



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 92

PRELIMINARY REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Thursday

6 December 1990

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Statements by Ministers

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

Before recognizing the Member for Eagle River I want to, on behalf of hon. members, welcome to the galleries today three classes of Grade VI students from Pius X school here in St. John's, accompanied by their teachers Mr. Ron Halleran, Mr. Tom Hanlon, and Mr. Ron Abbott.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The hon. the Member for Eagle River.

Mr. Dumaresque: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today, I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to an historic event that is happening today on the Coast of Labrador. Newfoundland Telephone today is inaugurating a regular telephone service to Pinsent's Arm which is the second last community on the Coast of Labrador, a permanent community, to receive this kind of service. A lot of times hon. members do not believe that there are people in this Province who do not have this vital link to the outside community for their medical and personal business. Today, it is my pleasure to stand here and take this opportunity to thank Newfoundland Telephone for their work, and I hope that over the next year or so we will be able to inaugurate this service for the last community on the Labrador Coast which does not have this service, Norman Bay.

Mr. Speaker, I beg your indulgence and thank you, very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that it is Government's intention to amend the Labour Standards Regulations to eliminate the present two tiered minimum wage that includes one wage level for domestics and a higher minimum wage for all other workers.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms Cowan: This discrimination against domestic and child care workers who are nearly always female cannot be permitted to continue.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage will be increased to \$4.75 from \$4.25 per hour. It is our intention to have both changes to the Regulations become effective April 1, 1991. This will allow employers time to make provision for the changes.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, let me first of all thank the Minister for a copy of her statement and to say that we support fully the initiatives of the Minister today. She will remember I questioned her at Budget time on whether or not the two tiered system would be eliminated, both a few months ago and in the Budget before that as well. We are quite pleased indeed that this form of discrimination, if you will, is finally being removed because it

is discrimination against women because nearly all the domestics and child care workers are female. So it is a step that we support fully, Mr. Speaker. And I notice as well that the Federation of Labour in their brief to Government approximately a year ago called for this as well. So we are very pleased indeed that the Minister has finally taken this step and we support fully this initiative.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Further Statements By Ministers.

The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Section 114 of The Workers' Compensation Act, 1983, I am today announcing the appointment of a Committee to review several aspects of the Workers' Compensation Commission.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms Cowan: The Legislation provides for the appointment every five years, of a Review Committee to examine and report on such matters respecting the Act as the Committee deems fit and upon such matters as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or Minister of Employment and Labour Relations may refer to the Committee.

The last Review Committee was appointed in November 1986. Most of its recommendations have been implemented by the Commission but a few issues remain outstanding and require further study. These will be addressed by this current review process, which is beginning earlier than required by the legislation.

Some recent difficulties with certain aspects of workers' compensation and administration need to be addressed and government considers it appropriate to establish the review committee before making any changes.

The Committee will be comprised of three people. The Chairperson will be Mr. Clarence Randell, Deputy Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. The worker representative will be Mr. Jim Gill the national representative of the Canadian Auto Workers Union and the Employer representative will be Mr. Robert Giannou, owner of Corporate Services Limited a management consulting company. The Committee has been asked to report within six months.

The Review Committee will in the course of its considerations include the following:

1. Evaluation of the new wage loss system of workers compensation that was introduced in 1984 in order to ascertain if it is meeting the objectives originally intended.
2. Analysis of the funding levels of the Workers' Compensation Commission and the establishment of parameters for revenues expenditures and debt.
3. Assessment of the relevance of experience rating within the context of a new financial strategy for the Commission.
4. A review of the merits or otherwise of a policy by the Commission to pay interest on delayed compensation payments.
5. Assessment of section 21.7 of the Act and its provisions of the

Board of Directors to determine the issue or interpretation of policy or law after a matter has been decided by the Appeal Tribunal.

6. Re-evaluation of the current legislative provisions respecting the right of injured workers to claim compensation and commence third party legal action.

7. Review of Section 76 and 77 of the Act and assessment of whether the rehabilitation policies of the Commission are appropriate.

8. Examination of the cost-benefit of funding provided by the Commission for Occupational Health and Safety initiatives.

9. Analysis of the merits or otherwise of combining for one individual on a full time basis the duties and the responsibilities of the Chief Executive Officer with those of the Chairperson of the Board of Directors.

10. Consideration of the advisability of extending coverage of the Act to individuals involved in rescues at sea, such as provided for in section 67 to mine rescues.

11. A review of Part V1 of the Act relating to industrial diseases.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the appointment of this Review Committee and I am confident that the high calibre of the individuals who have agreed to serve on the Committee will ensure that various issues identified will receive a thorough examination.

Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Doyle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me thank the Minister as well for delivering a copy of her statement to me a couple of minutes before coming to the House. Again we welcome the decision of Government to set up this Review Committee. As the Minister indicated a few minutes ago, the Act provides for review every five years and I believe this review is certainly long overdue.

The Workers' Compensation Commission certainly needs to be reviewed. There seems to be, or we are hearing at least, that there are a lot of problems at the Commission. And I am pleased that the Commission or the Review has as one of its terms of reference: they will be looking at the problem of the Appeal Tribunal with respect to interpretation of policy affecting the appeals tribunal, so we are pleased to see that as one of the terms of reference. It seems to me that there is a real morale problem within the Workers' Compensation Commission, and hopefully the review process will go a long way to clear up some of the problems we are hearing about.

There seems to be a lot of complaints coming from the general public as to the length of time it takes to process claims, and that may or may not be true. Hopefully the review will be able to address these types of concerns and probably heighten morale a little bit at the Commission, which certainly needs to be done.

I hope the review, as well, is a very comprehensive one. I do not know all the people the Minister has appointed to the review commission, but I am very pleased to see the Deputy Minister of Labour, Mr. Randell, on that Commission. I have a lot of confidence in his ability, having worked with him for about three and a half years; I know what he is capable of and what kind of a job he will do on that Committee. I hope the commitment the Government makes to the resources for that study will enable the Committee to do a good job, a good, decent job.

As I said, a lot of complaints have been directed towards the Commission, but we cannot forget, as well, that the Workers' Compensation Commission do a lot of good work also, and it never seems to get out. All we hear is complaint, complaint after complaint after complaint about the Commission, but what about all the good work the Commission does? And there are some really fine people working at that Commission with whom I have had the opportunity, and I am sure all Members have, to go and to sit down and work. There are a lot of good people down there, a lot of fine, efficient, well-qualified people, but we are hearing some horror stories, sometimes, coming out of the Commission and we wonder if all these are legitimate. The review process will, I believe, serve to clear up a lot of that, and we look forward to the result of it.

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

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to address the

House on a matter which is very important to the people of our Province and, indeed, all residents of our country.

As the Minister with responsibilities for communications, I feel it is incumbent upon me to respond to the announced downsizing of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which includes the loss of some seventy positions in our Province, together with the closure of stations in Corner Brook and Goose Bay, Labrador.

We must take strong exception to the callous manner in which this announcement was made by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. As we are aware, employees of the Corporation were informed via closed circuit TV that their jobs had disappeared. I think the country in general and the employees of CBC in particular were shocked, and rightly so, by the despicable manner in which the announcement was handled.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gullage: These soon to be displaced employees, who contributed in a meaningful way to the Corporation, were literally thrown to the streets and told to fend for themselves. For a Corporation in the business of communications, the manner in which the announcement was made leaves a lot to be desired. We have come to expect more from the CBC.

I think we are all very much aware of the fact that the closure of the stations in Corner Brook and Goose Bay will have a most serious impact on the economy of these two centres, as it will be very difficult for those displaced

employees to be able to find alternate means of employment in their chosen profession. While some of the employees in the larger centres may be absorbed in private sector broadcasting, this is not likely to happen in our Province.

The technicians, writers, actors, etc., who will be affected by this restrictive policy will have a far greater impact on our small population than elsewhere in Canada.

Additionally, the withdrawal of local programming by CBC is particularly severe in this Province, which is recognized as having an unique cultural identity. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has supported the arts in Newfoundland and Labrador by its mounting of special drama productions as well as documentaries and so forth, which were often aired nationally and which received critical acclaim.

The CBC has allowed us to see ourselves as a distinct society and to share our cultural values with the rest of our far-reaching nation and the effects of the downsizing will be felt across the country.

I know that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians were very dismayed to learn that the extremely popular "Land & Sea" program is to be axed and that they are not even going to be allowed to complete the series of programs they are now producing. This program has been running for several decades - it is what Newfoundland and Labrador is all about and it will be sadly missed, not only by viewers in our Province, but across the country.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the CBC Board of Directors is making a grave mistake in the manner in which the CBC has chosen to deal with its budget problems. As the current Broadcasting Act suggests, and I am sure those who many years ago were instrumental in establishing the CBC would agree, the primary purpose of the Corporation is to be the vehicle for Canadians from coast to coast to share and enjoy their diverse cultures and thereby form a stronger Canadian bond. These measures which the Corporation has announced, certainly in my opinion, are opposite to what I feel, and I am sure the majority of Canadians feel, the Corporation should be doing at this juncture of Canadian history. Local and regional programming, in my opinion, should not bear the brunt of the budget cut-backs. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I feel this activity should be the first thing to be preserved if the CBC is to exist at all.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gullage: It is my intention to meet with local CBC management officials as soon as possible to obtain all the details of how CBC Newfoundland operations will be affected and attempt to determine whether or not there may be further measures which the Corporation is contemplating which may impact on the Province or, more particularly, the employees of CBC.

Mr. Speaker, what the CBC has done is unacceptable to me and I believe that most members of this House share that view. The CBC is a publicly funded corporation and I feel the Federal Government must intervene in this matter. Mr. Speaker, I intend to convey my

concerns in the strongest possible terms to the Federal Minister of Communications. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, we share the sentiments expressed for the most part, indeed entirely, expressed by the Minister responsible in this particular situation. I think it would be fair to say that all of us received the dramatic announcements of the last twenty-four hours or so with a great deal of dismay and shock. What has happened and what will happen I fear, as a result of these dramatic changes, is that we as Newfoundlanders, as a people will have seriously eroded our very culture and our very history. That is what is going to happen. That will be the net result. The whole purpose of CBC, not only in Newfoundland, but, indeed, throughout Canada, certainly in Newfoundland, is to act as an instrument of communication for the people of the Province, particularly in our case, the people of rural Newfoundland and in the remote areas of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at some of the detailed information that has been provided you will see that the amount of money cut, if you want, from the Newfoundland operation is really a petty, little amount - I think the amount is about \$4.5 million. Now that \$4.5 million reduction has, in fact, seriously attacked our very nature here in Newfoundland; the entire Province is affected by it. But if you took \$4.5 million from the Toronto operation or the

Montreal operation, it probably would not even be missed. I would suggest to the CBC that they might have looked at it, perhaps, in a little different way, in a little different light.

Mr. Speaker, \$4.5 million in the coming fiscal year is what will be cut from the CBC's budget here in this Province. Seventy positions, 7-0, seventy jobs, will be lost, and about 600 hours of regionally and locally produced T.V. programs will be eliminated, and the Minister referred to some of the programs: "Land & Sea", an institution in this Province for years, one of the most positive -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: - one of the most positive programs, I would argue, ever produced. In fact, not only is it a major, mostly watched program in Newfoundland and Labrador, it is watched all across the country. Because it is now, I think, a regular feature on the Newsworld channel and so on.

The On Camera program. Sure the Premier can attest to it, having been the most recent guest, as well as the President of Treasury Board in the past. As much as some of us in the past have appeared on the On Camera program, and felt maybe a bit uncomfortable because of the pressing questions, but enjoyed it. It is a highly rated program, without question.

Newfoundland Outdoors, another very popular program locally produced. MUN Music. Dialogue - hosted by Richard Beaton. Most people would not believe the high ratings that program has. It has shot up in just the last couple of years to very high ratings. Shirley Newhook's Coffee Break is

another program that gets a lot of viewers.

So, Mr. Speaker, that will be eliminated. And in Corner Brook, Labrador City and Goose Bay, the entire local programming will be totally eliminated. Except for, I suppose, the odd - they might do a Larry Hudson thing here and there, something like that. We are not sure of that.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Nothing at all. Well, in any event, it is a terrible decision and I think we all recognize that it is a terrible decision. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you this: I went over to CBC today around noon, and while I was there I met with a number of workers. And it was pointed out to me in no uncertain terms that what has transpired is this: in Canada, in all the other Provinces in Canada, other jurisdictions, years ago they traded off local programming for regional programming - in other Provinces. In Newfoundland, the opposite occurred. They wanted more local programming and rightly so, because of our history and our culture and our geography and all the rest of it.

So, Newfoundland -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Some Hon. Members: By leave! By leave!

Mr. Speaker: By leave.

