



Province of Newfoundland

FORTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XLI

Second Session

Number 83

PRELIMINARY REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Thomas Lush

Friday

23 November 1990

The House met at 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker (Lush): Order, please!

Before going to the routine business, on behalf of hon. Members I would like to welcome to the public galleries today the Mayor of Wareham from the district of Bonavista North, His Worship, Mayor Hunt.

An Hon. Member: Hear hear!

Statements by Ministers

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

Mr. Kelland: Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker it is with much pleasure that I announce the establishment of a Round Table on Environment and Economy for the Province and the appointment of members to it.

An Hon. Member: Hear hear!

The Newfoundland and Labrador Round Table on Environment and Economy is a multi-sectoral forum of senior decision makers and leaders in the Province.

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Order please!

Mr. Kelland: Its mission is to build consensus on issues pertaining to the integration of economic and environmental planning. The goal is environmentally sustainable economic development.

We are fortunate to have a distinguished group of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians

to serve on the Round Table. The Chairman is Dr. Noel Murphy, a person with deep and diverse experience - physician, politician, businessman and community leader. Dr. Murphy, I might add, is a former Member of the House of Assembly.

Mr. Simms: He certainly has diverse experience.

An Hon. Member: It shows how liberal we really are.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Order please!

I ask hon. Members to please extend to the Minister courtesy while he is making his statement.

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

Mr. Kelland: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I might add as an aside the Member from Humber East indicated Dr. Noel Murphy was a PC member. I would remind her that her leader was a Liberal member one time in the House of Assembly.

The other, Mr. Speaker, the other non-governmental members are -

An Hon. Member: What about the Minister of Fisheries?

An Hon. Member: The Minister of Finance.

Mr. Kelland: Mr. Wes Abel, St. John's; Ms. Monica Behr, St. John's; Mr. Tom Humphrey, Corner Brook; Ms. Dorothy Inglis, St. John's; Ms. Regina McCarthy, St. John's; Mr. David Mercer, St. John's; Mr. Ron Ross, Wabush; Ms. Judy Rowell, Nain; Mr. Douglas Smith, St. John's; Mr. Stuart Weldon, Corner Brook; Mr. William Wells, St. John's; Mr. Peter

Woodward, Goose Bay; and Ms. Caroline Young, Lethbridge.

An Hon. Member: Hurray, we got a Liberal now.

Mr. Kelland: In addition four Government Ministers will also serve. They are: the Chairman of the Resource Policy Committee, currently the hon. Charles "Chuck" Furey; Chairman of the Social Policy Committee, currently the hon. Phil Warren; the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the hon. Graham Flight; and the Minister of Environment and Lands, who needs no introduction to the House.

Mr. Speaker, we are confident that the Province will be well served by a Round Table with such broad and diverse representation. I want to emphasize that the public members do not represent particular organizations on the Round Table; rather they are leaders in their own right, who bring a diversity of backgrounds, interests and views to the Round Table.

The terms of reference for the Round Table are appended to the statement and copies have been distributed to all hon. Members. The Round Table will report to the Premier but it is important to note that the Round Table is not only an advisory body to Government, more than that it is a multi-sectoral organization whose members have a vested interest in environment-economy integration and who are prepared to work towards constructive solutions that will be acceptable to all stakeholders.

In establishing the Round Table on Environment and Economy, Mr. Speaker, we join other Provinces and the national Government in

fulfilling one of the key recommendations of the National Task Force on Environment and Economy. Our Government regards this as a very important initiative. In keeping with the principles enunciated by the Brundtland Commission, this Province must develop economically, but in a manner that is truly sustainable environmentally. We look to the Round Table to help us achieve that.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. First of all I would like to thank the Minister for having his secretary deliver a copy of this statement to my office at 8:25 this morning. That gave me plenty of time to look through it.

I want to congratulate the Minister and Government on their initiative. Hopefully it will ensure more protection for our environment. But, Mr. Speaker, sometimes the environment and economy just do not jive from where I sit; not to confuse, Mr. Speaker, with what is first. Economics is secondary when it comes to environmental issues.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I find it is pointed out that those people are a forum of senior decision makers. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this will not include any public forums or individual input when it comes to environmental issues.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder aloud at which segment of the two

departments will have the greatest input. I hope that it will be the Department of Environment and Lands, which would be first and foremost in every decision that is being made. Again this Province has stakes in that release. This Province must develop economically, and I am sure that each and every one of us agree that it has to develop. But I hope, on a sound footing, as all members on this side hope and I am sure all members from the other side as well, that it can develop economically and safe environmentally.

Mr. Speaker, I have no axe to grind as it pertains to the individuals who have been appointed to this Round Table Committee. When looking at the names, they come across to me as being distinguished Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. But I hope that this is not something that we are prone to; something as a front without teeth. Again, remember that what comes from their deliberations will end up in one mans possession, and that is the Premier.

And hopefully - this is what the statement said - and I hope that those recommendations will not become a part of what has happened since this Government took office, and gather dust in some dark corner. I also find that I perhaps may have overlooked this, but I find that there are no union representatives in this group and I am sure that unions do have concerns as it pertains to economics and the environment.

I, again, compliment the Minister and the Government. This is not a new thing, this has been thought about for a number of years. I

hope that they can find some co-existence between economics and environmental issues.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out here that, I suppose, in any other constituency in Canada the environmental critic would have been asked to serve and, I am sorry, this did not happen. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record now -

An Hon. Member: You were willing to serve?

Mr. Parsons: Absolutely. But I want to go on record now in saying that even though I am not part of it, we will be forever watching what this Committee is doing and what recommendations -

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

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

Oral Questions

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

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, on October 5 the Minister of Finance announced, and let me quote the Minister, he said, For reasons of simplicity and efficiency, the Government intended to piggyback on the goods and services tax by including the federal goods and services tax and the retail sales tax, and that this would become effective on January 1, 1991. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister if he would confirm that by keeping the rate as it presently is, at 12 per cent, that this decision will have the result

of increasing our retail sales tax from 12 per cent to almost 13 per cent of the cost of retail goods?

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

Dr. Kitchen: I am glad the Leader of the Opposition raised this question, because there is a fundamental fallacy going around with respect to this. On the surface it looks like if the federal Government tax is \$100 at 7 per cent you get \$107, and if the provincial Government puts 12 per cent on that you will get \$12.84, so that the total becomes \$119.84. It looks like there is a .84, but here is what is happening and here is why the mathematics are incorrect. On goods that are manufactured in Canada right now there is a manufacturer's tax commonly known as the federal sales tax, which is hidden in the price of goods manufactured in Canada, and that is about 13.5 per cent on most items. On January 1 that will be eliminated, and, therefore, the price of goods should be reduced on these items by 13.5 per cent so that as prices go down, the 7 per cent is not 7 per cent on \$100 anymore, it is 7 per cent on perhaps \$87, and then the 12 per cent on that means that it is probably about the same or less than it was before on that type of goods.

Now the GST is broader than the manufacturer's sales tax, it is on other items, so that the calculation is not perfect. But this is an incorrect calculation and we estimate that if we do not continue to do that, because the price of goods will fall this Province will lose \$24 million worth of RST revenue. So we just had to put our tax on top of that tax, which is what we do now.

Right now our tax is on the price of goods that includes the federal sales tax, you see, which is hidden, and we are just following along with the same procedure as we did before. And if we do not do it, we will lost \$24 million, our estimate, and in these times we just cannot afford to do without that.

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

Mr. Rideout: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. This is the same convoluted explanation that came from the Minister when he brought in his first Budget, trying to convince Newfoundlanders that they were not the highest taxed people in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister this. The Minister's reason for doing this was, he said, was for the sake of simplicity and efficiency. Simply put, if an item costs \$100 and the Minister is going to tack retail sales tax onto the \$100 plus the 7 per cent goods and services tax, will that not have the effect of producing a tax grab for the minister, for this Government of almost \$1.00 on that purchase? Is that not the effect it will have, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Simms: It comes to \$12.84 instead of 12 per cent.

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

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is asking his second question which he prepared before he had the answer to the first question. What is happening, Mr. Speaker, is this: he is like a monkey at a stop light, and once he sees the

red he will stop no matter under what conditions, and we cannot have monkeys at stop lights asking questions, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if one of the Pages could go out and find a dunce cap for me that I could send over to the Minister, because if there is anybody in this House who deserves a dunce cap, it is the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Simms: No wonder they call him the Mad professor.

An Hon. Member: It is no wonder they call him the mad professor and the mad doctor. Now, let me ask the Minister a question that has not yet been prepared.

If the Minister knows the answers to those questions why doesn't he tell the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, or does he want to hide from them that this Government will get a major, major tax grab out of piggybacking on the GST?

Mr. Rideout: Is he going to get up?

Mr. Windsor: What a disgrace. Boy, resign. You are (inaudible).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rideout: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) get on your feet, boy. Go on.

Dr. Kitchen: (Inaudible) the reason you are over there.

Mr. Simms: It is you. You are a real joke, Herb, a real joke, boy.

Mr. Rideout: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Minister of Finance, if he can settle down enough to listen to it.

Mr. Simms: What a joke! Good God.

Mr. Rideout: Now, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Finance confirm that based on his original estimates of \$596 million for RST this year, that this decision to piggyback on the GST for the sake of simplicity and efficiency, which is what he told the people of the Province, will extract upwards of an additional \$10 million from the people of this Province for January, February and March of this fiscal year? Will he tell us that his calculations show that, and will he tell us further that with a full year of piggybacking on the GST the Government stands to gain a tax windfall of an additional \$40 million?

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

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, these figures are incorrect.

Mr. Rideout: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a supplementary.

Mr. Rideout: Well, Mr. Speaker, if those figures are incorrect, will the brainy Minister of Finance get up and tell the people of the Province what the correct figures are? Surely the Government and the Department must have done some calculations, they must know something. So if these figures are incorrect, give us the real figures, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Simms: The Premier hasn't given us answers to questions we asked him six months ago.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Speaker, we have done our calculations and we anticipate that there will be an increase in revenue as a result of this measure. And on an annualized basis, rather than lose \$24 million if we did not do it, we estimate that we will gain perhaps \$20 million for the whole year by so doing. But it is a very dicey question here as to just what will come out of it because of the level of retail sales tax and the level of retail sales and things of that nature. So it is a very iffy question and it would be not doing a very good thing by being very firm at this stage of the game, before the economy rebuilds itself for next year.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries.

A few days ago the Minister made some public statements about tightening up at the Fisheries Loan Board and making it more difficult for fishermen to get loans. I am wondering if the Minister could explain to the House why he is taking these actions of tightening up the Fisheries Loan Board?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that we would make it harder for fishermen to get loans. What I did say in reply to a question from a member of the news media was that there is a review going on into the operation of the Fisheries Loan Board, the first one, by the way, in ten years. So I think it is about time we took a look at it and examined some of our programs and policies, and hopefully find ways and means of making them more responsive to the needs of our fishermen. That is the sole purpose of the review; it is certainly not being done with a view to cutting out programs or making it tougher for fishermen to get loans.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I say to the Minister, I believe the last time there was a review done at the Loan Board was after he left as Minister of Fisheries.

I wonder if the Minister of Fisheries could inform the House whether or not the Loan Board will be offering any interest relief to fishermen who have had justified low landings this year, with low income, and are finding it very

difficult. Will there be any interest relief offered by the Loan Board to those fishermen this year?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) for a minister (inaudible).

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to reply to the comment by the Leader of the Opposition, but I won't. Maybe the hon. member made reference to the time of the last review of the Loan Board. I will let that one pass.

Mr. Speaker, I have said before that if there are fishermen out there who are finding it difficult to meet their commitments this year to the Fisheries Loan Board, then we will be receptive to finding some ways of helping them, as we have done in the past. Last year, you will recall, we assisted fishermen on the South Coast who were finding it difficult to meet their payments and we sort of allowed them to go by for awhile, and I am sure if the need arises, we will do the same thing this year - but I repeat, if the need is there.

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

Mr. Matthews: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. With the departmental reviews that have been ongoing by Government over the last month and a half or so, looking at the possibility of layoffs, does the Minister expect there will be a reduction in staff at the Fisheries Loan Board next year? And, if so, will that not further compound and delay the processing of loans for fishermen?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, if we find that there is some unnecessary fat at the Loan Board, we will trim it. We have not determined that yet, but there is a review going on, and we are looking at the operations of the department and the Loan Board. There has been no decision made yet to reduce the staff, but I can only tell him that whatever happens, the interests of the fishermen we are there to serve will certainly come first, and we will do absolutely nothing that will impair our ability to deliver the programs we are required to deliver in the Department of Fisheries.

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

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy. The Minister of Energy will be aware from news reports this morning that approximately 200 people are being laid off, or have been laid off, at the Come By Chance operation. Could the Minister offer some insight or some details into the reason for these layoffs and whether or not these layoffs are of a permanent or a temporary nature?

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

Dr. Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank my hon. colleague for the question. I was quite surprised myself yesterday, actually, when I got back to my office at about 5:15 p.m. and was told there was going to be a layoff, effective today, I believe. It is about 200. I don't have any more information

than was in the news reports this morning, but we are following up on it and hoping to find out more.

