



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

First Session

Number 75

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Friday

6 December 1985

House met at 10:00 a.m.

SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
er, please!

### Statements by Ministers

POWER:  
Speaker.

SPEAKER:  
hon. the Minister of Career  
elopment and Advanced Studies.

POWER:  
ould just like to take a moment  
ask the House to send a letter  
condolence to the family of the  
e Ella Manuel, who was a  
enth generation Newfoundlander  
m Woody Point, in Bonne Bay.  
. Manuel was a writer who wrote  
ticularly for children, aiming  
make them conscious on social  
ues. She was a writer and  
earcher for CBC. She also  
mitted a brief to the Royal  
mission on the Status of Women  
the loneliness and isolation  
ed by women in Newfoundland and  
rador.

November of 1980 Miss Manuel  
ame the only Newfoundland woman  
receive the Persons' Award,  
ch is awarded by the Governor  
eral of Canada to honour women  
have worked much of their  
es to improve the status of  
en in this country. Miss Manuel  
a pioneer, a feminist and a  
an with a social conscience  
l ahead of her time. I am sure  
colleagues would want to join  
h me in sending a letter of  
dolence to her family.

BARRY:  
Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
The minister was kind enough to  
give me notice that he would be  
raising this matter. We gladly  
join with other members of the  
House in supporting this request  
for a resolution of condolence to  
go to the family of Ella Manuel.  
I had the opportunity to meet Miss  
Manuel on a number of occasions.  
Miss Manuel was a person who - it  
is rare to find, I guess - in her  
own lifetime was recognized as  
somebody who is deserving of the  
highest esteem. She had obtained  
the respect of her peers in the  
teaching profession.

I met her on a number of  
occasions, at conferences. I had  
the opportunity to chat with her  
and I found her to be, Mr.  
Speaker, a very knowledgeable, but  
also a very sensitive and  
understanding individual,  
understanding of the problems that  
affect people on a human level. I  
think that we can point to Miss  
Manuel as a person who has made a  
tremendous contribution to our  
Province and would that we had,  
Mr. Speaker, more people like  
here. I think her entire career  
was exemplary. I think all  
members should join in this  
resolution of condolence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), I would like to ask the Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs, (Mr. Ottenheimer) whether the Provincial government has made any approaches to the Government of Canada with respect to the obtaining of a firefighting tug for the City of St. John's. The minister might be aware that a couple of months ago now, just before the House opened, if I recall, there was quite a serious fire resulting in a fatality on the waterfront. St. John's firemen indicated that it was a very perilous proceed for them to get at that fire, there were certain inflammable, and, I believe, explosive materials in the area, and the view was expressed that a firefighting tug would have been very important in helping to extinguish that particular blaze. Mr. Speaker, as things progress, and we hope the Harbour will increase in traffic, we are going to see more and more hazardous cargoes being brought into the Harbour. What is government doing to ensure that we have adequate firefighting facilities for that port?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question of the Leader of the Opposition, I can certainly inform him and members of the House that the government have for quite a period of time been endeavouring

to have appropriate firefighting equipment, a firefighting tug available for the City of St. John's harbour.

I could not say when the last representation was made, but I know that representations have been made for a period of time. That has been something which, on a consistent basis, government have endeavoured to have secured here for St. John's harbour.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate whether there has been any response received from the Government of Canada or whether there is any indication this new era of co-operation and consultation is going to bring results in this particular area?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the latest representations on that were made by the Minister of Transport. I do not know really to speak as a fact what the exact response was, so I would have to check with him and inform the hon. gentleman. I realize the House will probably be closing, but I will certainly undertake to do it by phone or in writing. Rather than speculate, it would certainly be preferable for me to check with the hon. gentleman to

what the response was at the time of the latest presentation. But I know that presentations have been going on quite some period of time.

BARRY:  
supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER:  
supplementary, the hon. the leader of the Opposition.

BARRY:  
assume that the minister would be aware if the Government of Canada had rejected the concept. We assume that there has been communication of any rejection government up to this point in time?

SPEAKER:  
The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

OTTENHEIMER:  
Speaker, I do not think there has been any rejection as such, the exact reply to the latest presentation I am not aware of, I do not have first-hand knowledge of it. I know that I had an involvement in it about a year and half or so ago and, of course, it was under the former administration in Ottawa, and the problems posed, which I thought were not necessarily valid ones, were jurisdictional ones - certain responsibilities onshore versus certain responsibilities offshore. I do not think that was entirely valid. But there has not been to, my knowledge, any rejection, and I understand the matter is still under discussion, so I would be speculating to predict the latest reaction of the latest discussion without a first-hand knowledge of it.

SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to table this letter that I received from Mr. Mazankowski, and I suggest the minister should get up to Ottawa this afternoon because there has been a serious breakdown in his intergovernmental relations according to the message in this letter, which basically says, Mr. Speaker, that the concept of a firefighting tug for the port of St. John's has been turned down by the Government of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister is aware that the Government of Canada is pointing to the firefighting capabilities of the St. John's Fire Department as being adequate, and they refer to the fact that 'onshore firefighting facilities have been upgraded, however, and a considerable amount of new equipment has been provided to the Fire Department.' Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would undertake to ensure that the contact is made immediately with the Government of Canada so that the minister can be updated. Would the minister indicate why is it that he is so out of touch with what is going on in Ottawa?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker, if I were one-tenth as out of touch with what is going on in Ottawa as the hon. gentleman is with what is going on in Newfoundland, I would indeed have cause to worry.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Social Services. In the past couple of days the minister has stated that many of the conditions which were outlined in the report have been taken care of, and that many of these situations are no longer occurring; in other words, steps have been taken to correct some of the things which were mentioned in the report. I would like to ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the parents and relatives of children who are in these institutions, and on behalf of parents all over this Province, would he please, please, stand up and indicate to us and to the whole Province which of these practices are not now going on, which have been stopped?

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to use the next twenty minutes of this Question Period the way we did yesterday. I have answered honestly and truthfully all question put to me. That question was asked over and over and over yesterday and I answered it. Now, there must be some rules in this House to stop that kind of thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

There is a very simple way that the minister can avoid answering questions. He can resign.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I have checked the responses the minister has given and the minister, in fact, has never, ever outlined specifically which of these practices have been stopped. He is refusing to do so again, and he should hang his head in shame. I ask him one more time: Which of these practices are not going on? He has not answered that question ever, and the record will show, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That question has already been asked.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, let the record show that the minister refuses to answer that particular question.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

us get the record straight, Speaker. I did not refuse to answer any questions. I answered every question that was asked of me yesterday. And if I gave the same answer, it is because it is the proper answer, and I will continue to give that same answer day, over and over and over again. Now, if that is what the position want, then that is fine. But I will get up every day and I will say the same thing.

BAKER:  
supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER:  
supplementary, the hon. the member for Gander.

BAKER:  
Speaker, I realize that the minister has given an answer, and he has given the same answer that he has given here now today, "I give the answer," and that is all that we have heard. I think this is a serious matter.

SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member is now making a speech.

BAKER:  
I ask the minister: In light of the fact that he could really get himself off the hook by giving us a specific answer to this question, why does he not give us a specific answer?

SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

BRETT:  
Speaker, this hon. member is on the hook. Members of the opposition have the right to ask a question they wish, and I have

the right to answer it if I wish, and to give the answer that I decide I am going to give. That is my right.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries in his capacity as the minister who is supposed to be responsible in this House for fishermen and plant workers. It concerns the so called Emergency Works Programme that is supposed to be in place for fishermen and plant workers in the Province. We have seen the hang-ups and the delays. We have seen the hunger strikes that are going on in the Province, and we have seen that there have been all kinds of delays in getting those projects in place. People are still -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member is now making a speech.

MR. TULK:  
In view of the fact that there are hunger strikes going on in this Province, the like of which has not been since 1949, and in view of the fact that we are being told that those Works Programmes are now going to be delayed another four to six weeks before anybody actually gets to work because the funds are not coming through from Ottawa - it is going to take some four to six weeks for the funds to get through - I want to ask the Minister of Fisheries, who is responsible for fishermen and fish plant workers in the Province, if indeed he will see that there is a

sense of urgency - the mechanism is already in place - put into taking care of what has been an emergency situation for the past four or five months?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, this whole programme was put together with a sense of emergency and has been acted on ever since then with a sense of emergency. I mean, the hon. gentleman cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. There have been 5,000 jobs, as I understand it, created already in this Province through the Fisheries Response Programme. My colleague, the Minister of Career Development and Advance Studies (Mr. Power) and I and this government worked very hard to put that programme together. Obviously there are going to be some delays with it, but we are very pleased with the way the programme is working and we will do our best to ensure that every job is created as quickly as possible despite the objections of the hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Five thousand jobs created and yet there is not a single person in this Province working today on that emergency programme. How does the minister explain that? We have hunger strike after hunger strike.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The hon. the member for Fogo is getting up and giving erroneous information. As I understand it from the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), many of those 5,000 jobs have already started?

MR. FLIGHT:

How many?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Five thousand jobs have been approved for 91 projects, so you have hundreds and hundreds of jobs already created.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

That is not a point of order! He is making a speech, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So let the member for Fogo tell the truth when he gets up to ask a question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

That is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I ask the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) to restrain himself. He will decide whether it is a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

I will undertake to restrain myself if you treat his spurious

ints of order the way you treat  
spurious points of order.  
ur only ruling now can be that  
it was not a point of order.  
it is your ruling. Go give it.