Mr. Simms: I thank the hon. Members, I will just be brief. But in Newfoundland, therefore, it affects us a hell of a lot more

than it affects anybody else in the country, and that is the point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, with respect to that. And, Mr. Speaker, all of us in this House should leave no stone unturned. This is an important matter, a very important matter. The more Members think about it, I believe, it will become even more evident. But none of us - we should all leave no stone unturned to try to get these decisions reversed. We really should do that.

I just want to end with this. I said I met with some of the workers over at CBC today, at noonish. And, Mr. Speaker, some of those workers, by the way, were in their fifties, early fifties. So what are they going to do next April? And they are highly trained people, very professional people. It is not going to be easy, particularly in these times, for those individuals. But the feeling I got from talking to them, quite frankly, was not so much a concern for their own individual jobs, and they were very sincere about it, not so much a concern for their own individual jobs, their own personal jobs, but the fact that these programs which are so highly rated, so highly watched, up to 70 per cent of the Newfoundland viewing audience - are going to be eliminated. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a terrible, terrible shame, and I can tell you, I believe that this issue must not be allowed to die. And I can tell you also, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House at least, will pledge to do everything we can, including making representations to our so-called political cousins in Ottawa to see if they cannot use their influence to reduce the (inaudible).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Gullage: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today the appointment of a new Director of Cultural Affairs for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, effective January 7, 1991.

The person selected to fill this important position is Elizabeth M. Batstone, a native Newfoundlander who currently serves as the executive director of the Newfoundland Historic Parks.

I am also pleased to announce that the Government Selection Committee was unanimous in its choice of Ms Batstone. Among others, the Committee included Dr. Patrick O'Flaherty, Memorial University's Professor of English and the author of the O'Flaherty Report on the Arts.

Ms Batstone was born in Greenspond, Bonavista Bay, and was educated at Memorial University. For the past ten years she has been actively involved in arts and culture in both a voluntary and a professional capacity. She has served as a member of the Board of the Newfoundland Symphony Orchestra and also as a member of the Newfoundland Quarterly Magazine.

Ms Batstone is a former vice-president of the St. John's YM-YWCA and has played a leadership role on the regional, national and international level within the Canadian YM-YWCA movement. She has served as the Newfoundland Representative on the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, and, as well,

spent seven years as a free-lance journalist in both radio and newspaper.

During the period from 1983-86 Ms Batstone served in Halifax as the executive director of the Nova Scotia Choral Federation, a province-wide arts organization, and also served as a board member of the Cultural Federations of Nova Scotia during that period. She has displayed an extensive knowledge of the arts generally and the problems of artists in particular, and brings a broad perspective regarding the cultural scene.

Besides her outstanding administrative track record and her personal skills, Ms Batstone brings to this position an unqualified dedication to the importance of arts and culture in the life of Newfoundland and Labrador. The diversity of her background, and the wide variety of her experience, means that she will be able to bring to the position a level of understanding in helping to develop new Arts policy - a policy that is not encumbered by any narrow definition of the artistic community or any exclusive commitment to either of the artistic disciplines.

The position of Director of Cultural Affairs is a very demanding one and I have every confidence that the person whom we have selected is well suited to carry out the duties and responsibilities of this important office.

In our search for a new Director of Cultural Affairs we looked for a person who possessed a keen knowledge of Arts Administration and Development; a person with

strong oral and written communication abilities, a person with management training together with analytical and supervisory skills and the ability to maintain effective working relationships. We believe Ms Batstone possesses all of these essential qualifications.

I am pleased to say that many of the recommendations of the O'Flaherty Report - as they relate to the duties and responsibilities of the Director of Culture Affairs - were incorporated in the job description.

As indicated, the Director of Cultural Affairs is a responsible position and, Ms. Batstone's mandate will be: To ensure effective provincial development in all areas of the performing, visual and literary arts covering both amateur and professional; To ensure effective administration, operation and programming of six provincially-owned Arts and Culture Centres; To initiate international and interprovincial projects and programs; serve on national committees; initiate and develop support systems and activities; consult with the artistic community; oversee the Newfoundland Arts and Letters Competition, and supervise and prepare the annual budget of the Cultural Affairs Division of the Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs.

Newfoundland and Labrador is the home of some of the most creative and accomplished artists to be found anywhere. These very talented people are making an enormous contribution to the cultural and artistic life of our Province and, as a Government, we do understand and appreciate the value of the arts in our society.

The new Director of Cultural Affairs will be in place early in the new year and I think it is reasonable to expect that, in the implementation of a new arts policy for the Province, the new director will assume a leading position in the formulation and implementation of that policy.

Mr. Speaker, there has been substantive movement on many of the O'Flaherty recommendations since the report was presented in March of this year. Perhaps it might be in order to review them.

Responsibility for Protocol has been removed from the position of Cultural Affairs Director along with the responsibility for the day-to-day management of the St. John's Arts and Culture Centre and other centres throughout the Province.

With reference to the Arts and Culture Centres, the O'Flaherty Report suggested, among other things, that productivity should be emphasized and we have initiated measures to accomplish this. As well, a concerted effort is being made to reactivate consultative committees and these committees are to be given a say with respect to all programming decisions.

We have acted upon the recommendation that all space for the display of visual art and sculpture in the Arts and Culture Centres outside St. John's be placed under the control of the Regional Managers.

Additionally, we recognize the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council as the primary funding agency for the arts in Newfoundland and Labrador and certainly, such recognition is

there for the NLAC, and this is incorporated into legislation.

The NLAC now decides 'in council' on the names it is going to put forward to the Minister to serve on government committees or other bodies. In the past, names were recommended by the executive. However, in future they will now be recommended by the full council.

For the very first time this year, the art work purchased under the Art Procurement Program was exhibited publicly as suggested in the O'Flaherty Report.

In line with other recommendations, the Division of Cultural Affairs is now publishing a pamphlet explaining the guidelines, schedules and procedures for the Art Procurement Program. The pamphlet is available upon request to all interested parties.

The 'international/interprovincial Touring Grants' program is now administered by the Director of Cultural Affairs, and guidelines for the program are drawn up and publicized to all artists in the Province. These guidelines are available at the Arts and Culture Centres or they are mailed out to anyone who wants them.

As the Minister responsible, I will endeavour to represent the interests of Arts and Culture to the best of my ability and I want to reassure Artists in particular that, as a Government, we appreciate and value the arts community and the tremendous contribution that artists are making to the well-being of our Province. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that this Government has badly neglected the arts in its first nineteen months in office.

The position of Director of Cultural Affairs is vitally important, yet it has been vacant for twenty months. The Provincial Government has not had a Director of Cultural Affairs since John Perlin retired on March 31, 1989. This Administration, in nineteen months in office, did not even appoint a person to fill the position in an acting capacity; the Government did not even begin to recruit applicants for the position until late August this year, after considerable pressure.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Ms Verge: Mr. Speaker, the Government has brought down two Budgets without a Director of Cultural Affairs. The Government will have most of the work completed on its third Budget, the Budget for the 1991-92 fiscal year, before a Director of Cultural Affairs is in position.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad at long last, despite the inexcusable delay -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: At long last.

Ms Verge: At long last - despite the inexcusable delay that the Government is appointing a Director of Cultural Affairs. I respect the process the Government followed in recruiting candidates and selecting the successful candidate; I am glad the

Government included on the Public Services Commission Interview Committee Dr. Patrick O'Flaherty, the Chairperson of the Government Arts Policy Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know Ms Elizabeth Batstone's experience and involvement in the Arts, but I do know Ms Batstone personally. She and I both worked in the Women's Movement in the Province in the 1970s.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms Verge: She was with the Grand Falls Status of Women Council when I was active with the Corner Brook Status of Women Council.

And, Mr. Speaker, I do trust the judgment of the Public Service Committee and the Interview Committee in particular, and I note the minister's statement that Ms Batstone has displayed an extensive knowledge of the arts generally and the problems of artists in particular, and brings a broad perspective regarding the cultural scene.

Mr. Speaker, the minister mentions that Ms Batstone will have a challenging job, and that is certainly true. The challenge of the Director of Cultural Affairs is greater than it should be, given the attitude of the Premier and the placement of the Division of Cultural Affairs within the bureaucracy. Cultural affairs hardly has a chance, drowning as it is in a sea of sewers and swimming pools. There is no way that any one minister, regardless of how well-intentioned he or she might be, can adequately address cultural and arts issues when the same individual has responsibility for Municipal Affairs, Recreation, the Fire Commissioner's Office,

Youth and Housing. It is an impossible task. And it is high time the Premier realized that the arts and culture should be assigned to a Minister with the interest and the time to assist in the development of appropriate policies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to comment on the content of the Government's arts policy report.

The Government has largely ignored that report, even though the Government has had the report since the end of March. The Premier admitted recently that he has not even read the report. Now the report calls for major policy development and a significant budget increase. In the budget for the present year the Government actually cut back the real grant to the Provincial Arts Council, which is the vehicle for allocating Provincial public funding to artists and arts groups in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, lip service from the Minister is not enough. I call on the Minister and the Premier to put their money where their mouth is and to increase significantly the budget for the Provincial Arts Council, beginning by an immediate transfer of the unused portion of the Director's salary for this year to the Arts Council budget.

An Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Ms Verge: Mr. Speaker, the Minister intended to have a Director in place last winter -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Some Hon. Members: By leave! By leave!

Ms Verge: If I might complete my sentence, Premier.

Some Hon. Members: No leave! No leave!

Ms Verge: The Minister intended to have a Director in place last winter -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up and I gather there is no leave granted.

An Hon. Member: Give her time to clue up.

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. This past fall the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs changed the staffing policy, as the Minister would know, for the St. John's Fire Department which would leave positions vacant when fire fighters were on leave because of illness or another valid reason. That policy, incidentally, we think seriously affects fire protection to residents of St. John's, particularly in the East End.

My question to the Minister of Works, Services and Transportation. Has he adopted a similar policy with respect to

security staff on duty in public buildings, for example, the St. John's Arts and Culture Centre? To be specific, does he have a policy not to replace security individuals off work because of illness or leave?

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

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, we introduced a new programme last year, as you know. We are going to an automated system and that will mean that as people retire who are filling those jobs, they will not be replaced because we are into an automated system. The policy we are following is the one that is generally followed in Government in replacing people when they are off sick.

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

Mr. Simms: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Let me ask him something specific. Perhaps we can zero in on the issue. Is the Minister aware, for example, that last night at the Arts and Culture Centre here in St. John's there was only one security guard on duty, half the normal complement, because the second guard scheduled for duty was sick and the Centre had been told not to replace security personnel?

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

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, there are 3,100 employees in my Department and I really do not know if one was sick and if the other one was not replaced. But I will certainly check for the hon. member and give him an answer

tomorrow.

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

Mr. Simms: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister was aware of the serious situation I am talking about he would not be trying to make such a joke about the situation.

Is the Minister aware that last night there were more than 1,000 people at the Arts and Culture Center? More than 300 of them school age children. Is he also aware that a number of the fire lanes were blocked and a number of accesses were obstructed at various areas around the building? And in that kind of a situation wouldn't he have concern for public safety and would he consider one security guard, therefore, enough to handle any potential emergency that might arise?

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

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, the fearmongering goes on. I will check into the allegations that the hon. Member is making and give him a report. But again, it is typical of the fearmongering that you get from that crowd over there.

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

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Simms: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It is a bit unfortunate that somehow or another members on this side cannot ask questions at all. He

says it is fearmongering, he says it is fearmongering, he says it is fearmongering. When you do not have a valid answer, I suppose, it is best to deflect it by accusing us of fearmongering.

My final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. Will the Minister investigate this particular situation I have raised, because I have had calls about it, concerns about it, and I want to know if she would investigate the situation and determine specifically whether security and safety measures conform to occupational health and safety codes sections 43 and 44, or were these sections violated? Would she check into that and tell me?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I will be only too pleased to look into it and to consult with my colleague on the matter.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries. On November 28, the Minister of Fisheries informed the House that he had recommended to the Federal Minister of Fisheries that the total allowable catch for the northern cod stocks be set between 170,000 and 185,000 metric tons for 1991. Has the Minister received any indication from the federal minister whether or not his recommendation has been accepted or has he been given any

indication as to what we can expect the total allowable catch to be in 1991?

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

Mr. Carter: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not. The only thing I can tell the House and the hon. Member is that the minister, during his most recent visit to the Province, indicated that he probably would be able to make an announcement to that effect around December 10, or the 15, within that area.

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

Mr. Matthews: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Minister also said publicly, and under questioning in the House, that the Provincial Government is taking the position that any reduction in the total allowable catch should come from the offshore fishery. I am wondering if the Minister has any information to indicate that the Federal Government intends to apply the 1991 TAC reduction strictly on the back of the offshore? Has he received any indication from the Federal Minister that that is a fact?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, no, I can't say much about that either. I can only tell the House and the hon. gentleman that there appears to be some pressure building up in some quarters, including the Province of Nova Scotia, to have the inshore allowance reduced, if in fact it is found necessary to reduce the total allowable catch. I repeat, there is pressure, I am sure, on the Federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to do that,

so I guess we will have to wait and see, but he has not indicated to me one way or the other, what his intentions are in that regard.