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

Mr. Doyle: Mr. Speaker, I understand the minister has to get the information later on today probably, but I would ask him if he perceives any spinoff effect from these cutbacks at the refinery? Many local firms, for instance, in the Avalon Peninsula area in particular, get their gas supplies from the Come By Chance refinery. Will production of gasoline, for instance, at the refinery be reduced as a result of these layoffs? Does the Minister foresee any problem in that regard?

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

Dr. Gibbons: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge the layoffs are related only to construction projects at the refinery and have no relation at all to production. The total staff at the refinery was about 570 I believe, recently. With 200 layoffs from construction we still have about 370 or so who are involved in the production end, so I anticipate that production will continue.

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

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

Mr. Doyle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have been hearing that in the not-too-distant future the Come By Chance refinery may very well be undergoing an expansion to be in a position to take advantage of its proximity to Hibernia crude. Could the

Minister indicate if this is indeed a fact and if there is any concern for the future viability of the refinery as a result of these layoffs?

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

Dr. Gibbons: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not had any concerns about the future viability of the refinery. At this time, I am not aware of any consideration of an expansion there to accommodate Hibernia crude. I understand the refinery can pretty well accommodate Hibernia crude now. It may have to do some minor work, because Hibernia crude with its wax content may need some heating of the containers and pipes and so on. But within the six years we still have before Hibernia crude starts to flow, there is lots of time to do anything that might be necessary.

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

Mr. Hewlett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. During the past year the Provincial Government has repeatedly assured citizens of the Province that any changes in our Crown Lands policy will not impede people's access to the shoreline of our lakes and rivers. I would ask the Minister responsible for Lands, is that still Government policy?

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

Mr. Kelland: I am not sure really if I understood the question, Mr. Speaker, but the intent is, as you will see in Bill 25 when it comes in, when it is in for second reading and debate, that our intention is not and never has

been to restrict the normal traditional access to the ten metre right-of-way around most freshwater bodies in the Province, if that answers your question.

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

Mr. Hewlett: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister, will the licencing of boathouses and wharves restrict access to the shoreline reservation?

Mr. Kelland: No -

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

Mr. Kelland: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I am just so anxious to get up here. If you will read the Act we will be in discussion on very shortly, you will see that licences can be given for the construction of wharves, boat houses, and things like that. That will not restrict access to the ten metre right-of-way, and will only be permitted to the amount that they do through necessity and through the bond reserve. But the access will not be restricted in any way.

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

Mr. Hewlett: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister this: Could not the licencing of a boat house in excess of ten metres in length lead to the denial of access to the shoreline?

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

Mr. Kelland: Mr. Speaker, I guess that would depend on how much of the ten metres was out over the

water.

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

Mr. Hewlett: Mr. Speaker, would not the licencing of a boat house in excess of ten meters in length, which stretches from the water across the reservation onto private property, deny access to the shoreline?

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

Mr. Kelland: I do not visualize that that might happen. But if it does, or if you know of a case where it has happened, I would ask that you bring it to my attention and we will have it investigated and dealt with.

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

Mr. Hewlett: In hearing what the Minister had to say, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister, then, would he consider amendments to the legislation that would prevent the blocking of access because of long boat houses?

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

Mr. Kelland: Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to deny any member of the House the opportunity to present an amendment. My consideration is that the Act as it has been rewritten - we tidied up the Act that had been presented originally by the former administration, and we have corrected the inequities and so on in there with the re-drafting now of Bill 25, and I believe it adequately addresses that. It is for debate in the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and if

there is room for improvement we can improve. I have no problem with that, but I am not going to commit right now that I will bring in any specific amendment, because I believe the Act as it is written is quite adequate, more than adequate.

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Environment and Lands. Only a few days ago, employees of the St. John's City Council working at the Robin, Hood Bay garbage disposal site expressed grave concern over the increasing use of that site for the disposal of hazardous waste. Does the Minister share those concerns?

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

Mr. Kelland: In the broad context, yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What plans does the Minister have to provide for an appropriate and environmentally sound site for the storage and disposal of hazardous waste?

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

Mr. Kelland: Mr. Speaker, I suppose you could say one of the major environmental problems in this Province is the management of waste, and there are ways and means of addressing those things. Specifically, as the hon. member knows, there is an application, or registration on file now by a

company that wishes to handle hazardous waste from around the city and its environs, and I can say I think that is a good idea. We have to address those concerns when it comes to the environment. We cannot afford to have the NIMBY syndrome. We have to be aware that facilities such as the one that is proposed and registered are a necessity if we are to deal with our waste problem.

Having said that I think it is a good idea, through necessity and through legislation projects of that nature have to be raised and registered because of a number of concerns from the general public and interested parties. Actually technical people have raised enough issues to have that registered. In fact, I recall the member some time back, two weeks ago when the project had just been registered, demanded, I believe, that I would order an immediate environmental impact statement, and I informed him at that time that we have to go through the process that has been established by the legislation.

So, yes, I support the management of waste. With respect to specific plans by the department, we are not a funding agency as much as we are a regulatory agency, as the hon. member knows, and we would do whatever we could to encourage the entrepreneurial end of the population to get involved. But, at the same time, if appropriate speed is not attained and maintained with respect to the handling of our waste, we are in a position and are determined to provide legislation and regulations to cause that to happen.

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is my final supplementary. Because of the outcry from the residents of this area, surely the minister would not inflict upon the residents the will of some people within Government or even the City Council. My question to the minister would be, would the minister seriously consider the placing of this potentially hazardous facility in a neighborhood, perhaps to ruin the environment, contaminate the waterways, place in this area a potentially dangerous and environmentally unsound, unproven facility? I mean, That is the point. He said he was looking at it. But surely this minister could not consider placing this on Sugarloaf Road where there would be a potential danger to the people who inhabit that particular area, and that is densely populated.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Parsons: Not consider one smidgen of a chance, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Kelland: I thought I might have adequately answered that already. As the hon. member knows, anybody in a democratic society has the right to make a proposal to Government. If the project is seen to have any sort of an environmental impact whatsoever it is required that it be registered under the Environmental Assessment Legislation. Now, that was done.

I said a little while ago that I believe management of waste is one of our major problems environmentally speaking, and

facilities such as the one proposed is a good idea; we have to do something about it. I did not say, however, that that is the world's best location to have such a facility, and that is why we are in this current process. There will be a forty-five day period of public input with respect to the location.

By the way, from what I can understand, Mr. Speaker, the major concern seems to be the location not the recognition by people of the fact that we have to be responsible for managing our own waste materials. The location is one of the major factors, and that will be duly addressed in the forty-five days that the public and others have an opportunity to have some input. Following that, we will make an assessment of what has transpired so far and decide whether or not the project can be released at that stage in the game, whether additional environmental information is required through an EIS or whatever - those are our options - or disallow the project entirely. And the proponent, the City Council of St. John's, and the general public are well aware of that, I would think.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Fisheries.

Is the Minister aware that hundreds of fishermen and fish plant workers are not qualifying for the federally announced fisheries emergency response program, and has the Minister taken any action to resolve this problem for those fishermen and fish plant workers?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware at this point in time how many fishermen are or are not qualifying for special assistance, but if and when it comes to our attention, if there are large numbers of people out there who do not qualify, then we will have a look at it.

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

Mr. Matthews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On June 6 I wrote the Minister of Fisheries asking for a gear replacement program for fishermen who had suffered severe gear losses, and the Minister wrote me back and adamantly said no, that they would not be putting in place a gear replacement program.

Well, as a result of that gear loss, with hundreds of fishermen around the Province who had low earnings and now find themselves not qualifying for the fisheries emergency response program, would the Minister consider a provincial response program to assist those fishermen who had low earnings because of gear losses?

The Minister's officials have documented those people and the amount of gear loss, the fishermen, where they live and so on. Would the Minister consider a provincial response component to address the problems for those fishermen?

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

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the fact that we do have at times severe gear losses

that impact quite seriously on fishermen, but there is no replacement program in place and I think hon. Members will appreciate the problems that would be created by trying to put together such a program.

For years now we have been looking at the possibility of some kind of a gear insurance policy and that, in my view, appears to be the best way to go. And I understand the union has expressed some interest in that kind of a program.

We have in the past, on a number of occasions, talked to the Federal Government about it, and it seems to me rather than trying to react on an ad hoc basis to every crisis which comes about as a result of a storm and some gear loss, that maybe some kind of a permanent gear replacement program or gear insurance program would be more appropriate.

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

Mr. Matthews: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I understand the Minister is going off to a Ministers' meeting shortly to discuss total allowable catch for 1991 and so on. I am wondering if the Minister could inform the House whether or not he has any indications of what we can expect from the federal ministers to the amount of the total allowable catch for 1991, and has he any indications or implications for the resource short program?

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

Mr. Carter: I am glad he asked me that question, Mr. Speaker, it is a good one.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) headlines.

Mr. Carter: Yes, there is a meeting at nine o'clock Monday morning in Prince Edward Island with the Atlantic Provinces Fisheries Ministers and with our federal counterpart, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. I understand there will be a number of options put forward at the meeting as to what the total allowable catch might be in 1991 - the 1991 management plan.

We have not fully decided yet, Mr. Speaker, what position we will take in terms of the TAC; we want to get access to more scientific advice, I suppose. But I can tell you one thing, we will be making a very strong plea to the federal minister and to my provincial counterparts, firstly, that we have the Scandinavian long-liner allocation reinstated, the only user group in Atlantic Canada that was totally abolished.

We will be asking for an increase in the resource short plant program. Again last year, we know, that program suffered a 59 per cent reduction, which was more than twice what the prorated reduction was across the board for other user groups. So we will be making a strong plea for the re-instatement of those programs, and we will have to wait and see what the total allowable catch will be.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, everybody is aware, I guess, of the ongoing public comments by Abitibi-Price about their ongoing restructuring plans for their mills all across the country. I would like to ask

the Minister of Forestry if he can tell us what he sees as being the future of the Grand falls mill and the Stephenville mill, particularly in relation to the ongoing restructuring, and does he have any concerns?

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

Mr. Flight: Mr. Speaker, we have reason to have confidence in the future viability of the Grand Falls mill. With regard to the commitment Abitibi made last fall to the Government, to their membership and to the town at large with regard to the restructuring after the shutdown of No. 6, they are fairly well on schedule with that and they are continuing their modernization.

Their plans to continue with the construction of a power generation plant on the Exploits River, although I don't have an up-to-date, detailed understanding of exactly where they are, I am aware that the commitment is just as strong and they are doing the kind of work now, environmental and otherwise, that will permit them to start construction when they have done whatever is necessary to have to commit the funds to the project.

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

Mr. Simms: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a quick supplementary to the Acting Premier, the Government House Leader, in the absence of the Premier. Last December the Premier announced on behalf of Abitibi that, in fact, the company would be proceeding with the hydro project in Grand Falls, with the project to begin, I believe, next

year, 1991. Can the Acting Premier confirm whether in fact that is still the case? And when will construction begin? When?

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

Mr. Flight: Mr. Speaker, the company at this point in time is not prepared to give a definite date as to when it will begin, nor did they ever give a specific date as to when it will begin. They said in 1991.

Mr. Simms: No, they said '90.

Mr. Flight: And now what is happening, Mr. Speaker, is they are doing their ongoing environmental studies as required, doing ESP on Red Indian Lake, and they are looking -

Mr. Simms: What? ESP?

Mr. Flight: Environmental impact study.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Doyle: EIS.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Flight: It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition ran out of questions this morning, and the member for Grand Falls stood up and asked a question - the House has been open a month, and we are finally getting a question on Grand Falls and on the paper industry. The only reason we got the question is the Opposition ran out of questions.

Mr. Speaker: I am rising to inform hon. members that Question Period has expired.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

I want to comment on unparliamentary language. The Chair picked it up early in the Question Period. I think hon. members will realize if there is anything that offends the Chair, it is unparliamentary language. Sometimes it is very difficult for the Chair to rise on unparliamentary language quickly to catch the nuances and the context in which the particular word was used, but I am referring to early in the Question Period, when the reference of 'a monkey' was made, and when the retort came back from the Leader of the Opposition then, 'is a dunce.'

These words, certainly in my view, hinge on being unparliamentary. I am going to view them a little more clearly. I would think, on the spur of the moment, they were not used in an unparliamentary way, but it wasn't music to my ears when I heard it, and I want hon. members, please, to be aware of the necessity, the absolute necessity for parliamentary language. As I have said to hon. members before, the English language is replete with descriptive words, either in the elevating sense or in the opposite, and hon. members can use those words without getting into the offensive area when we start talking about monkeys and pigs and foxes, and so on.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

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

Mr. Murphy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure for me

to rise at this time to present a report of the Government Services Legislation Review Committee respecting the draft bill, 'An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act, 1977'. We travelled as a Committee, Mr. Speaker, across Labrador and Newfoundland.

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

A point of order.

