wildlife

conservation with the school curriculum has been developed and has been tested in 12 schools throughout the Province in cooperation with the Department of Education and School Boards. Once it is fully evaluated, it will be implemented through teachers workshops. This activity-based resource will involve children and their teachers in all grades with real-life concepts and problems. The goal is to foster responsible behaviour, which must have its roots formed early in life, towards our environment. In addition, the Wildlife Division has contributed to the Environmental Science Course taught in High School.

A comprehensive guide to hunters on how to complete the big game licence application form has been developed and issued, receiving wide acclaim by big game hunters. A comprehensive annual hunting and trapping guide has also been developed and issued covering all hunting and trapping seasons. This guide summarizes regulations, illustrates hunting areas and closed areas, describes special wildlife programs and studies, briefly describes hunter capability testing, provides the hunters code of behaviour and pointers on firearm safety. Content varies from year to year and may also include instruction on how to sight-in a rifle and describes techniques for the field care of game. This publication has been acclaimed by all hunters and trappers.

Tabled 6 July '88

ORDERS OF THE DAY 1/88

Question 27:

Winston Baker (Gander) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

A. The amount of funding used for the purchase of alcoholic beverages for all government aircraft in the fiscal year 1987.

B. Would the Minister of Finance also lay upon the Table of the House the cost of the charter of aircraft for the same period.

Answer:

A. Government Aircraft is used for air ambulance purposes and for forestry programs. There are no purchases of alcoholic beverages made for the aircraft.

B. During the fiscal year 1987 the following costs were incurred:-

Fixed Wing	\$1,300
Contract Helicopter	\$3,088

*Tabled by Hon. Minister
of Health, 6 July '88*

THE GENERAL HOSPITAL

THE HEALTH SCIENCES CENTRE
St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada A1B 3V6



OPERATED BY
THE GENERAL HOSPITAL
CORPORATION

Telephone: (709) 737-6300
Office: (709) 737-

1988 07 05

Dr. R. J. Williams
Associate Deputy Minister
Department of Health
Confederation Building
St. John's, Newfoundland

Dear Dr. Williams:

I am writing in reply to your request for information concerning remarks made by the Opposition Health Critic, Mr. Efford, relating to programs at the Miller Centre and the Health Sciences Centre. We have been unable to contact Mr. Efford to obtain some background information, but from my discussion with you, I understand his remarks were related to delays in the admission of two accident patients from the Emergency Department on June 29, and to complaints about accommodation provided to clients of the Workers' Compensation Commission at the Miller Centre.

On June 29 two patients from motor vehicle accidents were treated in our Emergency Department. Patient R.A. arrived at 12:00, was treated for lacerations to his left arm and knee and was discharged at 14:30. Patient G.C. arrived at the Emergency Department at 11:40 and had a Colles' fracture that required reduction diagnosed. This patient was held in Emergency until a space was available in the Operating Room at 17:00. He was admitted to hospital post-operation and discharged on July 3, 1988.

In reply to your enquiry with respect to accommodation for Workers' Compensation patients in Southcott Hall, an arrangement has been made with Workers' Compensation to provide a total of twenty rooms in Southcott Hall for Workers' Compensation patients from outside St. John's. This program commenced June 1, 1988. We are still in the process of sorting out specific needs of this group of patients which had previously been accommodated by the hotel system in St. John's.

These patients are mostly male and are accommodated on the same floor at Southcott Hall. Female patients are accommodated on a separate floor. Arrangements have been made for the purchase of additional furnishings for this area, but complaints have been received regarding the adequacy of shower and washroom facilities. There is just one shower/washroom on each floor and there are inevitable lineups for this facility.

I would also like to comment on the provision of bath/shower facilities for patients in the Main Block of the Miller Centre. All patient units are equipped with appropriate bathing facilities for patients, however, because of the limited number, these facilities must be shared by males and females.

I trust this is the information you required.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Hearn", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

John Hearn
Associate Executive Director

JH/ew

CONTENTS

WEDNESDAY, 6 JULY, 1988.

Statements by Ministers

Public Employees Political Activity:

Mr. Simms.....	3949
Mr. Tulk.....	3951
Mr. Fenwick.....	3953

Oral Questions

Offshore Oil Consultants:

List of consultants retained for offshore development. Mr. Gilbert, Dr. Collins.....3954

Breakdown of monies paid Mr. Loughheed's firm. Mr. Gilbert, Dr. Collins.....3955

Asks for the bottom line on fees paid to Mr. Loughheed's firm. Mr. Decker, Mr. Simms.....3955

Asks for details behind what firm has done to earn funds in a Special Warrent. Mr. Decker, Mr. Simms.....3957

Asks government to table statements which show what the firm did. Mr. Decker, Mr. Simms.....3958

Labour Standards Review Board:

Asks for details behind enquiry into Labour Standards Review Board and ask when copy of the report will be available. Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Blanchard.....3959

What recommendations are contained in the review board's enquiry. Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Blanchard.....3960

When will report be released and is a Vice-Chairman for the Workers' Compensation Appeal Tribunal going to be appointed. Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Blanchard.....3960

Home Builders Concern Over Tax:

What has province done to answer Home Builders' Association concerns over tax.

Mr. Gullage, Dr. Collins.....3961

Asks for letters to be tabled. Also asks government's opinion about Housing Corporation holding land which could be tendered to the private sector. Mr. Gullage, Dr. Collins.....3962

Asks minister's view on Home Builders stand against Housing Corporation's urban policy.

Mr. Gullage, Dr. Collins.....3962

Jet Fuel Spill at Goose Bay Airport:

Is Minister satisfied with Shell Oil's monitoring of their inventory. Mr. Simmons,

Mr. Russell.....3962

If the spill took place over a number of months, why did the company's inventory not show it earlier. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Russell.....3963

How could the situation continue for so long without ministerial awareness.

Mr. Simmons, Mr. Russell.....3963

Programs for Unincorporated Municipal Areas:

When will waterworks program for unincorporated towns be announced. Mr. Lush, Mr. Brett.....3964

Clean drinking water a serious problem. Can the minister be more precise. Mr. Lush,

Mr. Brett.....3964

How much money for the waterworks programs.

Mr. Lush, Mr. Brett.....3965

School Bursaries:

Can the minister review the whole field.

Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Hearn.....3965

Point of Privilege:

Mr. Tulk, on information about pay for Mr. Lougheed....3966
Mr. Speaker, reserves ruling.....3969
Mr. Speaker, rules no prima facie case.....3986

**Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given**

Details Regarding Government and Chartered Aircraft:

Mr. Windsor.....3969

Educational Section of Big Game Fee:

Mr. Hearn.....3969

Information on The General Hospital:

Dr. Collins.....3970

Orders of the Day

Bill No. 41, Supplementary Supply:

Mr. Simms.....3970

Committee of the Whole on Supply

Debate Begins.....3971

Debate Concludes.....3986

Resolution

On motion, Bill No. 41, passed.....3988

Motion 4, Meech Lake Accord:

Mr. K. Aylward, resumes debate.....	3988
Mr. Hiscock.....	3989
Mr. Fenwick.....	3996
Mr. Wells, adjourns debate.....	4002

Adjournment Motion.....	4005
-------------------------	------