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

Mr. Matthews: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Can the Minister confirm for the House, that he has received the report of the Maloney inquiry into the Newfoundland Fishery? Does the report contain any recommendations relative to the size and application of the 1991 TAC? Had the Federal Minister of Fisheries received the report prior to making his announcement on the 1991 TAC, and will the Minister be making this report public, so that the people in the Province can see the results of the recommendations of the Maloney inquiry?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, yes, we have received the Maloney report, in fact the Premier and I received it, I believe it was Monday past, and as soon as we have a chance to review it and do what one normally does with such a report, then we will be releasing its contents to the public. I can't say now when that will be, but I can only say that it will be at some future date released for public viewing.

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

Mr. Matthews: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Minister probably did not pick up all the supplementary, but I was just wondering if in the perusal of the report the Minister or the

Premier or the Government has seen anything that may influence the Federal Minister's decision as it pertains to the total allowable catch for 1991, and if so, has he made that information available or the recommendation available to the Federal Minister to hopefully influence his decision on setting the allocation for 1991?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to, at this point in time, release any of the contents of the report or its recommendations, except to say that a copy of the report will be sent to the Federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans within a day or two and then we will have to wait and see. But it is a good report, I should add, Mr. Speaker, it is an excellent report, and I think it is going to help Newfoundland's position in many respects, in terms of dealing with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

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

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister responsible for Health.

I wonder if the Minister would advise the House of the reasons why the Health Sciences Complex is laying off sixteen nurses with effect from December 22nd, 1990?

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

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, in this fiscal year the Health Sciences anticipated that they would need x number of nurses. Judging by past years, where there was a heavy turnover and where the pay for

nurses was lower, a lot of nurses used to quit, so, just as, if the hon. Member flies on a plane sometimes the seats are overbooked in the anticipation that all the people will not turn up, the hospital hired more nurses than they actually needed in anticipation that some of them would leave. Of course they discovered that they had too many nurses, Mr. Speaker, and they had to lay them off.

An Hon. Member: They overhired.

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

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, at least two of the nurses had been recruited by the hospital from Ireland, with appointments taking effect from September 24, 1990. Can the Minister confirm these appointments were for a one year period, and that they have been terminated due to Government cutbacks.

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

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to deal with specific incidents because I would think that institution hires a considerable number of nurses. However, if they were hired on contract, and if the contract was terminated, no doubt they will have a valid argument to go against the hospital, but to date there have been no nurses laid off at any hospital in this Province due to cutbacks, Mr. Speaker, because there are no cutbacks in this fiscal year.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Hearn: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has denied layoffs have anything to do with cutbacks. Why then were the nurses informed in their letters of dismissal, and I quote, 'due to lack of work and financial resources the Nursing Department has decided to reduce the float team by sixteen Nurse I positions?' I ask the Minister also, what does he think this does to the possible recruiting of expertise outside the Province, when you are hired for a year, use your own money, leave employment to come over here to work with employment offered for a year, to be laid off after a few weeks and sent home?

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

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that part of the question in the first answer I gave, where I explained the reason why it was done. As the letter points out it was because of a shortage of work due to, it seems like, where the hospital over-hired. As far as attracting people to come to the Province, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that we have had any problem to date. As a matter of fact within the last few weeks we hired a doctor from overseas to serve in Eagle River, so we are not having any problem with hiring staff. Daily, I receive letters from people all around the world who are looking for positions in this Province. I should say, Mr. Speaker, that the same thing we are doing in this Province is being done by every other province in this nation. I have talked with them at a recent Minister's conference and they are all taking similar action. It is unfortunate that the fiscal reality is such, but we are not doing anything which is unique.

It is just what the rest of our people are doing across the nation.

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

Mr. Winsor: My question is to the Minister of Social Services. In view of the dramatic increases that occurred recently both in fuel oil and electricity costs, or will occur in the new year, has the Minister given any consideration to increasing the basic allowance for social services recipients for the remainder of this fiscal year?

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

Mr. Efford: Mr. Speaker, I have always contended, not just since I became Minister of Social Services but even before, that the amount of money people are receiving in this Province for survival on social assistance is certainly not adequate, not only because of the recent increase in fuel and electricity rates, it is just overall. We have recently started an overall review of the Department of Social Services and the amount of money people are receiving in the Province. Certainly, that is one of the considerations we are looking at.

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

Mr. Winsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister has already indicated that social service recipients barely get enough to live on. Since the Minister's Department already takes overpayments from social service recipients, for sometimes their mistakes, and sometimes the mistakes of social

workers, will the Minister, for the winter months at least, consider to stop taking the overpayments from the social service recipients so at least they will be able to keep their homes warm this winter.

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

Mr. Efford: First of all let me correct the hon. Member, we do not normally take overpayments when there is a mistake made by the Department of Social Service. They used to under the former Minister, but we have begun looking at the overpayments which were on the books, and I think it is \$9 million since the early 1960s, it is quite an extensive sum of money.

If a social worker makes a mistake in overpayment, we cannot expect the individual to pay back the money. So we are taking a look at that now and we believe and agree that that policy should be corrected. As for the amount of money involved in overpayments, in a lot of cases it is incurred by people through abuse, sometimes through necessity, as in paying a light bill. But certainly we are looking at the overall review of the social assistant recipients and the amounts of money they receive. But to give you a definite answer: are we going to do that this month or next month? No - I cannot do that until budgetary procedures come into play.

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

Mr. Winsor: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

The social workers in the Province

already have the authority to issue \$60 either in a fuel allowance or an extra allowance. Many of the social workers are refusing this allowance now, yet the Appeal Board upholds it. When the case is appealed, quite often the Appeal Board will rule in favour of the recipients. In view of this will the Minister now give instructions to social workers to issue all recipients the \$60 in fuel oil allowance for the winter months?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all -

Mr. Simms: Rudolph the Red Nose Reindeer.

Mr. Efford: First of all, that is the purpose of the Appeals Board, whenever a person is not satisfied with a decision of a social worker, the purpose of the Appeals Board is to give people the opportunity to appeal a decision that they are not satisfied with. I cannot tell all the social workers in the Province to reverse a decision and to give everybody that amount of money. We have 25,050 cases of social service as of the 30th of October. Every individual case is assessed on its own merits and its own needs.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Efford: Mr. Speaker, we have a policy in place where wherever there is need for an individual family to request special fuel

allowance, whether it is because of the amount of money or the high cost of fuel or their particular needs for that month, a social worker has the authority to give them a special fuel allowance up to \$60, and I have no reason to change that. If the hon. Member can find a case where a social worker made the wrong decision he can make representation to the district manager, to the regional manager or to myself and we could have it corrected. But the policy is in place and we will adhere to that particular policy, and if they do not wish to do that, as many people do in the Province, they can go through the appeals board, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: Scrooge!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An Hon. Member: Answer the question.

Mr. Efford: How can you answer a question when there is interference from the other side?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) cut wood.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: Monsieur le Président: J'ai une question pour le premier ministre: Combien est le coût de nos leçons françaises pour les gens de Terre-Neuve et du Labrador? Je demande de le premier ministre: Combien? Combien?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: If it were spoken -

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: If it were spoken accurately, I have no doubt I would have understood it.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: But my competence in French has not reached the point where I can pick up the flaws in the hon. member's presentation. So I can't pick out precisely what he is saying. But I have the gist of it, he is asking for the cost of the French lessons that have been taken and I will -

An Hon. Member: What is the answer?

Premier Wells: - undertake to obtain the answer and provide it.

Mr. Speaker: Ordre, s'il vous plait, il n'y a pas. I was about to say that there are no rules in our House that permit the asking of questions in another language. But we have allowed the speaking of French in this House, and being the bilingual people we are, I am sure we would permit a question. The difficulty is we do not have any translators.

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am a little bit reluctant to attempt to suggest that Your Honour's comment may not be totally accurate. But my recollection is that in 1968 this House passed a resolution providing for the use of French in the Legislature. Specifically authorizing and making the House bilingual. The Province itself is not totally bilingual but it is

totally in order to speak French in the House and totally appropriate (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Premier.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, a la point d'ordre, or something like that.

Mr. Speaker, in fact the Premier is quite correct. I remember when I was in the Chair as Speaker, the former Member for Eagle River used to ask periodic questions of the former Minister of Education and Mr. Ottenheimer, at the time, who was also very fluent.

So, at the risk of losing a minute in Question Period, speaking to the point of order, I thought I would make the point and agree.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier.

In these times of severe fiscal restraint can the Premier justify to the people of the Province this expenditure of taxpayers' money on private French tutoring? Particularly, Mr. Speaker, when after six months - I must say he understood what I said to him - but he cannot answer a question which was put to him in French. He did understand it but did not or chose not to answer it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Let me deal with the last part of it first, Mr. Speaker. I have a disposition to be precise and to give answers precisely. If I attempted to

answer that in French I could not be confident that the answer would be precise. I knew what the hon. Member asked and I am reasonably pleased that I have progressed that far to date, bearing in mind the other burdens that I have.

Now with respect to the justification for it, Mr. Speaker, the basis on which it was undertaken - and I should tell the House, Mr. Speaker, that the Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat has been working with the Department of Education towards putting in place a programme to teach a handful of the senior civil servants who have to deal with Quebec and deal with people in the Federal Government who speak French - we want to have in place at least a handful of people in IGA and in the Premier's office who are competent in French.

As a matter of fact when we hired the receptionist for my office to replace the receptionist that was there, we specifically sought a bilingual receptionist so that the incoming calls in French to my office could be answered in French. Now there is a reason why I am doing it -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: Quite a number as a matter of fact.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: Yes.

An Hon. Member: Hundreds?

Premier Wells: Well, I would not say hundreds but quite a number.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, as to

why I undertook to do it: I started this last winter and the reason for it is fairly simple. Where I have to attend meetings on a constant basis, I frankly do not feel competent to deal with the issues and feel incompetent to deal with the thing totally where much of the discussion is in the French language, and I feel that I should make myself competent to do so. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, if the Government of Newfoundland is going to formally take a position that the development and expansion of bilingualism in the country is the right course for us to follow, I ought not to be so hypocritical as not to make the effort myself, and that is the reason for it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

Mr. Hodder: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

Mr. Speaker, the question is why can't the Premier pay for it himself? Mr. Speaker, I represent a French district, and I have a French newspaper. I have to make do without translation services and I would ask the Premier why does he not pay for his own french lessons? And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, maybe this is his long-range plan to enter federal politics, and does he really think it is appropriate that the people of the Province subsidize this effort?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I do not pay for it myself for one

simple reason: it is being done as part of my duty as Premier, and that is the basis on which it is being done. Secondly, I have cut out, as Premier, a vast quantity of expenses that the former administration just piled one on top of the other, as each of the members opposite went down to the private dining room and ate lunch at public expense and drank drinks at public expense and so on - all of that has been cut out, Mr. Speaker. And if hon. members want to know, I will get the detailed information and provide it to the House and demonstrate very clearly just what has been done. Now, I cannot possibly pay for everything that I do because I do not have adequate income to do it. I have eliminated living in a Government paid house.

An Hon. Member: Not totally.

Premier Wells: Well, not totally, but I basically provide my own house for entertainment and my own house is used for that purpose instead of having a private dining room for the Premier and a house paid for by the Government of this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, that petty picayune question is hardly worthy of any more attention than I have given it.

An Hon. Member: In your view.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Mr. Warren: Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary to the Premier. Knowing that the Government is

paying his lessons in french and knowing that my district, above any other district in this Province, is seventy per cent native, both Inuit and Innu, I wonder would the Premier consider asking the Government to give me the opportunity of finances also to learn their language?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: There are certain hopeless causes into which we should never put any money, Mr. Speaker. I do not have any concern that the hon. member needs to learn Inuktitut to service his district. I spent a couple of days last weekend in the hon. member's district. Unfortunately, due to weather conditions the hon. member, who was I know sincerely trying to get there, was unable to make it and I gave his apologies to his constituents and told them he had been trying to get there but got stuck in Goose Bay. Mr. Speaker, I had no difficulty whatsoever communicating with the Innu and with the Labrador Innuit Association. There is a terrific translator, a most impressive man, Augie Andersen, who does an incredible job. He is a marvel to watch, and there are others who participate in this as well. I doubt very much that it can be justified, but if a good case could be made for it, I have no doubt that Government would take a look at it.