Mr. Simms: Just to establish some firm and fast rules, I think, on this process. For example, in this particular case the Chairman of the Committee is tabling a report. Now, I know we have done it on one other occasion, but it is very difficult to be able to assess the report when we don't even have the bill.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes. Well, I just said we have done it on other occasions, but it doesn't make it right. In consideration of the process, it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, it would be more appropriate for the Committee to table its report at least after the bill has been tabled, so that members can compare the recommendations of the Committee with what is in the bill. To do it otherwise, even though we have done it on a couple of occasions, it wasn't raised as a point of order. I raise it now as a point of order so that we can establish some firm guideline. I think it would make much more sense to have the Bill first, and then the Committee Chairman table his report whenever that might be - not this particular Chairman or this particular bill, I mean in

the future.

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

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Opposition House Leader raises an interesting point. The bill, as such, has been available and the Committee members have it, obviously, because they have done their evaluation. Copies of the bill are around the Province. It has not yet been distributed in the House, I understand is the problem?

An Hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Baker: Okay.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) draft bill.

Mr. Baker: It was a draft bill you were operating with.

An Hon. Member: Yes. Right.

Mr. Baker: Okay. What the member is saying makes some sense, in that a Committee report, when it is distributed in the House, should bear some relation to a bill that members have in their possession. Perhaps we need to sit down and delineate a little bit more exactly what the procedure is to be. I would suggest that it would be fairly easy to come to some kind of an agreement on not tabling the Committee report until the bill is distributed, if we also have some kind of assurance that the Committee report does not end up in the media before the bill is presented, and so on.

So there are two things here to play. I think the member understands what I am saying. Perhaps if we could come to some

kind of an agreement, then in future we can make sure that does not happen.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, two points, just to carry it a bit further. First of all, on the issue of not giving it to the media beforehand, I know before, when the Member for Kilbride tried to table a minority report on another bill, there was some suggestion that that was similar to what happened to the former Leader of the N.D.P., Mr. Fenwick, when he disclosed some information on a Committee's report. But in this instance the Vice-Chairman told the Committee he was going to table a minority report. That was the difference. It is a little different situation. But I think we can have some discussions along those lines.

The other thing is - and I want to ask the Government House Leader to clarify this for me - I understood that part of the role of the Committee was after it had had its consultation with the public in public hearings, and after it had decided on some changes, or if, indeed, it had decided to recommend some changes, that those recommended changes would go back to the Minister who presumably would go to Cabinet and say, 'Look, the Committee would like to see these kinds of changes,' and before the bill was finally done - because they were dealing with a draft bill - if the Cabinet decided to accept some of those changes, then they would be put into the bill.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: No, I am not asking

why, I am just saying is that not one of the features of the Committee?

Mr. Doyle: That is the point I made last time.

Mr. Simms: The Chairman, I believe, agrees with me. I say to the Government House Leader, the understanding is that the Committee would send proposed changes to the Minister who would then go to Cabinet, and you would make the changes to the draft bill based on recommendations of the Committee, which ones they wanted to accept, and then the bill itself would be printed; the bill would then be tabled in the House, the Committee report would be tabled, and then you could see which ones the Government accepted, which ones they did not accept, and so on. Is that not meant to be part of the process? Because if it is not, he had better have a meeting with the Committee Chairman, because I am sure the Member for St. John's South has the same understanding as I do, that it was the intent of the Committee to send their suggestions to the Minister and the Minister would go to Cabinet to accept changes or reject changes recommended by the Committee. Is that not part of the process?

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

Mr. Baker: I think, if you go back and check Hansard, Mr. Speaker, you will find that that was indeed suggested as part of the process, but it was also pointed out that there may be many instances where bills have already been distributed in the House, and that another avenue is that the amendments suggested by the

Committee, if indeed there are any, would be dealt with during the Committee stage of the bill in the House, and that there are many avenues open. If the Committee receives a particular bill far enough ahead of time so that the process has not gone too far, then certainly the Minister could make recommendations to Cabinet in terms of changing parts of the bill. But if it has already been approved by Cabinet and the process has been printed and all this kind of thing, and the amendments are not of a major nature, then the simpler process is to bring it up in the Committee stage and deal with it there as an amendment.

But you are absolutely right. That process is an acceptable process from my way of understanding, but so is the other. I would like to point out that the draft bill in this process has become public. Many people around the Province know about the Bill, have seen copies of the draft Bill, and all this kind of thing, so I do not see anything wrong with the member tabling it today. But if the Opposition House Leader wants some hard and fast rules written down, then maybe that is what we should do.

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Speaker, just further to that, can the Minister tell us when the bill will be tabled? Perhaps that would be the easier question, number one, and number two, is there any urgency with tabling the Committee report today? Can it not be done next week, if the bill is going to be ready next week?

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

Mr. Baker: It could be done any time, Mr. Speaker. Obviously the hon. Committee Chairman decided he wanted it tabled today, and is doing so. I do not direct the Committees, so I will check and find out when the bill will be ready.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair has nothing to work on in terms of the point of order. The Opposition House Leader raised what to him was a concern, and a matter that concerns the Chair as well. Where we have a new Committee system, obviously I think it is important that hon. members on both sides come to certain agreements as to what procedures will be. But in view of the lack of these rules at the moment, the Chair cannot say that the hon. member cannot present the report, because there is nothing which would allow me to do that unless it is by agreement, of course, by both sides of course.

The hon. the Member for St. John's South.

Mr. Murphy: If I may, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few points on the hon. Opposition House Leader's point of order. I think, and I think the Committee might feel this, that the bill in draft form which was distributed throughout the Province to give interest groups an opportunity to look at the legislation that would probably be coming before the House, and/or the terminology of the Act, was a great opportunity for people concerned to make a presentation to the Committee. I would have thought that the Committee's report now, prior to distribution of the Act, might be timely, so that before the Act is

distributed we might consider the Committee's report and then it might certainly be more palatable to all members.

Mr. Simms: Was that a point of order?

Mr. Murphy: It was just to your point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I would rule on the point of order, but if the Opposition House Leader wants to respond?

Mr. Simms: Yes, I will respond to his point of order. My only concern, again, is that the bill itself is not drafted. We would not know, for example, if Cabinet has already decided to make some changes from the draft bill. We would not know that. We would have no idea, nor would you, so my only argument is that if the bill, for example, is not going to be printed and distributed until the week after next, which will be nearly two weeks from now, which is quite possible by the way, as I understand, then you have the Committee's report with its comments and recommendations but you would not even have the Bill to compare it with, or to address it. That is my only point. So, I mean, if there is no urgency, I do not know why you need - can you explain? Perhaps we would give leave for the Chairman to explain why he feels there is an urgency to table it today - urgency.

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

Mr. Baker: I do not unnecessarily want to prolong this, Mr. Speaker, but the report that is being presented is the report on the draft legislation. If in fact changes are being made to the bill

to conform to the Committee's report, then it is kind of useless to have the Committee report tabled after the changes have been made. There is no real reason to wait. If the committee structure is going to have some input, it is important that people realize there is some input.

For instance, when that bill is tabled if there are changes that correspond to what is recommended by the Committee, then it will be obvious to everybody that the committee process has had an effect and has had some input into what is happening with the making of a bill. Which is as it is intended, and which is why I do not see anything wrong with tabling a report on the draft bill at this time. But, as I say, we have no hard and fast rules and I would be willing to sit down with the Opposition House Leader and write up some.

Mr. Simms: Just one final point.

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

Mr. Simms: I do not want to belabour this all day either, but it is important that we clarify the rules and the procedures. I guess the big problem is that the bill is not printed. Why the bill is not printed then, if there are no changes and so on from the draft form, because it would seem to me to be a fairly simple process to go to the Queen's Printer with the draft bill and say here, print this, when it has been on the go for months and months and months and weeks and weeks. The Committee was on the go, when? September was it? Back in early September. So it certainly should have printed before.

But anyway we should have a discussion maybe and firm up some rules. I do not care.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair's ruling is the same as the one I made previously.

The hon. the Member for St. John's South.

Mr. Murphy: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In introducing the report I would just say that the Committee went from Labrador West all through the Island. We received submissions from twenty-three witnesses: some of the major union bargaining units throughout the Province, and some of the boards of many of the health care institutions. I personally think it is timely to table the report at this particular time, because it is complete.

I want to thank the Committee as a whole for what was a very long and arduous task in receiving all this particular information. As the Speaker would see from the report, it is put together to try and highlight. And those witnesses who presented briefs, we have highlighted all their major concerns and reached recommendations unanimously. I might add, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee. So again I thank the Committee and the hon. Member for Grand Falls, who participated at with us at the time we went across the Island, and I thank the Table, especially Miss Elizabeth Murphy for her assistance in putting this document together. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Further Reports by Standing and Special Committees, Notices of Motion - if I may to

hon. Members, something that has been rather annoying to me is when I am going down through the Orders of the Day, Members standing and walking out makes it - number one, nobody is supposed to rise in their place when the Speaker is speaking; number two, it makes it difficult. When I ask for Notices of Motion and I see somebody standing, then I think they are standing to react to the item I have called and it makes it rather difficult. So I ask hon. Members, please, to assist the Chair in abiding by these rather elementary rules.

Petitions

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present two petitions at this time, dealing with the closure of the regional office of the Department of Finance, Taxation Division, in Clarenville. There are two petitions. I will read the first one, Mr. Speaker, if I may. It says: 'To the hon. House of Assembly of Newfoundland in legislative session convened:

The petition of the undersigned residents of Clarenville and area: We, the undersigned, feel the decision to close the regional taxation office in Clarenville will have an adverse effect on the area. Both travel time and travel cost will increase if this office is moved to either Grand Falls or St. John's. Moving a necessary service 200 kilometers further away from one fifth of the population is not decentralization.'

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by 2,600 residents of the Clarenville area.

The second petition, Mr. Speaker, which is similar in its name, was circulated by the Chamber of Commerce of Clarenville to businesses in that area. It says: 'We, the undersigned businesses of Clarenville and Shoal Harbour, support the position of the Clarenville area Chamber of Commerce which opposes the closing down and relocation of the local Motor Vehicle Registration office and the Department of Finance office.' This one deals with both of them. 'We believe that these moves are economically unsound.'

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, what I will do is also table a third petition I have here, if I may, which is similarly related. This says, 'We, the undersigned, wish to publicly oppose the decision made by you, the Government, to close the office of Motor Registration in Clarenville on November 30, 1990. We, the public, feel this is a downgrading of service to us Newfoundlanders who live outside the Avalon region. We demand that the Motor Registration office in Clarenville remain open and provide efficient service to the public of this area as they have in the past.' That is signed by forty-nine residents of Plate Cove area: Plate Cove, Open Hall, and King's Cove, outside Clarenville. These are residents of the Bonavista Peninsula who were served by that office.

So, Mr. Speaker, this petition was signed by forty-nine people, the Chamber of Commerce petition is signed by 355 people, and the general petition was signed by 2,600 people, well over 3,000 who have added their names to these

three petitions against those particular moves of Government.

Mr. Speaker, speaking first of all to the issue of closing the Regional Taxation office, there are sixteen people who will be displaced there. Three of them, I understand, have been declared redundant and will no longer have positions, and the balance of fourteen - I think there are actually seventeen positions, one of which is vacant and one has been declared redundant. Fourteen positions, I think, are being transferred.

Mr. Speaker, out of the sixteen employees involved here, there are forty-two dependents, fourteen spouses and twenty-eight children. So not only is this a disruption to the employment of these sixteen persons, it also is a major disruption, of course, to their families. A large number of the spouses are gainfully employed in the Clarenville area. In fact, I have some numbers here somewhere dealing with the total salary. The spouses total income, in fact, is about fifty per cent of the total income of these sixteen employees. Some \$608,000 in salary is generated by these employees, and that is \$608,000 that is spent in the Clarenville area. And \$270,000 is earned by the spouses of these people. So that is almost \$1 million, Mr. Speaker, that is earned and spent in the Clarenville area by these people. To move that out of Clarenville is a major impact on the Clarenville area.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that various groups - I have a copy of a letter here from the Clarenville area Ministerial Association addressed to the Premier, dated November 5th, where that

Association, on behalf of their parishioners - this is the Ministerial Association dealing, I would assume, with all the churches in the area, and they have a very strong letter to the Premier urging him to reconsider that particular decision.

Mr. Speaker, I also have a letter addressed to the Premier, dated October 31st, I think it is, to which this letter was from the spouses of the employees, Mr. Speaker, as yet, all they have gotten is an acknowledgement from the Premier's special assistant that he has received the letter and he would refer it to the Minister of Finance.

The Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, for his part has failed to respond to the people at all. They have been unable, at least up until late yesterday, I understand that the spouses are a delegation from the spouses group which was meeting with the Minister of Finance late yesterday afternoon. I have no knowledge of the outcome of that particular meeting.

Up until that time they were unable to get any kind of a response from the Minister of Finance. Now, Mr. Speaker, the thing we really have to look at here is the economics of this move. The Minister of Finance indicated he would save \$50,000 by such a move. I would point out that the average cost of relocation -

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

The hon. Member's time is up.

Mr. Windsor: By leave? Could I just have another moment to -

Mr. Speaker: By leave.

Mr. Windsor: Thank you, and I thank the hon. gentleman opposite and the hon. lady.