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

Mr. Doyle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Employment and

Labour Relations as it relates to Bill C-21, the new Unemployment Insurance Bill. Bill C-21 allows for up to twenty-five weeks of parental leave. Our Labour Standards Act provides for fifteen weeks of parental leave. Now obviously in order for people in this Province to avail of the benefits under C-21 which is twenty-five weeks of parental leave, it will be necessary for the Province to amend its Labour Standards Act. Does the Minister intend to bring in such a bill?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms. Cowan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My Department is looking at that particular aspect at this moment. Whether or not we will bring in an amendment, time will tell. We have to consider, as we did for the minimum wage and other changes we are hoping to bring in regarding labour standards, the economic impact it will have in the Province. So we have to balance the needs of our individuals in the Province, the needs of the employers, and the economic environment. We are indeed, to the Member for Harbour Main, Mr. Speaker, looking at it. Whether or not I will be bringing an amendment to the House remains to be seen.

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

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, I have to say to the Minister that the answer bore no relationship whatever to the question I asked. Now, I am going to ask her again. I would not ask the question in French, because she is having problems with my English. Again, let me just make it perfectly

clear. Now we have a bill that recently passed called Bill C-21, and in that bill people can receive twenty-five weeks of parental leave. Under our current Labor Standards Act we get fifteen weeks of parental leave. I checked with the Legislative Counsel and it is necessary to bring in an amendment to our Labour Standards Act in order to qualify for that twenty-five weeks of parental leave. It is getting late, and if we do not bring in an amendment to the Labour Standards Act people will not be able to avail of the benefits under C-21. I am just wondering if the Minister is going to bring in a bill which will give effect to an amendment to the Labour Standards Act so that people can qualify under C-21?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: If he had read the paper a few weeks ago, and I understood the Opposition got all their questions from the paper, he would have read my answer, which would have saved some time today, and he could have gone on to something else.

This Government does not have to change that particular regulation unless it sees fit. Several provincial governments in Canada have already decided that they will not change it to mirror that particular federal bill. So it is up to us then, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to repeat what I said first.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Ms Cowan: Because I was correct the first time.

Mr. Speaker: Question Period has expired.

Mr. Simms: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Simms: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Just to pursue an earlier exchange with respect to the House showing some expression with respect to the CBC -

Premier Wells: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Well, I am using the point of order to raise it. We have often done that, I say to the Premier, unless he is violently opposed to that method. It is one that has been in practice for years.

But since we discussed it earlier and had a little exchange about it, talking about an expression from this House of Assembly, hopefully a unanimous expression from the House of Assembly to express our concerns about the CBC situation which we discussed earlier in the statements, would the Government House Leader consider - I know he perhaps might have some difficulty with some of the words or something in the resolution that is on the Order Paper, placed yesterday by the Member for Port au Port. To eliminate and to avoid that and to make it fairly simple and straightforward, rather than quibble or argue over words in whereases and stuff like that, would the Government House Leader consider, in order that we can get on with the matter and deal with it in a simple fashion tomorrow morning or something, deal with perhaps referring to the

resolution presented yesterday by the Member for Port au Port, eliminating the Whereases, and just deal with the resolved parts so that all we would be asked to debate in this House would be the following, as an expression from this House: Be it resolved that this House call upon the Federal Government to insure that the necessary funding is provided to retain the present level of television and radio services and programming in Newfoundland and Labrador?

Nothing could be simpler. In my view, nothing could be simpler. In the past we have done it on other issues without even debate. So all I am asking is could we agree to debate tomorrow morning, one speaker for five minutes each or something on that particular issue, so that we as a House can express our views on this matter.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, this is not a point of order. The ordinary business of the House is being interfered with, and I object to it.

To begin with, we disagree with the hon. Member's resolution and we are not prepared to deal with it on that basis.

Some Hon. Members: Oh. oh!

Premier Wells: We disagree with the hon. Member's resolution.

Ms. Verge: What is wrong with it?

Premier Wells: What is wrong with it is that it does not deal with the issue and it distorts the whole thing. We have a great understanding of the concern of the Federal Government to limit

its expenditures and live within its means and restrain its budgetary expenditures.

We are disgusted with the offensive and callous way in which the CBC implemented those changes.

Ms. Verge: What (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Premier Wells: If the hon. member will restrain herself, she might learn something.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, we do not accept the resolution as it is worded. The Minister expressed our concern about the callous and improper manner in which the CBC approached it and, as was suggested earlier, if the hon. Opposition House Leader wants to speak with the Government House Leader, do it. This is not the time to do it, and there is no point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I want to point out to hon. members that this matter, although a point of order can be raised at any time quite obviously, it would be more appropriately done when we have gone down through the Order of Business and come to the Orders of the Day.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader indicated, I think, that he wanted to speak again. The Chair wants to get this over as quickly as possible. The Chair was of the understanding that we had agreed to meet and come up with a resolution a little later, and we do not want to delay the House any further. There is certainly no point of order, and I have

listened to presentations from both sides. If the hon. Opposition House Leader insists, I will hear one more comment.

Mr. Simms: No, no, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to argue or anything of that nature. I just want to make sure that we understand that in this Legislature it has often been a practice in the past - often - when Oppositions frequently will get up and raise matters using the guise of a point of order, and that has been quite acceptable. We have done it before on resolutions dealing with the seal hunt and other matters. We tried to do it before, I think, and the member opposite could not get a seconder for the one he wanted done. But we have often done that. So I do not think the Premier's comments are appropriate at all. I mean, it has been acceptable.

Now all I am saying to the Premier and to the Government is are you prepared to deal with a simple resolution that calls on the Federal Government to reinstate their funding to allow the programming and services that exist now to continue? I mean, you cannot get much simpler than that. Now if you want to quibble with words, and if you want to attack the Federal Government and stuff of that nature, then we are more interested in dealing with what was done not how it was done, as the Premier just tried to (inaudible).

Premier Wells: Again, Mr. Speaker, it is not a point of order. We agreed before the House opened to have the two House Leaders work out an agreeable resolution. Obviously the Opposition want to do a little bit of grandstanding. They have now

done their grandstanding.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, the Government of this Province will not tell the Government of Canada that it cannot reduce its expenditure.

Some Hon. Members: Shame on you! Shame on you! Shame! Shame!

Premier Wells: We will not tell the Government of Canada.

Mr. Simms: You have not got the guts. You are backing off. That is all that is wrong with you.

Premier Wells: But what we will tell the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, is that we find abhorrent the method they used to do it. We disagree with where they are putting the cuts. We have no quarrel with doing that. But we will not be pushed into this kind of a corner by the kind of grandstanding that the Opposition is going through now.

having spoken to the House before strangers were admitted and agreed on the manner in which it would be dealt with, and we would agree to work out a resolution, now they want to go through their grandstanding and, Mr. Speaker, we have no intention of being so silly as to fall for that kind of nonsense.

Mr. Simms: On a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The Chair has been trying to move to expedite the Order of Business. We have ruled that there is no point of order. The hon. Opposition House Leader now

wants to address a point of privilege.

Mr. Simms: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to address a point of privilege dealing with the accusation and innuendo cast a few moments ago by the Premier in his remarks. And I resent the suggestions he is making, that we are grandstanding over an issue as important as this. I resent that. And this Government has shown many, many times in recent weeks that if you ask a question you are either fearmongering or you are scaremongering or now you are grandstanding. Mr. Speaker, does not the Premier realize that this is an important issue and he is the one (inaudible).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, we are not interested in grandstanding or fearmongering or scaremongering. We are asking the Premier to simply agree to vote on a resolution which calls on the Federal Government to provide the funding to allow services to remain in place that now exist. Now if you do not agree with it, well, then, be man enough to get up and say you do not agree with it. Don't talk all the way around it, as you usually do.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege I say without hesitation that the actions are grandstanding.

An Hon. Member: You are wrong.

Premier Wells: Because, Mr. Speaker, we sat in this House before Your Honour admitted strangers and agreed as to how it would be done.

Now what the hon. Members opposite want to do is to try and put the Government in the embarrassing position of voting on a resolution asking for the reinstatement of those expenditures, so then they can turn around and say reinstate all possible expenditures in Health and Education and Transportation and anywhere else!

Some Hon. Members: You are wrong. You are wrong.

Premier Wells: Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether they think we are as stupid -

Some Hon. Members: Yes, you are.

Premier Wells: - as they may be or what, but we have no intention of attempting to tell the Government of Canada how to manage their budgetary problems. What we will say to the Government of Canada is we are disgusted by the callous manner in which they put these reductions into place and, Mr. Speaker, we disagree with their reducing expenditures on regional programming and preserving totally without reduction the national expenditures. That is what we disagree with. And we have no intention of allowing this kind of grandstanding against the arrangement that was made, to have this kind of grandstanding contrary to the agreement that was entered into before the doors were opened, Mr. Speaker, to allow Members opposite to grandstand in this way.

Mr. Simms: A master of illusion you are, boy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order, please!

There was no point of privilege.

The hon. Members I think are aware that the Premier used the word 'grandstanding' and it is not even ruled to be unparliamentary in the sense that it was used. So there is no point of privilege.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

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

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have the great pleasure today to present to the House a report of the Social Legislation Review Committee on the draft bill, "An Act Respecting Chiropractors." Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to the House that the Legislation Review Committee unanimously supports this particular report, and I would like to thank the hon. the Member from Humber East, my Vice-Chair; the Member from Burin - Placentia West -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) bosom buddy.

Mr. Reid: I am not going to go that far, Mr. Speaker - the Member for Harbour Grace and the Member for St. George's. Also, Mr. Speaker, I have to mention here Miss Elizabeth Murphy's dedicated work in the long hours we put into this particular bill -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Reid: - and also the co-operation we received from the Minister's staff as well as from the Minister himself. I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that if this House could - I know I might be ruled out of order here, but I am going to say it anyway - get along as well as my

Committee gets along, we would not have to put up with the nonsense we do on a regular basis. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Premier Wells: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of answers I want to give today. One is a question asked on October 18 by the hon. Member for Mount Pearl - there are two questions really. He asked, how much has been spent to date by the Economic Recovery Commission? Well, I will table the answer to that now, and just refer to two amounts. But I will table the detail. I will not read that out.

For the year ended March 31, 1990 there was budgeted \$3 million and was spent, \$1,062,331. For the year ended March 31, 1991 there was budgeted \$2,833,750 and up to November 30, 1990 we spent \$1,221,408. Now all of the other details of the expenditure on the loans and so on, that is all there as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the second question was, what accomplishments have there been that would have not have taken place at any rate? The hon. Member was talking about jobs and what jobs had been created that would not have taken place anyway. Now that is what took the time, Mr. Speaker, to get the answer. Because when they came back, the first answer they gave me four or five weeks ago was over 2,000 jobs. I said, now I want to make sure that every one of those jobs is attributable to the ERC and would not have taken place merely by the normal routine

work of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. So I sent it back and I said, make sure you pare it down to the absolute bone. And I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to table the detail, but I will not read it out. Just to summarize the detail there is attributable to the ERC a total of 1,531 jobs. That is made up, Mr. Speaker, of 470 totally new jobs and 1,065 jobs that would have been gone if the ERC had not interceded.

For example, I can think of 350 jobs that were gone, but through the intercession of the ERC they got them back again. All of the details are there. So, Mr. Speaker, that is 470 new jobs that did not exist before. And of those 470, Mr. Speaker, 338 were full-time jobs, year-round jobs, and 132 were part-time jobs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is only the beginning. Let me tell hon. Members some more good news. Assuming that things go as they are expected between now and December 31 1990, we will be able to announce another 176 new jobs that were not there before - I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, another 240. Of the jobs that have already been created, if the work continues as was projected, there will be a further 176 jobs created.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is also in process work - some may be realized and some may not - that should, if things work out reasonably well, produce relatively shortly another 834 jobs. Now, Mr. Speaker, one can readily see that within a very short time, within its first effective year of operation, the ERC has produced ten times as many jobs as the Sprung Greenhouse would have produced if it

succeeded, and so far, Mr. Speaker, the ERC has cost \$2 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, by comparison with their effort, we have produced ten times as many jobs for one-tenth of the cost. That is what I call performance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to submit the detail of that and the detailed numbers and an assessment of it. I should also point out, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to those there were several hundred other jobs created through the efforts of the NLDC into which the ERC only had a peripheral input or not a substantial input. That, Mr. Speaker, answers that particular question.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Premier Wells: They do not like that, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

Premier Wells: Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two questions on the Order Paper that I have to answer, one of which is the names of all persons employed contractually or as regular Government employees by the Office of the Premier, the salary, a brief description of the duties of the above, and whether or not any Government vehicle or vehicle allowance is available to any person.

I am tabling, Mr. Speaker, a list of everybody, including myself, and the salaries paid to everybody, with a description of all the individuals. And I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that all

are political staff. There are no regular Government employees as such, although one of them was the Registrar; the Filing Registrar was there when we took over the office. She remains there, but I am told that she is still a political appointee and not a regular Government employee. One lady is a temporary replacement for a secretary who is on maternity leave.

A vehicle allowance of \$80 per month is provided to Edward Joyce, who is the Executive Assistant in Corner Brook who uses his own automobile for Governmental purposes and it is best to account for it on that basis. That is the lowest cost the Government can obtain. We are having a look, Mr. Speaker, at when we get some of those cars turned in, and we might assign a car to Corner Brook for use when I am in Corner Brook.

The St. John's office has the use of a four-wheel drive vehicle, the Chevy Blazer that used to be used by the former Premier in addition to his regular chauffeured car. That is assigned to the Executive Council. This vehicle is not used by the Premier's office exclusively, but is available to the Executive Council as is required.

The total complement of the staff stands at twenty, compared, Mr. Speaker, to twenty-six in the 1988-1989 year - six less than the former Premier had. And, Mr. Speaker, in total salary cost, our total salary cost for this current year is \$747,767 compared with \$875,000 two years ago, with the increases that there have been in the meantime. So we have saved a great deal of money, Mr. Speaker, more than enough to pay for French lessons, I can tell you that.

Petitions

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

Ms. Verge: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition of 3,800 students of Memorial -

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, I have an Answer to a Question which was asked by the hon. the Member for Kilbride.

Mr. Tobin: We just passed it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

We have come to Petitions, unless hon. Members agree to go back?

Some Hon. Members: By leave! By leave!

Mr. Speaker: Agreed. By leave.

Mr. Simms: As long as you are not nasty or provocative.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister, under Answers to Questions for Which Notice has been Given.

Mr. Gilbert: I am under Answers to Questions now and I can be as nasty and as provocative as I want to, can I?

An Hon. Member: No leave, Mr. Speaker. No leave.

Some Hon. Members: Oh. oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order, please!

I want to try and bring some orderliness to the House and try and give it the dignity and the respect it deserves. I will ask again, has leave been granted to

revert to Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

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

Mr. Gilbert: Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Kilbride asked a question concerning road conditions between Donovans and Holyrood over the weekend, so I am going to give him the report that was given to me this morning.

Friday November 30. The weather conditions were rain, freezing rain, and then snow. The Operations Supervisor called the crews at 8:00 p.m. Two tandem truck plows equipped with ice control worked from 8:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. They made one run with the plow and ice control east and west of Foxtrap, opened up one lane in each direction.

Saturday December 1. Men and equipment started working at 5:00 a.m. and worked eleven hours, until 4:00 p.m. The plow working between Foxtrap and Holyrood intersections made one run and was down for repairs for three hours. After the repairs were completed it made two runs along that section. The main problem on Saturday was that the snow had packed on the highway and was hard to remove. Salt was used to remove the packed snow, however, and this was only accomplished in sections.

Sunday December 2. The temperature ranged from -3 to +3 with no precipitation. A grader and tandem truck plow worked from 8:00 a.m. Sunday until noon clearing off the remaining hard packed snow between Foxtrap and

Holyrood. Again, an example of scaremongering on the part of those people over there.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) garbage. I went over it three times the weekend and (inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order, please!

Petitions. The hon. the Member for Humber East.

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, I wish to present a petition of 3,800 students of Memorial University of Newfoundland. That is 3,800, Mr. Speaker. I will read the petition:

The Council of the Student's Union and members of the Memorial University community protest the impending financial cutbacks to Memorial University. These proposed cutbacks will result in: reduced staff levels, increased tuition and user fees, and curtailed enrollment. We, the undersigned, request that the Provincial Government reconsider their proposals to impose any financial constraints on the operating budget of Memorial University.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, this petition has been signed by 3,800 students and perhaps some faculty and staff of Memorial University. The phrase in the introduction to the petition is members of a Memorial University community. Mr. Speaker, I and my colleagues in the Opposition wish to associate ourselves with the call of the Memorial University community for the university to be spared from the proposed provincial Government cutbacks in funding.

Mr. Speaker, university education is linked closely with economic performance. Indeed, the connection between education level and human ingenuity with productivity and economic growth is becoming greater and greater. If we look around the world at nations that have geographic similarities to our own, and to our Province in particular, we can see examples of superior performance and productivity which seem to be based largely on their superior literacy levels and education attainment.

Iceland is an example. Iceland is an island nation of half the population of Newfoundland and Labrador, with an economy based mainly on fish. Iceland has full employment and has one of the world's highest national per capita standards of living. Iceland also has one of the world's highest education rates and, obviously, there is linkage. Economists have indicated that the economy of the western world will become less and less dependent on natural resource development and become more reliant on what are called information industries, which obviously involve human brain power and ingenuity. And to equip Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to pursue economic opportunities of the future, there has to be better university education, made more available to residents of every part of the Province, and funding to support university programs has to be increased.

For Memorial University simply to carry forward its present level of programming and services, there has to be a budget increase, because there are certain built-in costs and inflationary factors that are inevitable, but the

present level of programs and services is not adequate. The present participation rate is not great enough and, therefore, the Government has to provide extra funding. So, Mr. Speaker, in addition to agreeing with the call of the university community to be spared the proposed cutbacks, we in the Opposition would urge the Government to increase the level of funding.

I note that the Government has made promises to expand university facilities and programming, not only at the main St. John's campus, but at the Sir Wilfred Grenfell College campus in Corner Brook, the Government has gone on record as advocating an expansion of the Grenfell College programming to full undergraduate degrees in arts and sciences, with majors in several subject areas. Now, if that expansion is to come to pass, according to a report done by a university committee headed by Dr. Michael Stavely, there will have to be approximately \$25 million devoted to buildings and facilities on the Corner Brook campus.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we in the Opposition strongly agree with the petition of the Memorial University community, protesting the proposed provincial Government financing cutbacks, and point out the severe damage that will result if the proposals become reality in the Spring Budget.

I might add that I, personally, believe that the Government proposals are part of a psychological political campaign -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!
Order, please!

The hon. Member's time is up.

Ms Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

o o o

An Hon. Member: Mr. Speaker, may we revert to petitions?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister has asked leave to respond to the petition. Can we revert back to that? Do we have leave?

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, if I could speak on the point of order. We certainly have no difficulty under the rules of the House in reverting back to the rules that govern the presentation of petitions, if that is agreeable with the other side.

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

Dr. Warren: Mr. Speaker, I will just respond very briefly to the petition. Certainly this Government believes that investment in education is one of the best investments a society can make at all levels of education, particularly at this point in time, at post-secondary levels. We as a Government want to increase the participation rates in post-secondary, not just at university but at colleges and at other post-secondary institutions. We have initiated a number of activities already. We have indicated that we want to decentralize post-secondary education throughout the Province to bring opportunities closer to the people. We have reformed the Student Aid Program, and I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, that we have in the gallery today the President of the Student Council at Memorial and I think he would confirm that we have done a

tremendous amount during the past year to reform the Student Aid Program and to provide opportunities for more Newfoundlanders to go on to do post-secondary. We have also increased scholarships very dramatically, and I can assure the hon. member and the students at Memorial, that we will do everything possible to provide the best possible post-secondary education for students in this Province. We have to compete with the world. Our people must be educated and this Government is committed to providing a high level of education for all our students.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I take this opportunity as well to rise and speak in support of the petition so ably presented by my colleague from Humber East. It is a very, very important petition and it is a very, very important issue for the future of Newfoundland and Labrador, particularly for young Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. I have listened to the Minister very, very intently over the last number of weeks in this Legislature when he has been questioned about the impact of Budget freezes or funding cutbacks, and the implication it is going to have for Memorial University of Newfoundland, and the thousands of students about our Province who are attending, or who will want to attend that university. I want to say to the Minister that he can get up in his place all he like and talk about

this past year's improvements in student aid, he can talk all he like about increasing scholarships, but the real issue here is whether or not Memorial University, as we know it, will be able to continue to function at the level that it now functions, whether or not it will be able to provide the quality of education, and whether it will be able to offer the same number of courses that it now offers to the students out and about this Province? That is the real issue here, Mr. Speaker. The other big worry, of course, is that if the budget is frozen, or indeed there are cutbacks, will we indeed see a freeze on the enrollment level at the University? Will that be controlled and will we see a freeze? Then we will have hundreds and hundreds of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who will not be able to get admission to Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador and consequently will not go on to be better educated Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, which will be good for the future of our Province. That is the real issue, so I take great pleasure today to rise in this Legislature to support the petition. I would like to compliment the Student Union at the University for taking up this very, very important cause, to congratulate them on getting this petition, getting it to the Legislature, so that we once more can get support for their cause, and to get the Minister to his feet to hear what he has to say about this very important issue. I only wish the next time the Minister rises in his place he will be able to ensure the students of Memorial University, ensure the faculty, the administration of Memorial University, that next year they

will indeed receive the increase to the University they so willingly deserve. If we do not see that, Mr. Speaker, then I am afraid that the very successful Memorial University of Newfoundland and Labrador that we have seen in this Province, that we brag about so much, that I think it would be very, very regressive and a very sorry day for Newfoundland and Labrador if this Minister of Education and this Government freezes the budget of the university or cuts it back. So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks and go on record as endorsing very sincerely the petition so ably put forth.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the Day.

Mr. Baker: Order 12.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 23 to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance. That matter is - without going into a lot of detail - the issue that we debated earlier in the House and we talked about back and forth, the CBC cutbacks.

Some Hon. Members: Carried.

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand that this is simply a motion that the House adjourn to discuss a matter of urgent and pressing business, standing order 23. It is a matter that has been dealt with across the floor of the House a couple of times during this afternoon's

sitting and I am prepared to sit down with the Opposition House Leader to see if we can come up with a resolution that is immediately acceptable to both sides. However, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that what the House Leader wants to do is to make exactly the same case that is made in the resolution currently before the House. There are some arguments for and against, of course, adjourning the House to discuss the matter of urgent importance. First of all I would like to point out that a resolution does indeed exist on the order paper that deals with the same issue that the member is mentioning. I am assuming he wants to deal with exactly the same issue. The standard arguments that House Leaders use, Mr. Speaker, against speaking against adjournment of the House under Standing Order 23 is the fact that there are ample opportunities on the order paper to discuss such matters, including the Address in Reply in which almost any matter can be discussed. So, Mr. Speaker, I simply make the case that I do not think that we should adjourn the House to discuss this matter at this time and that we try to deal with it in some other way, that there is no emergency situation in the Province, and that the matter he refers to can be dealt with adequately by other means, and the fact that there is already a resolution on the order paper dealing with the same matters, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: In judging whether adjournment should proceed under this Standing Order, or whether the Chair ought to permit debate under this procedure, the Chair has to look at a couple of things. One, of course, is not the urgency of the matter that the

Chair looks at. There is no question about the urgency of the matter; it is the urgency of the debate. And in looking at the urgency of the debate, one of the factors that previous speakers in this House and other Houses has used is: what will be achieved by the debate being held this day? Will it change something? As a result of the debate will there be any changes resulting?

We are looking at, first of all, a matter that is not within the jurisdiction of the Province, so it is very unlikely that anything we could do today would change anything, since it is not under the Province's jurisdiction, other than an expression, of course, of dissatisfaction by the House. We have already had the Minister of Municipal Affairs give a statement to the effect of the position of the Government and the response from the Opposition which substantially agreed with that position. The hon. the Government House Leader also pointed out that there is a resolution before the House and that is another matter when deciding upon emergency debate. If there is a resolution before the House, then one does not allow the debate to take place. So two things: we have a resolution before the House, also, to the Chair's understanding, there was an agreement earlier in the day that both sides would meet and attempt to come up with a satisfactory resolution. That has not happened. The Chair has no control over that, but in the Chair's view there is a resolution before the House, so for these reasons the Chair will not grant the emergency debate at this time.

Mr. Sinms: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On a point of order, the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Just to use the guise of a point of order to try to conclude this issue for the time being. Considering his comments just made, would the President of the Council be prepared to ask his Minister responsible for communications, the Minister for Municipal Affairs, to get together with the Member for Port au Port who, on our side, initiated this issue yesterday with a draft resolution, and maybe the two of them might be able to come up with wording that is acceptable to both sides, that we could have a look at -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) you would call resolutions (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: No, I already went through that earlier. They have already refused and rejected that, even though it is simple. But I thought probably if the Minister and the Member for Port au Port got together - I have spoken with the Member and he is quite prepared to look at some wording and some drafting without conceding anything, and come back to our side, and you go back to your side, and maybe before the day ends it would be nice if we might be able to have something. Something short and simple is all we need, anyway to express something from the House. If he would be prepared to do that, would he be prepared to do that?

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

Mr. Baker: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Along the lines of what I have been talking about on a couple of occasions today, that is exactly what I have been saying.