Relocation, Mr. Speaker, generally costs on an average \$8,000 per family when people are forced to relocate. If sixteen families are relocated, you are looking at \$128,000 just in relocation expenses. Add to that the fact that the lease on the building which is now being occupied by that division does not expire until December of 1992, and of course other space will be required here, the suggestion is made that there would be no jobs lost. I would question that, as I understand it, vacant positions in St. John's and Grand Falls will be filled by these people and those jobs therefore will not be filled so positions are in fact being terminated. So there are in fact sixteen positions being eliminated by this move.

The Minister tries to tell us that money will be saved in travelling. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely untrue. The Minister stood in this House, and one of the most ridiculous statements I have ever heard in this House, and he said, well, it will be more effective because they will be leaving St. John's or Grand Falls and they will be driving out and they will stay overnight and they will get a full day's work instead of driving for two or three or four hours, getting an hour or so of work done and driving back again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have it on good information from those people involved that that is not the case in fact, that those people will now have to leave St. John's and

drive to, for example, Marystown, no different than driving from Clareville except it is about two hours longer and they will still have to stay overnight.

The fact is that in many cases they simply gather the material and bring it back to their office to do the proper auditing of that work. And so there will be absolutely no gain, in fact, what you are doing is losing a lot of time, whereas, now they are operating out of Clareville and they can go to Shoal Harbour or up to Trinity or Bonavista in less than an hour, now they will take three to four hours to do the same thing and will be required to stay overnight, so productivity, Mr. Speaker, will be greatly diminished; greatly diminished and in fact the work of the sixteen auditors or sixteen employees cannot be done from St. John's or Grand Falls in the same manner it is being done from Clareville.

As the petition points out, one-fifth of the population of the Province is served by this office, a huge area of the Province, being right from Bonavista to Fortune and St. Lawrence; a tremendous area, a lot of businesses as witnessed by the Chamber of Commerce and they are concerned that they no longer have an office in Clareville to which they can go for advice. Everybody looks at taxation offices and say, well you will be glad they are not going to be around as much - that is not true.

The fact of the matter is, and I experienced in the Department of Finance, Mr. Speaker, most people in the Province do not have a problem with paying taxes, what they have a problem with is people who avoid paying taxes for which

they are obligated to pay. Most businesses, business people, business persons and individuals, I would suggest, would prefer to see everybody pay their fair share and they like to know that the taxation division is able to do a good job and are there, not only to ensure the taxes are collected but to give them advice when requested.

Mr. Speaker, I realize I have gone well over time. I thank hon. people opposite for that opportunity and I ask the Minister of Finance, seriously not only is it unfortunate I do not have time to get into Motor Registration, that is a service also that has been very valuable to that area, of tremendous benefit to people from that whole eastern area of the Province, to be able to go to Clareville and to deal with a Motor Registration office, instead of having to deal with St. John's or Grand Falls.

So I ask the Government to reconsider these moves, particularly in view of the fact that there is no saving of dollars here, in fact it will cost far more to operate out of Clareville and they will need additional staff to do the same amount of work, and the other alternative is that, if they do not put in additional staff, there is going to be a lot of tax revenues which will be lost.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Government to urgently and seriously reconsider this move which I think is a retrograde step indeed. Thank you.

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

Mr. Parsons: Thank you very much,

Mr. Speaker. I would like at this time to support my colleague for Mount Pearl in the presentation of those petitions. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, when I was up and having a few words to the changes in the Highway Traffic Act I then said I wonder how much of a saving the Government is talking about. And I know that times are tight, and they are talking about saving x number of dollars. But in a place the size of Clarenville and the surrounding area, I wonder is Government doing the right thing. And I think there are a lot of people on both sides of the House who have some queries and some misgivings as it pertains to moving those offices from those particular areas.

Mr. Speaker, you have a couple of thousand signators here, who believe - and I suppose because of their association, of their living in this particular area - I suppose they would have concerns in a private way. But, Mr. Speaker, it looks to me like there are many people out there who are saying, is this some kind of decentralization? But how would that be brought into its right perspective in the Clarenville area?

Mr. Speaker, again I know that the Government is trying to save dollars, but when you look at the transportation costs, and also the cost to individuals, Mr. Speaker, I wonder is there any credence really in this move? And I, like my colleague from Mount Pearl, wonder if the Government would not perhaps take a second look at these decisions and perhaps if they did take a second look, and perhaps if some of their economic, monetary advisors, and perhaps the Minister of Development could see again in his search for areas to

develop, to spend money in the right places, that perhaps he could not convince his colleagues. And also the hon. Minister of Social Services, who sort of has an association with the rural part of Newfoundland, indeed he represents a rural part of Newfoundland. And again, Mr. Speaker, I think that there should be input enough from people in Cabinet who can see this as a mistake.

We have seen offices closed now in Clarenville, in Wabush. There is another one closing besides that. And Mr. Speaker, the thing is when we take everything into consideration not only are we creating another problem as it pertains to unemployment, but we are taking away the lifestyles of those people who are involved. We are also taking away the privilege and the purpose of those establishments in the first place, to facilitate the need of the public in those particular areas.

Mr. Speaker, not enough can be said about changes like those, because I think sometimes, Mr. Speaker, they are just done in an ad hoc manner. A manner by which someone says, well, we are going to have to save so much money in a department and by hook or by crook that money has to be saved. And someone will just say, oh well, we will take a pencil, we will draw through this, we will close down this operation. But on numerous occasions, Mr. Speaker, and I think that history repeats itself, sometimes this is not the right way to go. More input should be ascertained or gained from people in the know and even from people in the area. If this operation was costing a mammoth amount to Government, and the services did not compare or did not add up to

the cost then, Mr. Speaker, I could see perhaps doing something.

But when you close out an office that services people, that gives people an opportunity to be served in their own backyard, and move them to St. John's or Grand Falls - fine for St. John's or Grand Falls - but the point remains, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Clarendville and the surrounding area, as far as I am concerned, do have a right to those services. I ask the Government, in the light of this petition, to reconsider their decision and reinstate it, leave the people be, because, Mr. Speaker, the people have spoken, they have signed this petition, nearly 3000 in both petitions, and I say again to the Government, reverse your decision. There are over 3000, altogether. Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility to our citizens out there, who have asked the Government to revert back and leave these offices open, because they believe there is no great amount of money being saved.

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

Orders of the Day

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

Mr. Baker: Order 5, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, that the House go into Committee of the Whole to debate a certain Bill, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Bill No. 10.

The hon. the President of Treasury

Board.

Mr. Baker: I just want to remind the House that we were discussing Bill 10 in the previous sitting. There were some amendments made, I do not know in writing, but they were made, and we all understood what they were. The first amendment was in Section 1 Subsection (4) under (b) and (c), and it involves separating out day care from homemaker services, and in two instances adding homemaker services as a separate sub-subsection under Subsection 4. That was the first amendment. The second amendment had to do with Section 2, Subsection 5; and the amendment was that we change three years from two years. I just want to make it clear to everybody what the amendments were, and I think the Minister will address both of them.

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

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I discussed further last evening, and this morning, with the executive and the people in day care and homemaker services, the two particular amendments of the hon. Member for Humber East. The first one in changing the amendment to the organization's day care and, the second, going further, and not having day care and/or homemaker services, we have no problems with that. The hon. Member should recognize we have already established a number of people on the boards, nine and one discretionary ten, so we are going to have to go back and change that now to having representation from day care and representation from the homemaker association, and eliminate the discretionary

individual. We were intending to appoint just one person from either home. I also talked to the Legislative Council and this is what they informed me, so we would have to go back and change that particular part of the legislation. We have no problems because the board represents both organizations. I am agreeable. I talked to the Director of Day Care, and I talked to the executive level of the Department and we have no major problems with that. It is just a formality and we thought it was better to do that instead of having too many people on the board, but we are satisfied to go back. As far as reducing the number of years from three back to two, the number of years in the licensing process, the reasons the hon. Member gave for that, we do not agree with. I understand her concerns, the genuine concerns, and so do we as a Department. The fact that the day care centres and the homemaker services, especially the day care centres, are being managed and living up to the standards and practices that they should, because they are providing a service to children, and if we do not force them and put the rules and regulations in place then they will not and we cannot have any children out there suffering. Nobody is going to disagree with that, but that depends on the number of inspections that are done by the Department of Social Services and the Day Care Program. I agree that in the past there were not enough inspections done and I have had continuous meetings with the Day Care and Homemakers Association, and the people involved directly with day care service, and that is another reason why we have put a person from day care and a person from the community, a parent of the

children, on the board so that there will be a good wide representation of the people on the board to address any concerns. The mandate of the Department is to improve the number of inspections, and whether the license is issued for a six month period, or a five or six year period, that is not going to improve the standard of the inspections because if a person is not following the standards and the rules set down by the Department of Social Services you can revoke the license at any time, on a given notice, so there is no argument there saying the number of years will improve on the quality of service. The position the Department has taken, and the reason why we have done it, is because it is administratively a nightmare having a large number of centres set up. We have in excess of 3124 spaces. I just forget the number of centres, but it is approximately 121, and to renew the licenses administratively has been causing a problem in the licenses being done on time, so we thought, and we believe, that this will not affect the standard and that is the reason why we brought it in. I would like the hon. Member for Humber East to consider and accept what we are saying, that the inspections have been, and will be even improved further, and more inspections will be done to make sure that we have quality day care service, and all centres are living up to standard.

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

Ms Verge: I would like to speak to this briefly. The Day Care Advocates, a provincial organization, and the Corner Brook Citizens Child Care Committee,

both groups representing day care consumers and parents, made strong representations to the Social Legislation Review Committee that three years is too long a period between licensing board reviews of day care centres licences. The Minister has acknowledged, as did his Director of Day Care and Homemaker Services, when she answered questions posed by the Review Committee members, that Department staff have not been doing the required annual inspections as thoroughly or as well as they should, and that is for two reasons. Number one, the Department has been short-staffed, and, number two, many of the personnel assigned to inspecting day care centres throughout the Province are not properly trained for that purpose. Now, the Minister's Director said that to our Committee, and what I would urge the Government to do is accept the compromise recommended by the parent groups, of moving from one year reviews by the licensing board to two year reviews, and then after the Minister's good intentions of improving the annual inspections have actually been realized, then come back to the House and amend the Act to lengthen the span of board reviews up to three years. Let us not take any chances with the safety and the lives of little children in the meantime. The Minister is all too aware of what can go wrong if custodians of children are not doing their work properly, so let us not take any chances. It is not a big concession for the Minister to make, yet it is one that was fervently recommended by the two leading day care consumer groups in the Province. If the Minister has any questions about that, he can ask the Member for Carbonear who Chairs the Social Legislation

Review Committee.

In conclusion, Chairperson, not only was two years recommended by the citizens advocacy groups who appeared before the Review Committee, but it was also agreed to unanimously by the Review Committee by the three Government members on the Committee: the Chairperson, the Member for Carbonear, the Member for St. George's, and the Member for Harbour Grace along with two on this side of the House.

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

Mr. Efford: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I could understand or be convinced that reverting from three years to two or to one would improve the safety and the standards of any day care center, I would have no hesitation in doing it whatsoever. The safety and the standards of the centres depends on the Department of Social Service's ability to do regular inspections.

I have a driver's licence, and I believe my driver's licence is for three years; I am not quite sure, but I believe it is for a three year period. Now that is just an administrative function, instead of issuing a licence each year, they are issued every three years. If I commit an offense or break a rule or law, especially now that the demerit point system is in place, my licence can be revoked instantly. This is the same in any day care centre. If any of the centres are not living up to standard by the regulation put down by the director of day care, the Department of Social Services, we would revoke the licence immediately. We have done that, and we will continue to do

that. It has nothing to do with the ability of carrying out the inspections and the standard. We must improve the number of inspections. Yes, agreed. But whether the licence is issued for one, two or three years has absolutely nothing to do with it. My position on that is very, very clear and I do not know what else I can say to convince the Member. There is no reason to change the number of years, but improve the standards and everything will be according to the safety of the children in those centres.

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

Ms Verge: A final comment. I say to the Minister: improve your inspections first and then come to the House and get us to increase the span between board renewals to three years. The board does not routinely renew licences, the board scrutinizes the centre and does a thorough assessment of the centres' care of the children in its charge. And the Minister responsible for the Status of Women may understand this better than the Minister for Social Services, but please improve the annual inspections first. I mean the Minister has a knowledge that they are not up to scratch. That is what the consumer groups told us, and the Minister's director confirmed it when she testified before our Committee. Improve the inspections both the quantity and the quality first before lengthening the period before board renewals as much as three years. The consumer groups and the Opposition are agreeing to a two year period up from a one year period, but lets leave it at two years, that is a compromise, and wait until the department inspections are improved before

lengthening it all the way to three years.

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

Mr. Baker: Just for a few minutes, Mr. Chairman. I had a nice conversation with the Member for Humber East yesterday after the House closed, and she pointed out all her concerns to me and she obviously has a point in terms of what she is concerned about. Since that conversation I have checked with the Minister and through him with the people in his Department about those particular concerns. And we understand that she is concerned about the quality of these centres and maintaining the quality, and insuring that things are done in the best possible way. And we are in total agreement on that.