I would like to remind the House that there already has been a statement by the Minister responsible for Communications in the House and responded to by Members Opposite, which express views of both sides of the House. What we are trying to do here is to come up with something on which we can vote and would be acceptable to both sides, and on that basis I would be prepared to ask these two Members to sit down and see what they can up with. And if in fact there is something that is acceptable to both sides, then we could deal with it rather quickly.

Orders of the Day

Mr. Baker: Order 12, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order 12 is second reading of an "An Act Respecting Chiropractors". (Bill No. 60).

For the guidance of the Chair, has this been in second reading before or is this the first time?

An Hon. Member: This is the first time.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting Chiropractors". (Bill No. 60).

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

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, indeed, to introduce second reading of this bill -

Mr. Simms: Hear, hear!

Mr. Decker: - The Chiropractors Act, and I am glad to hear the Opposition House Leader say 'Hear, hear!'

It is a subject which has been under discussion for quite a number of years. Now I have a whole long speech, but I do not foresee any difficulty putting this Act through.

Looking at the experience in the rest of Canada and in North America generally, Mr. Speaker, it was obvious that an Act to govern Chiropractors was necessary and that that was the only practical and reasonable option which was available.

The Legislative hearing process was very valuable, Mr. Speaker, in terms of dealing with some of the difficult issues relating to the subject. The Social Legislation Review Committee, chaired by the hon. Member for Carbonear, did an excellent job in having public input into this piece of legislation. That committee made some very valuable, worthwhile suggestions with regard to changes, and I brought these before Government, Mr. Speaker, and Government agreed to accept most of the suggestions which were made by the Legislation Committee. I think this is an excellent opportunity for me to thank the Members of that Review Committee for their very thoughtful and their very careful review of this complicated subject in a relatively short time. I think especially the hon. Member for Carbonear deserves all the praise and credit we can give him for this.

Ms Verge: Hear, hear!

Mr. Decker: This bill before the House will establish a process and a framework for the regulation of chiropractors, which is fairly similar to the ones which are in place in terms of other

professions in the Province. The bill establishes a regulatory licencing board to oversee the implementation of the Act and the granting of licences to chiropractors, as well as any other matters relating to licencing and discipline.

The bill also provides for what we commonly refer to as a grandfather clause, whereby those chiropractors now in practice would not have to write the Canadian chiropractic examinations in order to acquire a licence. This was one of the recommendations made by the Social Legislation Review Committee.

I would like to point out that the chiropractors in question will have to meet all the other academic requirements in order to obtain a licence, however, they will be exempted from having to write the exams, which could be difficult for people who graduated some years ago, but this in no way will reflect on the ability or the education of the chiropractors who are practicing in this Province. This is a very common procedure, which is done by other professions.

I can tell you that our chiropractors in this Province are as qualified as chiropractors anywhere else in North America, but we are going to grandfather them in rather than have them subjected to writing exams.

The bill grants chiropractors access to x-ray services in their own offices, Mr. Speaker, or in the x-ray Departments of the hospitals. Evidence indicates that in order to carry out their functions properly, chiropractors need some access to x-ray services and this bill will -

Mr. Parsons: (Inaudible) ask one specific question?

Mr. Decker: Of course.

Mr. Parsons: If I went to a chiropractor (inaudible) is that covered by (inaudible)?

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, the original Act which we presented stated that MCP would not pay for x-rays. The Legislation Review Committee recommended that we take this reference out of the Act. That has been taken out at this time, but it does not necessarily follow that because it is taken out of the Act we will pay for the x-rays. So at this time we are not paying, but it is not written in stone. On the recommendation of the Social Legislation Review Committee, and this is what the hon member spoke about, the bill no longer contains references to the insurability of chiropractic. Of course, this will be pursued as a policy issue. There are presently no plans to insure chiropractic nor, I understand, have there been throughout the discussions which have taken place over the years with respect to this issue. In summary, this bill will provide for an effective regulation of chiropractic in the Province, and I am delighted indeed to introduce this bill at this time for second reading.

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

Ms. Verge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not expect the Minister of Health to be as brief as he was in speaking to introduce this legislation. It is important legislation in which a great number of people of the Province have a high degree of interest. I was privileged to participate as

Vice-Chairperson of the Social Legislation Review Committee, along with my colleagues, I will call them, the Member for Carbonear, who is the Chairperson, the Member for Harbour Grace, the Member for St. George's, and the Member for Burin - Placentia West, in scrutinizing an earlier version of this bill.

The original draft legislation was given to the Social Legislation Review Committee in the summer, and the Committee had several meetings considering the bill during the early part of the fall. We advertised our meetings and invited public response. The response was quite impressive. Obviously, as I mentioned before, there is a high degree of public interest in chiropractic in having legislation regulating the practice of chiropractic in the Province, and in trying to provide for improved availability of chiropractic services.

The people who made presentations to the Committee included consumers, patients, individuals, who came on their own, as well as organizations, the provincial Chiropractic Association, individual chiropractors, the Newfoundland Medical Association, the Newfoundland and Labrador Association of Hospitals and Nursing Homes, the Physiotherapist Association, the Dietitians Association, as well as others. I am speaking from memory now, but there is a complete list of the names of the presenters, in an appendix to the report of the Social Legislation Review Committee, which the chairperson tabled earlier this afternoon.

I found the presentations of these people fascinating. The Committee work on the chiropractic

legislation was one of the most interesting tasks I have had during my political career. We probed not only legislation governing chiropractic, but our discussions ranged widely and included a critique of the whole medical system in our Province and in most of the Western world.

What emerged from the process of committee consultations is that, number one, the bill was largely satisfactory, being a product of earlier work of an advisory committee to the Department of Health, established by the previous Government, which was continued by the new Government. However, there were two major points of contention. The first was the provision in the original bill saying that chiropractic services would not be covered by MCP or hospital insurance. The other controversial point had to do with the denial to chiropractors of direct access to hospital, lab and x-ray services.

Much of the Committee's time was spent examining those two particular issues. As for the rest of the proposed legislation, there was widespread agreement. Certain exceptions were made, and those have been noted in the Committee's report.

The Committee made a unanimous recommendation to the Minister of Health, calling for certain changes in the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Committee differed on the policy question of whether there should be public funding of chiropractic services, the same as medical services, but we all agreed that that subject would be better addressed in other legislation.

As an Opposition member, I would like to use the opportunity afforded by this debate to say that I believe it is time for the Government to extend MCP and hospital insurance coverage to chiropractic services. I learned in the course of my work on the Committee that chiropractic is extremely effective in terms of relieving people's pain and improving their health, as well as in terms of cost.

Several individuals told us about their personal stories of misery and grief while they attempted unsuccessfully to get treatment from physicians, but who, after months and even years of agony, were finally healed by chiropractors. Actually, since my work on the Committee, every time I encounter a person with back trouble, I quickly ask them if they have seen a chiropractor. I have become a convert to the cause of chiropractic. Thankfully, I, personally, have never had serious back trouble, so I have never had to go to any health care professional for relief.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of public funding, I would urge the Minister of Health and the Government, in their Budget deliberations, to think seriously about extending MCP and hospital insurance coverage to chiropractic services.

The second point that was the subject of most of the presentations to the Committee had to do, as I say, with whether or not chiropractors should be able to access directly hospital, lab and x-ray services. All the presenters, with the exception of the institutional establishment in the Province, urged the Committee to make the recommendation which

we did ultimately, namely that the legislation give chiropractors the right to deal directly with hospital lab and x-ray departments. The alternative which is the case now, of course, is that chiropractors who need lab tests or x-rays have to send their patients to a physician, to a general practitioner, simply to arrange for a hospital x-ray or hospital lab tests. This results in needless duplication, extra cost for the Government, and a waste of time on the part of the patient. Because of the inability of chiropractors to deal directly with hospitals for lab and x-ray services patients have to make two visits to general practitioners, two visits which I am convinced are unnecessary and which add to the MCP cost borne by the Government.

This bill that we now have represents acceptance on the part of the Government of many of the recommendations of the public and the people who presented it to the Committee, as well as of the Committee itself. But sadly the bill does not extend to chiropractors the right to access directly hospital laboratory services. And I am disappointed that the Minister did not address this issue in his speech.

While I am pleased with the Committee deliberations on the bill, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the final bill was left so late in this sitting of the House of Assembly. If there had been more notice that this bill was going to be dealt with in the House before Christmas, then I am sure many of the people who came to the Committee and others, would have been here in the visitors galleries listening to the

debate. But as it is I learned just this morning that the Minister of Health did not notify even chiropractors that this legislation was going to be dealt with. And while I did inform them that we were going to be debating this legislation this afternoon there has not been sufficient time for any of the interested people to get here. Now I hope that the debate will continue tomorrow morning, so that some of the interested members of the public will be able to sit in the galleries and hear what is said.

Mr. Speaker -

An Hon. Member: If it was such a good idea, why didn't you start?

Ms Verge: That is a good question. We did not do everything right, but at least the former Government set in motion the Advisory Committee to the Department of Health that made recommendations for the bill. But I do not disagree with anyone who says that this legislation should have been passed a long time ago. But here we are today in December 1990 and I suppose it is better late than never.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to dwell on the question of the way chiropractors function in the health care system. Chiropractors are highly educated and trained to specialize in chiropractic, including in the use of the diagnostic tools of lab tests and X rays. They, more than general practitioners, are equipped to deal with hospital lab and X ray departments, so to block direct access on the part of chiropractors with these hospital diagnostic services does not make any sense at all. Now, in the course of the Committee's

deliberations as we discussed this issue I questioned each presenter, and the only people expressing any problem with chiropractors dealing directly with hospital diagnostic departments, as I mentioned, were the institutions, the Provincial Association of Hospitals and Nursing Homes, as I recall. They indicated that there is no substantive reason why chiropractors cannot deal effectively with hospital radiologists and lab technologists and technicians. The only reason they suggested that chiropractors should be denied direct access and instead have to refer patients to intermediary general practitioners is that there is not a good relationship, or good communications, between chiropractors and physicians. Now, physicians in the Canadian and Western health care system as it has evolved in this century are in a position of dominance. Physicians effectively have a monopoly over most health care services. Physicians are at the top of the health care pyramid and that is not logical or cost-effective. There are other health care professionals, including chiropractors, including nurses, including optometrists, including midwives, who are better trained for certain aspects of health care and who can provide not only better services but services at lower cost to the public, and I believe it is time for our provincial Department of Health as well as the Canadian Department of Health, Health and Welfare Canada, to embark upon a fundamental re-examination of our health care system and give greater recognition and acceptance to the role of health care professionals other than physicians. I believe that public funding through our Medicare

system should no longer be confined to services provided by physicians but instead should be extended to other health care givers. Mr. Speaker, in the case of hospital diagnostic services it seems to me that no good reason was advanced for denying chiropractors direct access and conversely many good reasons were spoken about allowing chiropractors to access directly the services. Now, Medicare and hospital insurance, public funding in other words, is quite relevant because even if the legislation were to permit chiropractors to order directly hospital lab services for their patients as aids in chiropractor's diagnosis and treatment, if there is not public funding for those tests then most patients would probably prefer to make the extra two trips to an intermediary doctor, or general practitioner so that through the GP ordering the lab services, there is MCP coverage. The two issues then are intertwined and I would, as I say, advocate an amendment to this bill to allow chiropractors to deal directly with hospital diagnostic services and then recommend to the Government that during the winter budgetary process that they approve extending public funding through MCP and hospital insurance to chiropractic services including hospital diagnostic services that are ordered directly by chiropractors. What is the sense, Mr. Speaker, of having public funding for hospital diagnostic services that are ordered by a GP for a patient, but not providing that public funding for the same services ordered by a chiropractor for the same individual?

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Ms. Verge: Mr. Speaker, the

Minister of Social Services is saying that nobody is listening to what I am saying. Evidently he is bored with the subject of chiropractic and evidently members opposite are impatient to wind up the business and go home and start their Christmas holidays. But I would like to say to the Minister of Social Services that we are here to represent our constituents and all the people of the Province.

Mr. Efford: (Inaudible).

Ms. Verge: Mr. Speaker, many members of the public have a lively interest in the subject of chiropractic. The response to the Social Legislation Review Committee was tremendous. Not only were there several groups and individuals who appeared before the Committee and gave well researched and thoughtful commentaries to us, but there were literally dozens of people who wrote letters to the Committee. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I say, just about every one of the presentations favoured legislation to regulate chiropractic in the Province, and welcomed most of the contents of the proposed legislation, but there were two issues that people took strong exception to, and one of them was the refusal to extend MCP and hospital insurance to chiropractic services and the other was the blockage of chiropractors dealing directly with hospital diagnostic services.