I accept the Minister's position myself that that is a major concern but should you use the time limits on the permit to then force proper inspection. That they are two separate problems: one is a renewal period or whatever you want to call it that is purely routine, the other is the inspection process which he assures me he is going to be particularly vigilant about and going to make sure is done properly.

So my understanding is, that if that happens, then we will absolutely guarantee that these centres are up to scratch. And he has assured me that this will be done. And I do not know how I can change the Member from Humber East's mind or anything else, but he assures me that the one routine matter should not interfere with the normal inspection and one should not control the other, and

that the inspections will be done properly and regularly and if any centres are not performing properly then they are going to be closed down bang! immediately. And I believe it.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, just a final comment. We have made our case, we have presented our argument. The Member for Humber East I think has put forth her argument very strongly and strenuously but there is not much to be gained by arguing back and forth about it. The Minister is obviously going to be bullish on this and he is not going to accept the change so all we can do I guess is deal with it and decide what the House decides, and hope that there are no incidents that occur as described by the Member for Humber East, that we do not have to face that problem. I hope it does not come back to haunt the Minister, I guess that is the best way to put it.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Day Care And Homemaker Services Act, 1975," (Bill No. 10).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill with amendment, carried.

Mr. Baker: Order six, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order 6, Bill No. 35.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act." (Bill No. 35).

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

Mr. Baker: Order 7, Mr. Chairman.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act, 1972". (Bill No. 49).

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to Bill No. 49. It is caused by the fact that the bill has been printed and on the Order Paper for a while and we are now just getting around to it, so there is a date that has to be changed.

In clause 14 subsection (2) of the bill - it is taking me a second to find it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Simms: January 1 from July 1, right?

Mr. Baker: Yes. It is amended by striking out the date "July 1" -

Mr. Simms: Right on the back, right on the back. The very back.

Mr. Baker: Striking out the date "July 1, 1990" and by substituting the date "January 1, 1991". So it just provides a new commencement date for the regulation.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we will move amendments I guess without waiting until he gets to the appropriate clause. That is an accepted practice I guess, is it? Like that was an amendment to clause 14, you only called clause 1 was it?

An Hon. Member: I guess if I (Inaudible).

Mr. Baker: He did not call either clause.

Mr. Simms: So we will agree to do any amendments -

Mr. Baker: Sure, let's have them up front, yes.

Mr. Simms: - and then they will put them in the appropriate place for the Chair to call.

Mr. Simms: So that being agreed upon, I would like to move an amendment as well. And the amendment is to clause 12. And we recommend that clause 12 be amended by deleting 39 (1) (a), or 39 (a) I guess more appropriately. Okay? Which now says, just for clarification, that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make regulations to a whole range of things. That (a) is regulation prescribing fees to be collected by the Registrar and paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

The Government House Leader sees that? What I am saying? We want to delete (a). In other words the Cabinet will not have the authority to prescribe fees. We are recommending that it will be done as it is now done, I think, through the House of Assembly, and obviously re-lettering the remaining clauses accordingly.

Anyway, you will understand what the amendment is, delete (a). I presume if we delete it from here there must be somewhere where it provides for it to come to the House of Assembly. To make our point - and maybe the Legislative Council can properly word it for us if we do not know what we are talking about here, but in essence these fees in particular, are a tax, indeed a sizeable revenue - the Minister of Finance will confirm - comes from the fees collected from the Registrar's

Office. Last year I think the revenue according to the budget was somewhere in the area of seven odd million dollars. This year in his estimates I think he is estimating \$10.6 million. Which is a sizeable revenue income for the Government and for the Department of Finance.

And I think under the present Act - we have a copy of it but I have not had a chance to check it out - but I think presently the fees are prescribed in the bill, in the legislation. The Clerk can nod or shake her head maybe. Fees presently I think are covered by the existing legislation. So therefore the House of Assembly has to pass it. And what we are saying is that that should remain the same, because obviously if it is such a sizeable revenue getter for the Province then the House of Assembly should have some say in what those fee increases might be, rather than have the Cabinet simply make the decision on what the fee increases might be, or the tax increases as we might refer to them.

So I move that amendment. Decide on it when we get to it.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. Simms: Which one are you talking about?

Mr. Chairman: That is the amendment made by the Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Simms: My amendment?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Simms: Clause 12?

On motion, Clause 14 (2) as

amended, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act." (Bill No. 49).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill with amendment, carried.

Mr. Baker: Order Number 8, Mr. Chairman.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Child Welfare Act". (Bill No. 51).

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

Mr. Baker: Order 9, Mr. Chairman.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Urban And Rural Planning Act". (Bill No. 9).

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

Mr. Baker: Order 10, Mr. Chairman.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Fish Inspection Act." (Bill No. 18).

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

Mr. Baker: Order 11, Mr. Chairman.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Freedom Of Information Act". (Bill No.6).

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

Mr. Simms: I am not sure if the Minister of Development is within hearing distance or listening distance, but I just want to put a quick question to him if he is

around. The Government House Leader can perhaps relay it or listen, or maybe he can respond or whatever.

You will recall that in second reading on this particular piece of legislation the Member for Burin - Placentia West raised the question of - he had no real difficulty I do not think with deleting Marystown Shipyard from freedom of information in a general way, having to disclose competitive bidding information or things of that nature, but I think he made an appeal to the Minister to consider somehow exempting from this new order information with respect to salaries, management salaries and so on, that somehow there could be a way found to say that this does not apply to salaries. I do not wish to repeat it. I am sure the Minister knows what I am talking about, does he?

The Member for Burin Placentia - West made the point in debate on second reading on this bill. He had no problem with deleting the competitive bidding information and that kind of thing, but he wondered if there might not be a way to allow, as happened once before I think, a request from unions - for example, management salaries, is there a way to delete or exempt that from this new order?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister of Development.

Mr. Furey: Well, I think we have to leave the bill intact to protect the integrity of the whole shipyard, but certainly as I mentioned to him, we would take any requests that came forward from unions or others and deal with them, each individual request on its merit. And if it does not affect the competitive position of

the yard, I certainly do not see any problem with releasing certain aspects of information.

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Simms: Just so we have it on record then, the Minister is saying - is he? - or I understand him to be saying that if, for example, there was a request from the union for information on management salaries as there was on a previous occasion, he would take that request under consideration and would deal with it the same as any other request for information that under normal circumstances would not be released, but he may still have the authority to release it, and if he does not think it would hurt the competitiveness, then he might be prepared to do that. Okay.

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

Mr. Baker: Order 12, Mr. Speaker.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Welfare Institutions Act". (Bill 20).

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

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, not particularly on this bill, but I will take advantage to ask the Government House Leader, since the clock is moving fairly rapidly and we have only four or five others there to deal with and we might be finished those within a reasonably short period of time and we may have a fair bit of time left on our hands this morning, has he given any consideration to what he

might do next? Or would he like to give some consideration and advise me, or discuss with me or something as soon as we can get a chance to get across and talk to each other, but we cannot seem to get that opportunity, because things are moving fairly quickly. You might want to think about it.

Mr. Baker: There are a number of things that could be done. My intention was to go back to second reading of Bill 38, Regional Services, that was already under discussion. But if you prefer, there are several other options we could have a little chat about behind the curtain, if you want to.

Mr. Simms: Well, Bill No. 38, I think he and I have already agreed that that would not be recalled until Monday, so I have advised our caucus of that. May I offer a suggestion to the Government House Leader? Because we have already advised our caucus of Monday, we are not sort of co-ordinated for that today, unfortunately. A lot of our members, by the way, are in their districts because of NTA functions last night, anniversary celebrations. Perhaps I could throw this out as a suggestion. The bill that was tabled this morning, the Loan Guarantee Bill, which is guarantees for municipalities and that kind of thing, if that is acceptable, our critic is quite acceptable to dealing with that for the rest of the morning, or however long he wants to take, when we get to that point.

Mr. Baker: That is no problem.

Mr. Simms: We have three or four more bills to finish off here, and we will probably be at that in ten or fifteen minutes.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Welfare Institutions Act." (Bill No. 20)

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

Mr. Baker: Order 13.

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Social Services". (Bill No. 4)

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

Mr. Baker: Order 14.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Health) Act". (Bill No. 19).

Mr. Simms: Mr. Chairman, just a brief comment for the Minister of Forestry. Perhaps he might be able to respond. In the debate on second reading on this bill I believe it was the Member for Torngat Mountains, if I remember, who offered a suggestion to him about including Labrador - was it? - in these exemptions. Has he had a chance to address that? Does he see any way to amend it? Is it a necessity, or what?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

Mr. Flight: Yes, Mr. Chairman, to the Member for Grand Falls and to the Member for Torngat Mountains, I raised the issue immediately with my officials and their position is that anything that applies under the legislation applies to Labrador, moving livestock or animals. Now one concern was raised, as the member knows, that when there was a

rabies scare here a year or two ago, it originated in Labrador, and I would reserve under the legislation the same right, that if officials who are in a position to advise me that there is a concern - well, it would apply anywhere - a concern with transferring rabies or any other disease that would threaten livestock, off the mainland as opposed to the Island, that the legislation would apply to Labrador, as it applies to Nova Scotia.

I think the member's concerns about inconvenience to his constituents in moving a pet, or that kind of thing, would be taken care of in that legislation to the same extent that it applies to Sydney, Nova Scotia.

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

Mr. Baker: Order 15.

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

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

Mr. Baker: Order 16.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Health Act". (Bill No. 45).

Mr. Simms: Is this Bill No. 45?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Simms: Do you have a copy of it there? May I just have a quick glance? I don't seem to have a copy on my desk. That is the one where we couldn't find copies or

something, was it not?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Simms: Yes, I understand that. But I remember the day it came up in second reading there were quite a few people who didn't seem to have a copy for some reason or other. I just want to have a quick glance at it before we continue. Oh, this is the fees one. This is the one the Minister of Health introduced, as I remember it now. And the Leader of the Opposition got up and said, 'Ah ha, trying to sneak this through by saying it is a minor bill.' Now, I recollect. I think the Leader of the Opposition pretty well expressed the views we share. I don't suppose my colleague, the Whip, the Member for Harbour Main, who has a fantastic memory, by the way, can recollect whether or not it was our intention to debate this at any great length in Committee of the Whole, or whether we had any amendments to propose or anything of that nature?

Mr. Doyle: No, I don't think so.

Mr. Simms: I think that particular afternoon I was busy slipping back and forth out of the House.

Okay. I am very hesitant to let this go without having a conversation with the Leader of the Opposition, but we will let it go. I suppose we can always hold it up in third reading if we intend to do anything like that.

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

Mr. Baker: Order 17.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act, 1988 (No. 2)". (Bill No. 65).

Mr. Simms: No, Mr. Chairman. Order 17 is the Highway Traffic Act, and that wasn't one of the groupings we dealt with, you will recall, by the dozen.

An Hon. Member: 17 is the one where you changed (inaudible) \$500 deduction (inaudible).

Mr. Baker: It is No. 18 you are talking about.

Mr. Simms: I thought he was trying to slip in Bill 48, there.

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

Mr. Baker: Shall we rise the Committee and report progress and then come back again?

Mr. Simms: Well, yes, why don't you rise the Committee, report progress on these and then come back to Committee.

Mr. Baker: That is what I was going to do.

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

Mr. Speaker: The hon. the Member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bills No. 35, 51, 9, 18, 6, 20, 4, 19, 29, 45 and 65 carried without amendments, and Bills No. 10 and 49 with amendments and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, amendments ordered read a first and second time, Committee ordered to sit again, presently.

On motion, amendments read a first and second time.

On motion, bills ordered read a third time, on tomorrow.

Mr. Baker: Motion 4, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain resolution, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Bill No. 70.

Resolution

That it is expedient to bring in a measure further to amend The Local Guarantee Act, 1957, to provide for the guarantee of the repayment of loans made to, and the advance of loans to certain Local Authorities.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

Dr. Kitchen: Mr. Chairman, what we have here is an amendment to The Local Authority Guarantee Act, and what we are doing is adding certain items to the schedule to provide for the lending of money to various community councils as listed in the schedule. That's about what it is, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. the Member for Mount Pearl.

Mr. Windsor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal that can be said under the heading of this particular piece of legislation, a great deal that can be said about the bill itself and the guarantees that are in it. I will get to that, in due course, in this debate.

First of all, I want to deal with an issue that is more topical, Mr. Chairman, one that I think deserves debate in this House of Assembly, and that is the incredible audacity of the City Council of St. John's. Mr. Chairman, if you read the paper of last night - and I will refer to this regularly throughout my few remarks - the headline is: 'St. John's Council takes aim at the Southlands Development'. The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs stood in his place here on Monday, I think it was - I was absent on business on Monday - and made a statement announcing the development of a further 3,000 acres of land to the west of Mount Pearl -

Mr. Furey: A good announcement.