Mr. Speaker, it seems illogical and contradictory for the Government, on the one hand, to be prepared to provide legal regulation for the practice of chiropractic in the Province. Reflecting presumably in appreciation of the skill and

effectiveness and usefulness of chiropractors, but then, on the other, to refuse chiropractors direct access to hospital lab and x-ray services.

As I mentioned I was surprised that the Minister of Health was so terse, spoke so briefly in introducing the legislation, particularly I was disappointed that the Minister failed to address these controversial issues. I hope when the Minister rises to complete the debate on second reading that he will get into this question of chiropractors relationships with hospital lab departments where test are done that are needed by chiropractors to do proper diagnosis and to give the best kind of treatment, and also the relationship of chiropractors with physicians.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, from everything that was said to the Committee, that the only reason that the Department of Health and now the Government have been unwilling to allow chiropractors to deal directly with hospital diagnostic services, is that the power structure in our health care system, physicians and hospital administrators, for reasons of health care politics, have been objecting. But, Mr. Speaker, nobody who presented to the Committee, including the representatives of the Department of Health, gave any substantive reason why chiropractors could not deal directly with hospital lab and x-ray services.

All the evidence given to the Committee indicated that chiropractors are much better trained than general practitioners in dealing with x-rays which are required for chiropractic

purposes, as well as lab tests that are required for chiropractic services.

Hospitals are staffed by radiologists and laboratory technologists and technicians who run the tests, and there does not seem to be any reason at all why these radiologists and lab technicians and technologists should not be able to communicate quite effectively and satisfactorily with chiropractors in the interest of the patients.

Mr. Speaker, we have to ask at times whether the interest of patients get lost in the small 'p' political shuffle within the health care establishment.

Mr. Speaker, I was just handed a note indicating that the Late Show is due to start at 4:30. The Government House Leader is saying no. By agreement there is no Late Show today, so I will be able to carry on.

Some Hon. Members: No leave. No leave.

Ms Verge: No leave. Okay.

Mr. Speaker, another aspect of the Committee work I would like to comment on has to do with the provision in the legislation for grandfathering or grandmothering chiropractors who have been working and practicing in our Province in an unregulated atmosphere for several years.

The legislation has certain criteria for registration of new entrants in chiropractic in the Province, and since some of the currently practicing chiropractors do not meet these education standards but yet have been giving good service to patients over a

period of time, consistent with what the Legislature has done when providing for a legal framework for other professional groups, such as chartered accountants and such as lawyers, the Committee recommended that there be a provision for grandfathering or grandmothering experienced chiropractors. This differs from the clauses in the original bill and we are pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the work of the Committee resulted in this improvement in the bill.

The number of chiropractors working in Newfoundland and Labrador now is relatively small. From memory, I recall it is just about fifteen. Chiropractors are concentrated in St. John's, with just a couple outside St. John's: there is one in Corner Brook, who is the only chiropractor in Western Newfoundland, and I believe there is at least one in Grand Falls - the Member for Grand Falls might be able to correct me - there is at least one in Clarenville. The President of the Newfoundland and Labrador Chiropractic Association is in Clarenville, but, then, most if not all the others are here in the St. John's area.

Now, the absence of legislation governing chiropractic has probably inhibited chiropractors from moving to our Province, or Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who have trained in chiropractic from returning here and setting up practices here.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope one of the positive results of this legislation will be the encouragement of more qualified chiropractors to set up a practice in Newfoundland and Labrador, particularly in regions of the

Province which are not now served by chiropractors.

Mr. Speaker, among the interesting presentations that were made to the Committee was a submission made by the Association of Injured Nurses. That association told the Committee that workplace back injuries suffered by nurses have risen dramatically over the last few years. The problem of back injury by nurses has reached such proportions that there has been an association formed to focus on the root causes of the injuries, as well as to advocate services for the victims. The Association of Injured Nurses is of the view that an increase in the provision of chiropractic services, including the placement of chiropractors within the larger health care institutions that have a large number of nurses and other health care workers who are prone to back injuries, would be of tremendous benefit, first of all by ensuring early intervention and treatment to address back injuries soon after they begin, and also to provide early and effective treatment.

Studies have been done, Mr. Speaker, in New Zealand and in the United Kingdom on chiropractic. These impressive studies, which have been recognized and accepted in many parts of the world, point to the usefulness and the cost effectiveness of chiropractic and provide a rationale for the Government of our Province placing chiropractors within health care institutions, and also utilizing chiropractors by the Workers' Compensation Commission. Additionally, the studies justify public funding through Medicare and hospital insurance of chiropractic services and ending the monopoly on Medicare and

hospital insurance enjoyed by physicians.

Mr. Speaker, I am getting near the end of my remarks.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: Old (inaudible) is there cheering you.

Ms. Verge: Mr. Speaker, I know there are members of the public who wanted to be here for this debate, and because of the late notice they have not been able to arrange to arrive in the visitors' gallery in time to hear the debate. So if I speak just a little longer and if my colleagues contribute to the debate, then I would hope that some of the people who are so interested in this legislation will be able to arrive in time, at least to hear the concluding speech of the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker, I know these people are particularly interested in hearing what the Minister has to say about chiropractors accessing hospital lab and x-ray services, and since he failed to even mention that contentious issue when he introduced the bill, I am counting on him to deal with it extensively when he concludes. Now what I would welcome the Minister saying is that he has agreed to propose an amendment to the bill so that chiropractors will be able to deal directly with hospital diagnostic services, and so patients who can afford the services, while we are waiting for the Government to extend MCP and hospital insurance coverage, will be spared two unnecessary visits to general practitioners simply to get referrals to hospitals.

Mr. Baker: (Inaudible) be here

tomorrow for Committee stage (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, be here tomorrow for third reading and Committee.

Ms. Verge: That could be. The Government House Leader is suggesting that tomorrow we have Committee stage.

Mr. Simms: And third reading.

Ms. Verge: That could very well be, but that really would not be the same as listening to the Minister's whole speech as he closes the debate on second reading.

Mr. Simms: Give them a copy of Hansard tomorrow morning.

Mr. Doyle: Are you getting the message?

Ms. Verge: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it seems that there is a consensus among Members on both sides that they would like me to wind up.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: See, I told you she was a very astute person.

Ms. Verge: And I know my colleague, the Member for Grand Bank, has a strong interest in this legislation and I am counting on him now to carry on the debate about the chiropractors bill, and to try to make sure that part of this debate is saved until tomorrow morning when chiropractors, and members of the public who are patients of chiropractors, will have a chance to come to the visitors' gallery and listen in on the debate.

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

Mr. Matthews: Mr. Speaker, I -

Some Hon. Members: Boo! Boo!

Mr. Hogan: It is nice to listen to you, Sir. I am (inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: I would like to thank the Member for Placentia. I just want to say that I have been threatened by the House Leader to only speak for a minute. But I thought it would be important, since I have been a supporter of chiropractic -

An Hon. Member: Do you use it?

Mr. Matthews: Openly, yes. And that is why I wanted to stand in the debate on this bill. I want to commend the Minister for bringing forward this piece of legislation, and I want to commend the Committee which was so ably chaired by the Member for Carbonear and vice-chaired, as I understand it, by the Member for Humber East. They have done a very good job. Because any time you bring a piece of legislation for the first time to a Legislature, you look for certain weaknesses and so on. I must say I have had a look through this and, to me, there is a fair amount of protection in this bill for the people, the patients who use chiropractic, and, as well, there is protection there for those who practice chiropractic, and I want to commend the Minister and the Committee on the job that they have done in bringing this forward.

The question has been asked today on a number of occasions, why was it not done before and so on? I just want to say that I certainly was a supporter of having it done before. And we all know that there were various reasons why it was not. I say to the Minister

that I think what he did, really, is he went over and he took the officials in the Department of Health, he took control and told them he wanted this done. I would say that is one of the main reasons why it is here, and I commend him for that.

Having said that, I think some of the problems with the whole perception of chiropractic has been that people do not understand or have not understood what chiropractic is. Some people - and we know, we do not need to mention any names - who have been in this Legislature before have made certain disparaging remarks about chiropractic and chiropractors. And, believe it or not, there are some people who believed them and thought they knew what they were talking about, and gave a very bad impression and a black eye to chiropractors. I think that was most undeserving at the time, and I still do.

As I said, I have been going to a chiropractor now, I would say, for probably four years. I have had back problems for years. I find chiropractic very, very good and helpful - do not have to take any drugs, which I think is very, very important, no painkillers, no muscle relaxants, none of that stuff. I find it works perfectly for me, and if I keep going back on a regular basis, I have no trouble functioning. I suppose Members opposite might debate this, but I have no trouble functioning quite normally all the time.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Matthews: Whatever the functions are, yes. But I just want to highlight a few things here. I am encouraged with the

definition of chiropractic which outlines very clearly what it is all about. And I think that has been a problem in the past, that people have not understood really what chiropractic means and the services that are provided by chiropractors. I think it is very, very important that more and more people get to understand what chiropractic is all about.

Another very important aspect of the bill, I find, is the Chiropractic Board and the makeup of the Board. It is very good, indeed, to see that the Chiropractic Association themselves, or the members of the Association, submit names to the Minister. So they have input on who sits on the Board, which I think is good. And, of course, it is encouraging and very good, as well, to see that there will be people on the Board who are not chiropractors. So I think between it all it should present a very balanced Board, and I commend the Minister and the Committee for that.

There is not much more that I want to say about the bill, Mr. Speaker. The other thing is, there is provision here to deal with incompetence or what may be deemed as improper action by a chiropractor. There is provision here, too, for the appeal process improper action by a chiropractor. There is provision here for the appeal process and so on. And I think, for the first shot, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I think this is a decent piece of legislation and I want to go on record in this House as supporting it.

Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Reid: Not until I get my two cents worth in.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There is just one thing: I am not going to be very long, but I think my two hon. -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Reid: - friends on the other side just missed one point and one point that is very, very important, as far as I am concerned, and I think it is very important as far as -

An Hon. Member: Do not go praising her up now.

Mr. Reid: - the members of this House are concerned, and I am going to direct my comments to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations. I think that if every member of this House could have had the opportunity to sit in on all of those hearings, all those meetings that we had, and had it explained to us exactly what chiropractic medicine was, I think a lot of people in this House and a lot of previous people who sat in this House would change their minds as it relates to chiropractors. And I am directing this comment to the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations and basically it is this, I personally feel, and it is a personal comment, I do not know how the Government feels about this, but I think that the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations should take immediately a strong look at the possibility of including chiropractic medicine into The Workers' Compensation Act.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Reid: Now I do not know if you realize what I mean by that.

An Hon. Member: No, boy, we are stunned. Tell us.

Mr. Reid: But under The Workers' Compensation Act chiropractic medicine or practice is not covered. And I can assure the Minister through my personal experience and from what I have heard in the last five or six months, as it relates to chiropractic medicine, that if it was the number of days that are lost in the workplace and especially in the hospitals and the group homes and the various homes that handle people on a daily basis in the health care sector, there would be a reduction in days lost. And I think there are a lot of people in this Province that would verify that and I have had the opportunity, and my hon. colleague for Harbour Grace knows of a similar case where his brother a few years ago hurt his back in a hospital, and he knows as well as I do that my wife, for example, Mr. Speaker, has had two operations on her back, she is a registered nurse, off work for a year, went to a chiropractor after that year and within a matter of six months was back to work, has not seen a medical doctor since as it relates to her back, but she would have been on workers' compensation, I suppose, or long term disability for a long, long time. Now whether or not he cured her, at least he put her back in good enough shape, for the want of a better word, for her to be able to go back to work and get off the workers' compensation or the unemployment rolls. And I think the Minister should take a good

serious look at that.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me make this comment -

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Reid: - it has taken up until now for a man to come along or a person to come along in this House with enough intestinal fortitude to say to the bureaucrats in the Department of Health that I am going to do it the way I see it and not the way you see it. And that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is introduced in the House right now and will pass.

Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words on the bill as well seeing it was before the Committee, I served on the Committee and I want to say that I was indeed honoured to have the opportunity to work on the Committee to deal with the chiropractors and to meet with the groups who were involved. I certainly do not want to get as political about it as the Chairman of the Committee just tried to get.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Tobin: The bill is before the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, because it is the will of the people of this Province that the bill be presented before the House of Assembly and I think it is the will of this House that the bill be approved.

An Hon. Member: Sit down now, boy!

Mr. Tobin: No, I might keep her going all evening.

But I can tell the hon. the Member for Carbonear, Mr. Speaker, that there are people within Government today, and I take exception to the slur he threw at the bureaucrats in the department, that there are people within Government today who work for the Government, who support the Chiropractors Act and I think someone has the responsibility to defend the people in the Department of Health rather than have slurs directed at them like the Member for Carbonear just did. They are committed to the progress of Government, they are committed, within the Department of Health to the Chiropractors Act and that type of contempt that was just shown by the Member for Carbonear should not be allowed to continue. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I thoroughly support the bill that is before the House.