Mr. Windsor: - 60 per cent of it within Mount Pearl, 40 per cent outside. The Minister of Development is correct, it was a good announcement. I mentioned to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, by the way, that he perhaps was ill-advised in making that announcement, simply because he has now told the market that Housing Corporation is going to have this great development. It is nothing new; developers have known this for a long period of time. The City Council says this was all secret and hushed up and rushed through. What absolute garbage, Mr. Chairman! The

Southlands Development has been on the drawing board since 1970, when the Mount Pearl-Newtown development scheme plans were first adopted by the Town of Mount Pearl at the time, and by the St. John's Metropolitan Area Board. It is part of the regional plan that was adopted in 1973 by all municipalities in this area, and if the City of St. John's didn't know about it, it is because of their own absolute incompetence and inability to follow what is going on in the region.

Now they have to get off their seats and find out what is going on. What really upsets me, Mr. Chairman, are the comments by the Mayor and some of the councillors. How could the Minister of Municipal Affairs do this sort of thing without consulting with the City of St. John's? It is none of their business! It is none of their business what goes on in Mount Pearl! Who do they think they are, that they have to be consulted by the Minister of Municipal Affairs before he approves a development in Mount Pearl or anywhere else in this Province?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Windsor: Who do they think they are? This is what we are talking about, amalgamating that kind of a mentality. It is being considered that that council would head up a super city in this area. God help us, Mr. Chairman, if that kind of parochialism is allowed to control this whole area. Now, Mr. Chairman, for them to say that they didn't know what was going on is an admission of their own incompetence.

Let me deal with some of the quotes that are here. 'This is

being planned in a vacuum.' Mr. Chairman! And, former Mayor Wyatt makes a comment here. 'All of this was kept so secret,' Mrs. Wyatt said. Mr. Chairman, I sat around the table in 1973 when she was the Mayor, when the original plan was adopted. She was there. The City Council of St. John's have approved the regional plan, and this is all part of it. It is the next phase of the Mount Pearl development. That is all it is. Does the City of St. John's think that the communities of Mount Pearl, or Port aux Basques, or Grand Falls, or Gander should be consulted before the next phase of Cowan Heights is approved? What garbage, Mr. Chairman! What absolute garbage. I have never heard of such foolishness. What we are seeing here, Mr. Chairman, is what has been coming out of City Hall for a number of years, the parochialism, and aided and abetted - I hope they are up there in the press gallery somewhere - by the Evening Telegram, if one reads this editorial, the most biased, stupid editorial I have ever read, that was in the paper last night.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Good. It pointed out for example that in 1989 municipal grants paid to St. John's amounted to only \$142 per capita, while areas outside the city received an average of \$261. 'If the city was treated fairly', they say. 'Why is the city not treated fairly?' I mean, they do not even know what is in The Municipal Grants Act, where all municipalities are treated fairly, certainly municipalities that do not have the ability to pay. The cost of providing water and sewer services, that is what this bill is all about, Bill 70. These are

guarantees for the cost of building water and sewer systems in the Province, to municipalities all around this Province.

The city of St. John's gets the same kind of assistance from Government, none, to build water and sewer systems, unless you do not have the ability to pay. There are areas in this Province where it costs \$100,000 per unit to supply water and sewer services. Those municipalities could never hope to pay for that, and so The Grants Act guarantees that anything over 20 per cent of the gross revenue of the municipality will be subsidized; they will pay up to 20 per cent of their gross revenue towards their long-term debt on water and sewer, and anything above that is being subsidized by the Province. It applies to every municipality in the Province. There the city of St. John's may not get as much. Neither does Mount Pearl.

Not one cent has Mount Pearl ever gotten to build a water and sewer system. Let me correct myself - \$49,000 they had by former Premier Smallwood as a subsidy on the initial installation of water and sewer systems in Mount Pearl.

Mr. Chairman, I can tell you a lot more has gone into the city of St. John's. And a statement such as - where is this, now? Oh, 'The work force from outside will contribute precious little towards the upkeep and renewal of its various services which they enjoy the use of.' What it means according to City Hall's forecast is that in future, unless important changes are made, there will be even more people using the city services but not paying for them. Both businesses and residents of the city will have to pay higher taxes

to support regional services.'

Mr. Chairman, they have no concept of what is going on in the city now, or of regional services, or of the concept of regional government that was talked about for many, many years. I think the Minister is talking now about a regional government or regional services board, whatever it is going to be called, whatever the decision will be. I pray to God this Government does not decide to go with an expanded city. That would be the end of the region, Mr. Chairman, I say to you.

But regional services is what we have now, and the city of St. John's does not pay for them any more than anybody else pays for them, they are charged on a per capita basis. They do not say that the Province built the regional water and sewer system. The Province built it, at no cost to the city. The City of St. John's, Mr. Chairman, has really gotten the benefit there that no other municipalities get, except the larger urban areas have had some help with trunk sewers and treatment systems. The City of St. John's needs one, but they are too stunned to realize it.

An Hon. Member: What?

Mr. Windsor: They are too stunned to realize they need a treatment system. They are talking about all this sewage that will go into their harbour. Since when did the city council own the harbour? I mean, does the hon. Minister of Labour feel that Conception Bay South owns Conception Bay? Of course not. Does the Member for Exploits think that Grand Falls owns the Exploits river? What foolishness - what foolishness, Mr. Chairman. What parochialism.

That is what you seeing here. It is that kind of an attitude, Mr. Chairman, that I say is holding back the City of St. John's.

The City Council, by these types of statements, show themselves to be far lower in quality than many other councils in this Province, who are forward thinking, who are progressive, small 'p', progressive thinking, looking toward the future. These kinds of statements from City Fathers, Mr. Chairman, will chase development and investors away from the city.

They could compare their performance with the performance of the city council of Mount Pearl - you would see a great difference, I say to you - and many other councils in this Province who have done a good job of developing their communities.

Mr. Chairman, let us have a look. There was no discussion of the potential seriousness of this at all. What seriousness, Mr. Chairman? Because some homes are going to be built in Mount Pearl, because Mount Pearl is going to grow? Poor St. John's. Did the Minister think about the seriousness of building 3,000 or 4,000 houses in Cowan Heights?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Exactly. Residents of St. John's will once again find themselves paying taxes for services such as roads, water, recreation, and waste disposal that will be used by people living in outside areas, Ms Duff says. Do these people realize that the tens of thousands of people who come into this city on a regular basis to work, and to spend money in their shopping areas, make a tremendous contribution to the

city of St. John's? If they knew what they were talking about, Mr. Speaker, they would be welcoming everybody with open arms, saying, come into St John's and spend your money. For years I have heard this nonsense about Mount Pearl, you have the plumb, you have Donovan's Industrial Park, you stole that away from the City of St. John's. Garbage, Mr. Speaker, absolute garbage, I say to the Member for St. John's South who does not know what he is talking about anyway. Donovan's Industrial Park has since 1970 been planned to be the industrial pace for the expanded Mount Pearl.

An Hon. Member: This building should be in Mount Pearl, too.

Mr. Windsor: Yes, it would make a lot more sense than up here on this windy hill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Windsor: There is the attitude, Mr. Speaker, the same attitude we heard from the Minister of Health when the board of the Grace General Hospital came and said, we would like to look at our options, and one of the options that makes sense is to build a new hospital somewhere and the logical place might be in the west end area, probably in Mount Pearl, because of accessibility to the rest of the Avalon Peninsula which it serves on a regional basis. They closed the door on him, Mr. Speaker, and would not even talk to him, would not even consider it. Mr. Speaker, if that council were doing their job and properly representing the people of the city, properly representing the Province as the people that govern our capital city, of which we should be proud, they should be trying to attract more people to

the city. I talked about Donovan's Industrial Park, this great plumb that is suppose to make Mount Pearl so rich because it was stolen from St. Johns, which is nonsense. The Village Mall, Mr. Speaker, produces more revenue for the city of St. John's than all the businesses in Donovan's Industrial Park generate for Mount Pearl. Now, who shops in the Village Mall? I can call them all by name. I can go in there on Saturday and call them all by name, and Your Honour will be there amongst them, no doubt. As a good resident of Mount Pearl he spends his money in the Village Mall. That will change when we get Pearl Gate built, I accept that, and so we should because we have a city now of almost 25,000 people. We have not got a fire department yet. I might as well mention that one. We got a bill yesterday for \$1.9 million for fire protection. It has gone up by another \$115,000, and you talk about taxation without representation. Did the city council in Mount Pearl have anything to say about that? Do they have anything to say about the running of the fire department? Do they have anything to say about negotiations with the fire fighters? No, Mr. Speaker. They have \$3 million worth of fire hall and fire equipment in there sitting on the ground for eighteen months and not a man in the building, thanks to this Government, unfortunately, thank to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who refuses to make a decision, refuses to allow the city of Mount Pearl to carry out the responsibility they have under the City Of Mount Pearl Act which is to provide fire service in their city. There are 209 fire departments in this Province and the second largest city, because

it is larger now than Corner Brook, the second largest city is not allowed to provide its own fire department. Now, where is the justice in that, Mr. Speaker? Over \$500,000 a year more the city of Mount Pearl is being forced to pay to support the St. John's fire department than it would cost them to run their own fire department, have their own fire station in the heart of town, and a far superior service than they now have. The Fire Commissioner said that the city of Mount Pearl is not now adequately - there is protection and you cannot say there is not, but knowledgeable people have said we must have a new fire department. Nobody questions that and yet it is sitting there costing something like \$300,000 a year in interest. \$300,000 a year in interest on the money that Mount Pearl borrowed without a cent of provincial input. Every other community in this Province gets seventy-five per cent of the cost of their fire trucks; straightforward, no question about it. It is just a matter of who comes up the top of the list each year. The Minister throws, I think it is \$375,000 in the Budget this year for fire fighting equipment, 75/25 basis with any municipality. Mount Pearl has not been given one cent, not one cent for fire fighting equipment, and they are sitting there and not even allowed to open the station. Instead of that, with all that equipment there for the fire hall, state of the art fire trucks - better than anything in the city of St. John's - 840 gallon per minute pumpers or something, two of them.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Because the Minister of Municipal and Provincial

Affairs will not allow them to open it.

An Hon. Member: Why?

Mr. Windsor: Because he wants to look at his regional system. We have no quarrel with that, but make a decision, for God's sake. The fire commissioner has recommend against it. Of course he has. The fire commissioner says that the regional system is not necessarily the best for this area. And the fire commissioner feels that Mount Pearl should run its own fire department, and still the Minister will not make a decision.

The city of Mount Pearl has a five year contract with its union to provide fire fighting services. A far more favorable contract, I might say, than we have with the St. John's fire department. It is a far more favorable contract, none of your three days on and one day off or whatever the shift system is there, twenty-four hour shifts, none of that. A good shift system which is now being used widely across Canada.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Oh, because poor St. John's sees Mount Pearl getting ahead of them again. That is why the city is so upset.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Of course they approve it, it is all part of the regional plan. They just do not like to see somebody else moving ahead. They did not say a word when Cowan Heights did, nothing about all the developments in the east end.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Murphy: I have not heard a peep out of you since the dockyard issue was on the go. Lets hear about the one hundred and odd people, residents of Mount Pearl, who were working in the dockyard. Lets hear you talk about supporting them.

Mr. Windsor: I have no problem supporting them.

An Hon. Member: The Provincial Government had to bail out the dockyard a few years ago.

Mr. Windsor: That is right. The Provincial Government bailed out the dockyard a couple of years ago. We put the synchrolift in there, and I was there for the official opening as Minister of Development at the time, who funded the dockyard.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Maybe it is going on the private block. What do you have against private investment? Nothing. What the member should be concerned about is the futures of the people who are working there. I assure the hon. member that I will support any effort that he makes, and I hope that he will support me to assist those people who are working there. And I say to the hon. member my information is that the future of the dockyard should be bright. It may be privatized, it may no longer be a Crown Corporation and that may result in millions of dollars of investment going into the dockyard and a tremendous expansion in the work available to the dockyard and in the types of work that they are going to be doing. The Minister of Development may well know more about some of the foreign investors who are interested in

that dockyard. I will say to the hon. Member for St. John's South: it may be, I reserve judgement, but it may well be the best thing that ever happened to the dockyard, and you may see twice the work force down there two year from now than you see now.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Maybe so. We have to look at that. We have to look at that anytime there is a proposal. But lets not get scared away because somebody said we are going to privatize something. I have seen many things that have been privatized that have faired very well afterward. I will give you an example, the paper mill in Stevensville, which the previous administration had to take over because it went bankrupt. And rather than let it die -

An Hon. Member: That is a poor comparison.

Mr. Windsor: It is a good comparison. The previous administration took it over - Federal-Provincial Governments of the day - I remember the day, the 28th of December, I believe it was. Halfway between Christmas and New Years that I went to Stevensville with the former Premier and with Mr. Jamieson, who was the Minister of International Affairs, I think, at the time. I do not recall exactly what he was.

An Hon. Member: External Affairs.

Mr. Windsor: External Affairs is the term, thank you. He was there and we made the great announcement that it had been sole to Abitibi and that millions of dollars were going to be invested in that paper mill; and it is now one of the best paper mills in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, let me get back to what I am talking about here, although this is interesting debate. Mr. Speaker, it is a concern that we have to see, both from the editor of the Evening Telegram and from the city counsellors, this attitude that if it is not done in St. John's, if anybody outside grows at all, there is something wrong with them.

If Conception Bay South flourishes, improves themselves, develops their community, strenghtens their tax base, provides a better standard of services for the residents, is there something wrong with that? The attitude that the city of St. John's must be consulted about anything that goes on in the region. Obviously major things, Mr. Chairman, are of interest to everybody in the region. Obviously they should not be done in isolation, without due consideration. But what is this great thing that they are talking about? This potential seriousness of all this, it says here in the paper. Potential seriousness of what? Building some more houses? In Mount Pearl?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Pardon?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Of prosperity. Yes. They hate to think that Mount Pearl will grow any more. The fact is they are jealous, Mr. Chairman, that the city of Mount Pearl has grown so well, that it is such an orderly development, and that they are doing a far superior job of providing services for the residents of Mount Pearl than the city council is to the people of St. John's.

And that is true, and the hon. gentleman opposite will not argue with me on that.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: I am talking about normal services like snow clearing in the morning.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: A narrow Street. The Prince Philip Parkway is hardly a narrow street, nor is the crosstown arterial. I am talking about St. John's, not about Mount Pearl. Have a look at Billard Avenue in Mount Pearl. Sixteen feet wide. Is that a wide street? But the snow is cleared off it long before streets in St. John's. All you have to do is listen to the radio in the morning, listen to the road reports, these roving reporters, I will not use any names, you all know who I am talking about. And you hear her on the radio saying: slippery conditions in the backstreets in St. John's, Mount Pearl is nice and clear, roads salted. But once you get into St. John's you have a problem. The harbour arterial is good, the Department of Highways have done their job in as far as Kilbride, and after that the city takes over.

I mean, Mr. Chairman, there is what is happening. Is that we have a jealousy building up here that things are happening outside the city, and that the world can carry on very nicely outside of the city of St. John's. Without the city fathers.

An Hon. Member: The oldest city in North America.

Mr. Windsor: The oldest city in North America, right. And they

should have the more mature council, the better ability to deal with these issues. They should have a broader view, Mr. Chairman, of what is going on in the region, and what their role is. Not only in the region but in the whole Province. It is our capital city, Mr. Chairman, they have a responsibility to the whole Province.

Some Hon. Members: Do you want to move the Capitol to Mount Pearl?

Mr. Windsor: Move the Capital to Mount Pearl? Why not? It is incredible, Mr. Chairman. Any time that Mount Pearl does something the city of St. John's or somebody in St. John's has got to object to it. And remember the great fight we had because Government made a decision, for no other reason than it made sense, to put the Motor Registration building in Mount Pearl.

An Hon. Member: That was a good move.

Mr. Windsor: A good move.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: It may not be good for the hon. Member for St. John's but the people of Conception Bay, who have to travel in to do business, are quite happy that they only have to come in there. The people who are coming in in their transport trucks who want to be tested are glad they do not have to haul transport trucks through the city streets.

That is why it was built out there. Because we have the testing track there. State-of-the-art, the best in Canada for driver testing and safety and training. Motorcycle

training course built into it.

An Hon. Member: The Minister of Social Services even agrees with it.

Mr. Windsor: Of course he has to agree with it. And what is wrong, Mr. Chairman, in having a Provincial building in Mount Pearl?

Some Hon. Members: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: If it had received tax revenues from provincially-owned properties, all of which must be served with major street networks, water and sewerage and public transportation it would have been an additional \$18 million to the good, I say to the city of St. John's, Mr. Speaker. If they do not want all these provincial buildings bring them all into Mount Pearl now. We will take every one of them and the 10,000 jobs that they represent in the city of St. John's, paid for by the taxpayers of the Province. There are a few in Gander, a few in Grand Falls, a few in Corner Brook, and none left in Clarenville because we cleaned those out in the last couple of weeks. I will not get into that again now. We will take all the provincial jobs you can send out to Mount Pearl, I say to you. And I say to the hon. President of Treasury Board that Gander would love to have them, too. Oh, the hon. gentleman would jump up and down if he could stand here in his place in the House and announce that Confederation Building or a new Confederation Building is going to be constructed in Gander. It would make a lot more sense, too, because it is central in the Province, because it serves all of the Province and not just the parochial people from St. John's, like the Member for St.

John's South. It would make a lot more sense to serve the Province from Central Newfoundland, and if it were economically practical to do it now I would support it, but obviously you are not going to do that in this day and age. Mr. Speaker, the cost of provincially owned properties, the Evening Telegram obviously does not know that the Province pays for services rendered. It buys its water and sewer services the same as every other municipality. To listen to city council you would think they were doing neighboring municipalities a favor.

Mr. Murphy: We are.

Mr. Windsor: What are you doing for them?

Mr. Murphy: All kinds of things.

Mr. Windsor: Like what? Name one.

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible) here -

Mr. Windsor: You will not be here very long because there is not one you can name.

An Hon. Member: They gladly take our money.

Mr. Windsor: They gladly take our money, the hon. Member for Placentia is correct.

Mr. Murphy: Where would you get your water?

Mr. Windsor: We would get it from Bay Bulls where we get it now, no thanks to the City of St. John's. The City of St. John's buys it from that same regional system after it comes through Mount Pearl.

Mr. Murphy: What would you do if you had a problem with it?

Mr. Windsor: With what, with water?

Mr. Murphy: If you had a problem at Bay Bull Big Pond with water where would you go, to St. John's?

Mr. Windsor: Where would you go? Here is an example if he wants to talk about water, Mr. Speaker. The Province wanted to take Windsor Lake over to upgrade it and to put proper treatment facilities out there, which it did not have a few years ago, and make it part of the regional system, but the city of St. John's said, that is ours, you cannot touch that. We will look after that ourselves. It has a far lower quality of water than comes from Bay Bulls. Bay Bulls has got the best water produced in North America, the most up-to-date treatment of ozonization, the first one ever built in North America, it is treated with ozon and it gives the best quality of water. I mentioned it briefly in the House the other day. At the trade show in Quebec a guy was trying to sell me spring water and I had to stop and tell him that we have the best spring water coming right out of our taps, and that he would not sell a bottle of it in St. John's because we have super water quality here. I forgot to mention it the other day, that when I went into that trade show I saw on the list of companies, Labrador. That caught my eye and I said, Labrador, what company is this, I must go see them. It was bottled water, Quebec bottled water, and the name of the company and the brand name of the water is Labrador. Everything on the bottle is in French and the people there could not speak to me in English, so I got no information from them. Labrador, bottled somewhere up in Northern Quebec,

apparently, or probably downtown Montreal. Labrador water a product of Quebec. It would turn your stomach, Mr. Speaker. I say to the hon. Member for St. John's South, Mr. Speaker, what services do we get from St. John's? Bus service. Yes, for which we pay the city of St. John's on an annual basis -

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: I am trying to make a point, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would muzzle himself long enough. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to make a point that the city of Mount Pearl subsidizes that bus service. They pay the city of St. John's to continue to provide that service and the people of Mount Pearl pay an extra, I think it is fifty cents, when you go into the city.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Mr. Speaker, the man is so stunned to even understand what I am saying to him. I did not say they should not, I am trying to point out to him - because he does not know - that they do pay for anything they receive, and we pay well for the garbage we dump in Robin Hood Bay, and so we should. Not as much as they are charging. And they forgot to charge us for the last four years; forgot to send us a bill. The City of Mount Pearl, though, were smart enough and responsible enough that they put the money in the bank anyway, and it was all sitting there.

An Hon. Member: do you hate the City of St. John's that much?

Mr. Windsor: I was born and raised in St. John's, I remind the hon. gentleman. I do not hate St.

John's, but I do not like the way it is being run and the incompetence that I am seeing at City Hall right now, I will tell you that.

Mr. Flight: Or your new council?

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) your colleague.

Mr. Windsor: And many of the new council. Yes, and my former colleague, who has made statements here as well. And I do not intend to support her comments on that, nor her view that the expanded city is the best for this region. And I will take her head on on that one when the time comes, Mr. Chairman, her and anybody else who wants to shove something down our throats.

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible) tar and feather (inaudible) St. John's the last election.

Mr. Simms: If you had something to do with tarring and feathering (inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: The paper says, 'St. John's residents will essentially pay a double tax by having to pay for Provincial input into the development and by paying higher taxes to provide service used by the whole capital city region', Mr. O'Neil said. Mr. O'Neil obviously does not know the first iota about development, the man who wanted to be mayor about ten years ago. He has been on council now - for what? - seventeen years or something. He obviously does not know how these things are financed. He obviously does not know that there is no difference about the financing package in Mount Pearl than there is in Cowan Heights, so he must be saying that the people of the Province are

subsidizing development in Cowan Heights, too.

The fact of the matter is, nobody is subsidizing it, Mr. Chairman. It is not true.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: It is not true, and the hon. speaker knows full well that when a building lot is bought and paid for, you are paying -

Mr. Flight: (Inaudible) a full hour (inaudible)?

Mr. Windsor: At least an hour, and I will be up again afterward. When a building lot is bought and paid for, Mr. Chairman, the full cost of development is recovered from the person who builds the house. And that is the way it should be. I wish every other municipality in the Province was doing the same thing - alright? The fact of the matter is, there are many developments in rural Newfoundland that are indeed subsidized by taxpayers. They are indeed subsidized. Because we are running water and sewer systems in rural areas, very expensive water and sewer systems in front of vacant land, providing serviced building lots, a real windfall for those property owners, and those municipalities are getting the subsidy over and above or about 20 per cent, and selling below true development costs.

But in St. John's and Mount Pearl, in Gander and in Corner Brook, the municipal areas where developments are being done by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation or by private developers, there is no subsidy, none whatsoever. I would say, too, that the City of Mount Pearl are doing a far better job than the City of St. John's as it

relates to providing recreation facilities. You look at the walkway systems, the parkland areas. The Minister of Environment will be proud, I am sure, of the way the streams in the Mount Pearl area are developed, and the Southlands is no different. South Brook runs through the Southlands, hence its name. A fine little brook, a lovely little river, full of trout, and it will be protected and developed, and will eventually, if the City of St. John's ever gets their act together, run right to Bowring Park. That river runs right into the Waterford River, runs down through Bowring Park. And it will be a fine linear park development.

And I am very proud of the role I played personally, with the Rotary Club of Waterford Valley, in developing the Waterford River linear park - a tremendous job being done. So where was the city of St. John's on that one? After they were beaten to death by Rotarians and by Mount Pearl city council, I managed to send a couple of trucks in to help. The City of Mount Pearl gives a grant every year to that project, to aid in the development of that park.

Mr. Chairman, I object strenuously to this whole attitude that the City of Mount Pearl gets anything for nothing, that they get any kind of special treatment. And I defy, I challenge any one opposite or anybody in City Hall to show me any kind of a special deal that Mount Pearl ever got, on anything.

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Would the buffoon from St. John's South, Mr. Chairman, like to come in and tell me something rather than standing

out in the corridor making snide remarks, contributing nothing to this debate in the House of Assembly?

Mr. Chairman, I want to complement the minister, in fact. The minister has done the right thing, which he had no choice but do of course, but his announcement was a good announcement. Unfortunately, as I started to say in my opening remarks - the Minister of Development will be interested - by making the announcement private developers are saying, 'Oh, oh, should we go ahead now if all this land is going to open up? All the announcement was well, we have our package together now and the city has adopted this plan. That is all he really said. There is nothing new in it, it is just the ongoing development of Mount Pearl.

An Hon. Member: Think of the work that is going to be created.

Mr. Windsor: The work that is going to be created? Oh, Mr. Chairman, it is incredible the number of jobs that are being created by this development. The importance of it in this region, both in the construction of the water and sewer systems and roads, and the construction of the houses, it is very labour intensive. Instead of the City of St. John's saying this is terrible, they could be saying, 'Great! Look at all the jobs that are going to be created.' The hon. the Member for Placentia would love to see that going down in Placentia. He may well see one. Maybe not 3,000, but I would suggest to him that he is going to see hundreds go down there when Hibernia gets moving. Argentia will play a major role in the Hibernia development I will predict, Mr. Chairman, and so will

St. John's; St. John's will feed off the rest of the Province, as they always have been doing.

An Hon. Member: Are you calling them parasites?

Mr. Windsor: I call nobody parasites. Everybody plays a real role. I appreciate what the hon. gentleman is saying. He is playing on words that have been quoted by others. I call nobody parasites. St. John's plays a role in the economic system of our Province, a real role, as does every other community. What is amazing is that the capital city, which should be so much more mature in its thinking than other municipalities in the Province, should be leading the way in forward thinking, has such a parochial attitude. Somebody even suggested one night that they were going to charge a fee every time somebody came to work in St. John's. I mean, what foolishness.