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

Mr. Decker: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank hon. members for the stimulating debate which we have gone through over the past hours on this particular piece of legislation. There is nothing more enjoyable you know when a Minister presents a bill than to feel the cut and thrust of debate. When the hon. Member for Humber East was speaking we were all on the edge of our seats, hanging onto every word on both sides of the House, and that is the kind of debate, Mr. Speaker, that I like to see in this House. I was hanging on my seat and I noticed the hon. Member for Grand Bank who could barely contain himself because he was so involved

in the debate. That is the kind of debate we had here to today and I am glad about it. I thank the hon. Member for Grand Bank for the kind words and I accept them in the spirit in which they were given. The hon. Member for Grand Bank has been a believer in this practice for many years, and he admitted so. The hon. Member for Humber East admits she is a convert, and it is very obvious here that in a case when a person becomes a convert that person tends to become even more zealous than those of us who have been believers for years. I think you will discover this in religion, where some people change their religion they become overly zealous and I believe the hon. the Member for Humber East has become a little bit overly zealous. I want to say that during the formation of this bill I thanked the members of the Department of Health who contributed all along the way and who advised the Government on the formation of this bill, the tremendous work they did. I want to thank all the people who made it possible and now, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to another few minutes in Committee, and hopefully we will have the same co-operation we have had here today and we can have this Chiropractors Act become part of the law of the land. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act Respecting Chiropractors," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 60)

Mr. Baker: Order 13.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Amusement Rides Act". (Bill No. 58).

Ms Cowan: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple amendment or simple -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Employment Relations.

Ms Cowan: You almost got it right there.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The proposed changes are in clauses 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, and they simply separate the appeal process which as of this moment is part of the Amusement Rides Advisory Board. After this legislation is passed there will be an Independent Amusement Rides Appeal Board that will listen to any appeals that come as a result of decisions of the Advisory Board.

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

Mr. Doyle: I do not have any great comment to make on the bill, Mr. Speaker. As the Minister pointed out a moment ago, it is a fairly straightforward piece of legislation that allows the Minister to establish an Amusement Rides Appeal Board, and it is really a mechanism put in place for an appeal procedure. That is really all there is to it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Employment and Labour Relations.

Ms Cowan: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Amusement Rides Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Mr. Baker: Order 17, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies and Errors in the Statute Law." (Bill No. 71).

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

Mr. Dicks: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a regular act that is brought into the House each year to correct errors that have crept into legislation as and when it is enacted. I think it pretty well speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker. If anyone has any questions, I will be pleased to answer them when debate ends. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, our critic has indicated to me that she would like me to indicate to the House that she has absolutely no problem with this particular piece of legislation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Simms: In fact, I think she pointed out to me that she initiated a number of these changes a number of years ago, and they are only now being passed.

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

Mr. Dicks: I move second reading, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

On motion, a Bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, on tomorrow. (Bill No. 71).

Mr. Baker: Order 3, Mr. Speaker.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on said Bill, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Bill No. 11. There are 159 clauses. Can we take them one -

The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Mr. Flight: Well, Mr. Chairman, we are into Committee. We have done the debate on this bill in second reading and I am ready to table the amendments. All the amendments proposed by the Legislation Review Committee were accepted by the department as submitted, so unless there are questions on the clauses as we go through, I move third reading, if that is the procedure.

Mr. Simms: No, we are still in Committee.

Mr. Flight: We are still in Committee.

Mr. Chairman: Shall Clause 1 carry?

Mr. Woodford: No.

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

Mr. Woodford: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few short comments. First of all, I would like to say, as I said the other day when the minister introduced the bill, I agree with it. We had some good constructive

discussions in Committee on it and with people outside. We asked people to appear. Some did and some did not. Nevertheless, they were given the chance. It was a good open, public discussion, the way a committee should work.

I would also like to say at this time, in agreeing with the amendments brought by the Minister, it is a sign, Mr. Chairman, that some other Ministers should take under consideration and consult with the Minister of Forestry in seeing how the Committee system can work. Some of the recommendations we asked for the Minister went along with; we got them, and the bill is now before the House and they are ready to be passed. So I say to some of the other Ministers involved with some of the bills, take a lesson and consult with the Minister of Forestry on what I consider a job well done.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Simms: Our critic has spoken for us on this side on this particular issue, and we have no further problems or questions. So might I suggest that we carry clauses 1 to 159, with the appropriate amendments inserted in between? Can we do that? Do you understand what we are doing? It will save all the verbiage? The amendments as tabled, right?

Mr. Flight: The amendments as tabled.

A Bill, "An act To Revise The Law Respecting The Management, Harvesting And Protection Of The Forests Of The Province". (Bill No. 11).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill with amendments as tabled, carried.

Mr. Baker: Order 7, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Bill No. 72?

Mr. Baker: I am sorry. Order 5.

Mr. Chairman: Order 5, Bill No. 46.

The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Yes. I wonder if we could we go to order 7, as I suggested, and then come back to Order 5.

Mr. Baker: I did not think you were ready for 7, that is why I suggested the change to 5.

Mr. Simms: Oh, 7?

Mr. Baker: But that is okay. Let us go to 7 then.

Mr. Simms: Yes, we are ready for that.

Mr. Baker: Order 7.

Mr. Chairman: Order 7, Bill No. 72.

A Bill, "An Act To Reconstitute Newfoundland And Labrador Development Corporation Limited And Certain Divisions Of The Department Of Development As Enterprise Newfoundland and Labrador". (Bill No. 72).

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

Mr. Baker: Order 5, Mr. Chairman.

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Human

Rights Code, 1988". (Bill No. 46).

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

Mr. Baker: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we could ask leave of the House to proceed with Committee stage of Bill No. 58, which is Order 13 on the Order Paper.

Mr. Chairman: Do we have leave for the Committee to deal with Bill No. 58?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Amusement Rides Act". (Bill No. 58).

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

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is getting close to 5:00 o'clock, and I would like to make one comment before I move adjournment.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker: I want to make one comment before I get to the adjournment, Mr. Chairman, and it is simply this: We have seen a couple of bills pass through here today, I am talking in terms of - well, hon. members know which ones, the Forestry Bill and the Chiropractors Bill. And we have had a couple of other examples this session of bills that have been very efficiently and very effectively dealt with by the

Legislation Review Committees, and that the Legislation Review Committee process has had an effect on the legislation, it has resulted in changes in the legislation. I thought I really should point this out, because quite often we have the tendency to think of these committees as simply operating and not having an effect.

I believe they had a very good effect on some of the legislation so far, and there are some pieces coming up in the future where the impact of these Legislation Review Committees has been very great.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I could not hear what the Government House Leader was talking about. Was it anything in particular or anything important?

Mr. Baker: I was praising the Legislation Review Committees for the work they did on those bills.

Mr. Speaker, 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 the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Does the House agree to stop the clock at 5 o'clock?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Stop the clock at five.

The hon. the Member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

Mr. L. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bills No. 72, 46 and 58 carried without amendments, and Bill No. 11, with amendments.

On motion, report received and adopted, Bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow, amendments to Bill No. 11 ordered read a first and second time now, Committee ordered to sit again, on tomorrow.

On motion, amendments read a first and second time.

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

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I was consulting with my very able parliamentary advisor to my right and I did not quite - I apologize to the Sergeant-at-Arms - hear what the Government House Leader was saying. It seems like he is trying to ram through the adjournment motion without an opportunity to have a little bit of discussion on a couple of points that are very salient, I believe. May I ask him, first of all, to confirm now for the members of the House that tomorrow morning it is his intention - may I be presumptuous enough to presume that is his intention to do Committee of the Whole on the regional services legislation, the Ombudsman legislation, the chiropractor's legislation, and the anomalies and errors legislation? Can he confirm that in that order, basically that is what we will be looking at

tomorrow morning, at least at the beginning?

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

Mr. Baker: I would like to confirm that that is at least the beginning of what we intend to do.

Mr. Simms: Oh, yes, before we move into next week or whatever.

Mr. Baker: That is right.

Mr. Speaker: The Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: And the other point, Mr. Speaker - I do not know if it is necessary for the Sergeant-at-Arms to stand there, but I suppose he can if he wishes. He enjoys it. On the issue that we were accused of many things about today, the resolution that we were attempting to draft, I have to say, Mr. Speaker, regrettably at this stage, from consultations I have had back and forth with some Members of our caucus if not all, but certainly some, regrettably the wording proposed I think, in consultation albeit, but the understanding was obviously that the Member for Port au Port was to get back to the Minister and eventually we would try to find something that would be acceptable.

We are having a very, very difficult time accepting, or finding acceptable, the wording as put forth in the first draft. Now it being 5:00 p.m., I do not know where we go from here. I mean, I do not suppose for a moment that anybody would propose that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Member for Port au Port stay up all night to try to work out these... I do not suppose for a

moment that that is what we are thinking about. So all I can say on the advice of my colleague, the Member for Port au Port, in consultation with other Members of our caucus, we regrettably cannot accept the wording of this particular draft.

Now I do not know if the Member for Port au Port intends to pursue it any further, or if there is any point, or if he detected there was a point or what. I do not know where exactly we go from here, other than to say we regrettably cannot accept this wording. We would be quite happy to accept the resolved part of the Member for Port au Port's resolution, just the resolved part, which is quite simple, which I explained earlier today, and which is on the Order Paper already. We would be quite happy to deal with that and get on with it. But the Government seems, for some strange and wonderful and weird reason, to want to -

An Hon. Member: Defend the Federal Government.

Mr. Simms: I do not know about that, but to make it all kinds of - I do not know why we are worrying about wording and all that kind of stuff. But this wording certainly -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: The wording on the draft does not come close to reflecting the wording in the Member for Port au Port's resolution yesterday, the resolved part. The wording of this does not reflect very closely at all with what he has had to say, so unless the Government has another option or suggestion, then I do not know if we can go any further

on this particular matter from here.

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

Mr. Tobin: No leave, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I would like to thank and congratulate the Member for Port au Port and the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs for the work they have put into re-drafting a resolution which they have taken to their respective caucuses or sides to see if it is acceptable. I would like to congratulate them on the job they have done. I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that regrettably we cannot accept that particular draft and we feel there should be some changes. So I am willing, simply because I know when the Opposition House Leader was Minister of Forestry I believe, he spent a lot of time sitting down having cups of tea and so on with people, so I was going to invite him down to -

Mr. Simms: That was when I was President of Treasury Board.

Mr. Baker: No. When you were Minister of Forestry, I believe, you were accused of having a cup of tea with somebody in Ottawa.

An Hon. Member: Oh yes!

Mr. Baker: Remember that? A long time -

An Hon. Member: That was the federal minister.

Mr. Baker: The federal minister, yes. Because I know of his liking

for such situations, I was going to suggest to him that perhaps he could come to my office, we could have a cup of coffee in a few minutes, and discuss possible changes. I would be willing to do that. But, of course, if his position now is that he must revert back to the original resolution and that he is not willing to discuss and not willing to compromise and not willing to come up with a joint resolution, then I would be willing to accept that as his position. But I would suggest that perhaps there are some minor changes which could be made that may be acceptable to both sides.

Mr. Speaker: I just want to remind hon. Members that we have a motion before the floor, but we seem to be operating by consent.

Mr. Baker: By consent.

Mr. Speaker: I recognize the hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, I hate to say it, but I do not think I would be caught dead walking into the President of Treasury Board's office for a cup of coffee. I hate to say it.

Mr. Flight: Why would (inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Because of the way he treats the Opposition in the House of Assembly: the lack of co-operation he usually shows in this House and how he attacks the Members opposite personally, accusing us of grandstanding and smearmongering, or gearmongering, whatever it is he accuses us of. So, you know, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that will resolve it. I have every confidence in the Member for Port au Port. Now whether the Minister has

confidence in his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, may be another question. But, if the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Member for Port au Port want to try to get together, which I doubt, because I know the Member for Port au Port has commitments for the next couple of hours for sure, and that is going to be difficult. But if he wants to have one more look at it - I mean, if the wording of the resolution is going to be centered around this particular part that you have in the draft, that is not even related.

An Hon. Member: Forget it.

Mr. Simms: It is not even related to our resolution, so I do not know how you could ever work out - maybe what we will do is we will show the -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, we have heard about your great conciliation efforts, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hodder: Just wait and see what they have.

Mr. Simms: This is what they have, is it not?

Mr. Hodder: They have seen ours, we have seen their's, now let us see what they have to show us next.

Mr. Simms: You mean you think he has something to show me? Does the minister have something to show me, if I go down? I do not have time to be drinking tea and stuff like that, but do you have something to show or what?

An Hon. Member: I say forget it.

Mr. Simms: Ah, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we are going to get

anywhere with it.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? All those in favour "aye"?

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 9:00 a.m.