Mr. Chairman, we have to realize that this bill we are debating emphasizes what is happening in this Province as it relates to development. The cost of development in this Province is incredible today, particularly in rural Newfoundland. To that degree, some of these comments are accurate. The cost of providing services in rural Newfoundland is, in many cases, exorbitant, particularly on coastal Labrador; very, very expensive.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: There is no alternative, I say to the hon. Member for Placentia who asked the question. No, there really is no alternative. That is the point I am making here. And this is where the editorial in the Evening

Telegram is so far off the mark. Because those people live in a remote part of the Province, difficult terrain, rocky country, are they to be denied basic services of water and sewerage? Of course not. And I think we in the urban areas with a far lower development cost, have a social responsibility to help those areas with basic services. We are not going to provide them with luxuries, but we have a responsibility to help those areas, just as the rest of Canada has a responsibility to help Newfoundland, which does not have the same wherewithal to provide the level of service. Just look at the cost of the Trans-Canada Highway per capita in Newfoundland. On a per capita basis, if you compared some of these provincial facilities - I mean, the cost of providing those services in Newfoundland is so much greater. The cost of constructing the road down through the Humber Valley now, they built that road in 1964 I believe it was. My friend the Opposition House Leader and I, in fact, the hon. Member for Grand Falls who is not listening now -

Mr. Simms: Yes, I am.

Mr. Windsor: The hon. Member for Grand Falls and I actually worked on that road, in 1964.

Mr. Simms: That is right. I carried your rod.

Mr. Windsor: He carried my rod, and did a fine job at it, too.

Mr. Simms: I was a rod man.

Mr. Windsor: He was a rod man.

An Hon. Member: You go back awhile (inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: That road, Mr. Speaker-

Mr. Simms: I was a boy, by the way. He was much older than I was.

An Hon. Member: He was the engineer, was he?

An Hon. Member: What were you doing there?

Mr. Windsor: Surveying. That road, Mr. Chairman, is the most expensive section of road in Canada, except for the Rogers Pass going through the Rocky Mountains.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: Down through Humber Valley. So there is an example of the cost. And, as I was saying, the rest of Canada has a responsibility, a social responsibility to help Newfoundland. And so do we as urban dwellers have a responsibility to help some of the other communities in rural Newfoundland and Labrador that could not provide these simple basic services for themselves.

I would say, though, to the Minister of Environment before he leaves - he is listening - and to the Minister of Municipal Affairs if he were here, and I have spoken to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and he understands what I am saying, and he is very interested in what I am saying and, in fact, asked me to meet with some of his officials and give them my thoughts, technical thoughts, on the level of service being provided for here, particularly in rural Newfoundland, that perhaps we do not need the cadillac systems. And I say here in this House that I have said the same thing to my

colleagues in the engineering fraternity who are largely guilty of designing cadillac systems when a far lesser standard of construction could have worked just as well.

Mr. Flight: At not half the cost.

Mr. Windsor: At far less cost, exactly. There has to be - the Minister talked about it today - sustainable development from an environmental point of view; there has to be sustainable construction costs too, from a practical point of view, in providing services. And if the Minister and the Minister of Municipal Affairs and their officials would look at that - I urge them to look at that in approving water and sewer systems, and also, I say to the Minister of Environment, in setting the standards.

We have problems in this Province, and I am getting into an area where I am slightly in conflict of interest, but in sewage treatment in this Province. And the standards are high, federal standards are now getting higher. In many cases the standards of what you discharge into a receiving body, the standards of what you are allowed to discharge is higher than the quality of the receiving water that you are throwing it into. Now that does not make any sense to me. I say to the Minister that we have been discharging basically raw sewage into the Atlantic Ocean for centuries. We have yet to pollute the Atlantic Ocean, and we are not likely going to.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: But we have some areas where we do have problems.

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible) where.

Mr. Windsor: Most of it is through the hon. gentleman's mouth, I am afraid.

Mr. Windsor: What I am saying, if the hon. gentleman would listen, Mr. Chairman, is that I am trying to make a case -

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible) water and sewer in St. John's South.

Mr. Windsor: - to the Minister of Environment, and to point out the importance of the fact that the City of St. John's and many other municipalities need sewerage treatment. Let us not look for the Cadillac. The concept of sustainable development is a good one, and we must be very careful about the environment. It is critical. But when we say we cannot discharge untreated sewerage into an area, into a receiving water, we need not say tertiary treatment. There is primary treatment, secondary treatment and tertiary treatment. Tertiary treatment is very, very expensive.

What is the sustainable level of pollution that we can contribute? For example, Deer Lake: The community of Deer Lake, right now, discharge all of their sewage into Deer Lake, which is a freshwater body - a relatively small community, a small amount of sewage being discharged immediately below the power plant for the Trans-Canada Highway.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) Windsor.

Mr. Windsor: I will come to Grand Falls - Windsor, if you want, yes.

The community of Deer Lake

discharge their sewage there, below the power plant, where you have a tremendous flow of water. So immediately you have incredible dilution, you have the tremendous turbulence coming out of the turbines, so you get a breaking up action. You have all of that white water, obviously that is oxygen, so there is automatic oxygenation there, and your officials are unable to find any solution a very short distance away from that; because it is a natural treatment system, except you get some of the gross solids, some of the heavy floatable stuff floating up on your beach, your municipal park, which is directly opposite. So you don't have a pollution problem, you have an ascetic problem. And, I say to the Minister, that is what we have in most communities in this Province.

I spoke to his council in Northwest River, this Summer, as he knows. He knew I was going at their request to speak with them about a particular piece of technology I am involved in; I won't address that here. And I think the deputy mayor is a fisherman.

The community of Northwest River is never going to pollute Lake Melville - 150 miles long, tidal water. The bit of sewage they contribute will never pollute it. But that fisherman has a problem, in that he has to pick his nets once a week. He fishes very near the mouth of the river, and it is not very appetizing when you are taking fish out of a fish net to sell for human consumption to see the stuff that is clinging to that net. So I say to the Minister again, you won't find any serious pollution problem there, but you do have an ascetic problem.

The point I am making is that all you need in those areas is primary treatment; remove the gross solids, and what is left will be acceptable.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: In Torbay the same thing? I am not aware of it. I will take a look at it, though. Grand Falls - Windsor - the hon. gentleman from Grand Falls asked me to - I am very familiar with it. I have looked at it and, obviously, I have a proposal in there. It is being studied by consultants now.

Mr. Baker: How is (inaudible) the primary (inaudible)?

Mr. Windsor: Very, very cost-efficient. The hon. the President of Treasury Board is familiar with the system. I am trying to be careful here not to get into a conflict situation. I do not want to sell my own technology, so I speak of primary treatment. It may be the technology we have, or it could be another form of primary treatment.

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible) sell it to the city.

Mr. Windsor: Well we should sell it to the city, because that is all they need. The City of St. John's flushes itself every day. Every day the harbour flushes itself. You remove the gross solids and your problem - well, first of all, if you remove the gross solids, you are taking better than 75 per cent out of it anyway - okay? So if you take 75 per cent away, you are a lot better off. You have taken all the larger pieces, the gross solids, out of it. The harbour of St. John's flushes itself every

day.

Corner Brook is a far worse problem. The Bay of Islands flushes itself once a week. And on top of that you have the paper mill there. And, I say to the Minister of Environment, the paper mill in Corner Brook discharges 200 tons of fibre a day - two hundred tons of fibre a day - into the harbour at Corner Brook, which is a serious problem, and we are working with them, obviously.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) settles.

Mr. Windsor: It settles? Yes. There is nothing living. I spoke with a diver out there, a guy who does diving in the Bay of Islands. He said he used to be able to go out and pick up lobster directly opposite the fish plant. But now, he says, I have to go eighteen miles out - out to Frenchman's Cove before he can find anything really moving. And all the fibre settles to the bottom and you build up methane gas. It starts to break down, bacterial action sets in, and it builds up methane gas. And that methane gas every now and then breaks the crust and there is a great gusher that comes up, and for two or three days, they say, you can not walk near the mill. When this gas comes up it is really foul, and it just bubbles for hour after hour, almost like there is a volcano on the go. But the paper mill is concerned and there is money being allocated to deal with that. I am aware that they are making plans and proposing to go ahead with some improvements there, and so they should.

But the point I am making to the Minister is let us look at our

standards, both in the standard of the water and sewer system that we construct, the standard of the treatment system, and the level of service that is being required. In many areas of rural Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, all that may be required is sewerage. Wells are quite adequate if we were not polluting each others wells with our sewage, with poorly constructed septic tanks, or perhaps more accurately, septic tanks in soil that is not appropriate. Certain soil conditions are not effective for septic tanks, they are not appropriate for them. And there are many communities in this Province, though, that do have acceptable soil conditions, where you could get away with just septic tanks, and maybe you would need a water supply system for fire fighting purposes. That is a consideration as well, if you feel that you want to go that route. If you have a domestic water supply system maybe you do not need a domestic sewage to go with it. Septic tanks can work very effectively, properly build, installed, and maintained septic systems, very, very, economically. You can run a water line over strange territories but a sewer line has to have proper grading done on it. A sewer line is far more expensive from a construction point of view to install if you are on solid rock than is a water line. A water line can go up hill and down hill, around corners and all the rest of it, but a sewer system is far more expensive to build from the excavation point of view. Maybe we can look at that, and again, I say to the Minister, when he is looking at the level of treatment that is required, if we are going to insist that municipalities install full treatment, which is

an noble objective and I cannot fault the Minister's officials for that, but if we are going to insist on that then you will never have them because they cannot afford them. The first thing they say is, yes, Mr. Minister, we will install a system as soon as the Minister of Municipal Affairs gives us the money to do it.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) operational.

Mr. Windsor: It can be costly. Secondary and tertiary treatment is but primary treatment is not so costly. Now, do not get me wrong there are areas that must have full treatment, but the first thing they say is give us the money, and if you are talking \$2 and \$3 million for small communities to treat their sewage, well I am afraid their priority is to get water and sewage to those fifty houses that are not serviced yet, to build that arena we have been looking for for years, to pave some of those streets, or even to fill in some of the pot holes. Those are the priorities, and you are putting your municipal council in a very difficult position when you say you must build sewage treatment. So I say to the Minister, yes, we must build sewage treatment and we have to get on with it now before it is too late, but the level of treatment is what is important here and what we must really consider. Maybe that \$3 million could be \$500,000 for a primary system, and those numbers are not out of whack because the Minister of Development asked me what primary treatment costs, at least our own technologies, and there are other technologies, maybe some that are cheaper for primary treatment under certain circumstances. The City of Gander

I will use as just one example. The system we put in Gander was forty per cent of the cost for a conventional system that was designed for Gander; and we have full, secondary treatment in Gander if they need it. We may in the future have to put in tertiary. The cost of the system which was installed was forty per cent of the cost of conventional lagoons, which would have taken fifty-five acres of land for settling lagoons. The system that is in place was on the old site on less than one acre.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: The hon. gentleman asked me what kind of a system. I got to get into a conflict of interest, but it is a new piece of technology, but I am not here to sell that. I am saying the principal of primary treatment being -

An Hon. Member: No lagoons at all.

Mr. Windsor: No lagoons. Totally closed. We could bury one under water street in Carbonear and you would not even know it was there.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) massive breaking up of the system (inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: It removes the sludge. Just settlement, but it is hydrodynamic separation. Mr. Speaker, they are dragging it out of me. It is a good system, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to be unfair. Perhaps there are others; I am not here to sell that system. The point I want to make is that there are technologies available which can remove seventy-five percent of the pollutants, the growth solids, so that the environmental impact

would be far, far less than it has been for centuries. And the same is true for the city of St. John's, of course, which has a very serious problem and needs to be addressed urgently by the city, be it our technology or any technology. I am not here to, nor is it proper for me to try to sell it.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to stop there for now and let other colleagues have a few words. There are others, I am sure, who want to deal with this. Maybe hon. gentlemen would like to deal with some of the other points that I made which are somewhat removed from the bill but pertinent, I think, because we are talking about providing provincial funds for water and sewer systems and other municipal services. I think it is important to consider how we provide those services and how we can best use the limited amount of money the Government has available to it for these purposes, and the limited ability of the communities to service a debt. The easiest thing in the world is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to say to the community of Ming's Bight, 'here is \$3 million. Put in a nice new water and sewer system.' But how do they operate and maintain that system. There is the problem. There is a problem. I will just finish on this note. When we talk about sewage treatment systems, I think there are eighty-six sewage treatment systems in this Province and only three of them work, primarily because the expertise is not in the community to operate them. They are not being properly operated, there is your problem.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible) expensive.

Mr. Windsor: Beg pardon.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

Mr. Windsor: It is a good system. The design is sound but it needs to be operated. It has to be operated. I will stop there for a moment, Mr. Chairman and let somebody else Speak.

Mr. Simms: It would be nice to hear from some of the former Mayors and what they think.

An Hon. Member: (Inaudible).

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Rideout: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not going to get wound up now for the next two or three minutes left, but I do have a few remarks I want to make on this bill before it goes though, primarily flowing out of comments made by the Minister of Finance in Question Period yesterday as it relates to municipal financing.

But if the Government House Leader is willing now, I will adjourn the debate and move that the Committee rise and make my few remarks on Monday.

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

Mr. Speaker: 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, have directed me to report progress and ask leave to

sit again.

Mr. Baker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to advise hon. Members that when we come back on Monday, we will be dealing with the Regional Services Board Legislation which we started in second reading once before, and we will now continue with for another half an hour or so.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

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

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