THE HON. MEMBERS:  
he him.

SPEAKER:  
e hon. the member for Fogo.

TULK:  
Speaker, have you ruled on the  
int of order? I am not speaking  
the point of order.

SPEAKER:  
e hon. the member for  
fortune-Hermitage on a point of  
er.

SIMMONS:  
rise on a point of privilege.

Speaker, as a member of the  
use I think -

THE HON. MEMBERS:  
oh!

SPEAKER:  
er, please!

SIMMONS:  
a member of the House, Mr.  
aker, I think I am entitled to  
that you rule on the Premier's  
int of order which you did not  
..

SIMMS:  
rose on a point of privilege.  
it is not a privilege, that is a  
int of nonsense.

SPEAKER:  
the point of order raised by  
e hon. the Premier, there was no  
int of order.

THE HON. MEMBERS:  
ar, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
The member for Fortune-Hermitage  
is vindicated.

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

MR. TULK:  
I want to point out to the  
Minister of Fisheries (Mr.  
Rideout) that even though the  
Premier, the Minister of Manpower  
and Career Development and  
whatever else they have thrown in  
that bucket, have stated that  
5,000 jobs have been created,  
there are few if any people  
working.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Nobody.

MR. TULK:  
They are not working. There is no  
work going on in this Province,  
Mr. Speaker. So I would ask the  
Minister of Fisheries, once again,  
as a person who I believe is not  
solely interested in playing  
politics, who perhaps has some  
interest in the fishermen and fish  
plant workers of this Province,  
will he move to try to get the  
Minister of Manpower (Mr. Power)  
the Premier, and his federal  
colleagues in Ottawa to have some  
money put into place so that those  
people can go to work on the  
projects that have supposedly been  
approved? Will he move on that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Sooky baby, Mr. Speaker! There  
are sixty-one people working in  
Bonavista, fifty or sixty in  
Branch, and twenty-nine went to  
work in Fleur de Lys on Monday.

The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, said nobody was working. The hon. gentleman is a spoilsport, Mr. Speaker, because we got the programme going. It was a programme of this government, done with our colleagues in Ottawa, and it is working very, very well despite the objections of the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

# supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

# supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

What a way to get the information out! What a way!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Thank you very much. One hundred and forty people had to go on a hunger strike! Where are the 5,000 jobs? One hundred and forty people working in the Province - that is what we have been told - who had to go on a hunger strike to get their jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

Now, I ask the minister to stand in his place and confess that the Minister of Manpower misled this House when he said 5,000 jobs had been created. Will he also show some sense of urgency in this matter and get some money into place so that these people can go

to work?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that there have already been 5,000 jobs created under the Special Fisheries Response programme in this Province. Mr. Speaker, there were ninety-one projects started in this Province on Monday of this week. Ninety-one people went to work in Carbonear on Monday of last week, and sixty-one in Bonavista. The hon. gentleman gets up, Mr. Speaker, and says no jobs were created. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is misleading the House, and I would suggest he is probably doing it deliberately so he can get a headline in the Weekend Telegram.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power). I ask the minister to take his seat, Mr. Speaker.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is very simple. I would like to ask the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies: Has he and his family enough money to see themselves through this Christmas? If he did not, what kind of a position would he be in?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

hear!

EFFORD:  
Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

OTTENHEIMER:  
Speaker, on a point of order.

SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, on a point of order.

OTTENHEIMER:  
Obviously the hon. gentleman has the right to ask a question and your Honour to recognize him, but technically speaking there is no supplementary because, as the pending Orders will show, a supplementary arises out of the answer given by a minister.

EFFORD:  
Speaker, a new question.

SPEAKER:  
Recognize the hon. member on a question.

EFFORD:  
Speaker, I am amazed at the error that is displayed on the other side about such a serious thing. Now, I asked that for a social reason, because the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies just stated that the people are working.

SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member is starting to make a speech.

EFFORD:  
Well, Mr. Speaker, the committees for Port de Grave and Cupids got a

phone call yesterday saying that they will have to wait another four to six weeks before they receive any money. Now I want to know what those people are supposed to do for the next four weeks? What are they supposed to live on, since the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies said that all of those people have money to start their projects?

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

MR. POWER:  
Mr. Speaker, here are the facts as they pertain to job creation in Newfoundland. In the last six or seven months we have put in over \$7.5 million for the Summer programme, the job emergency response for fishermen, and the Jobs Strategy programme. We have put \$7.5 million into those projects.

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

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

MR. EFFORD:  
What about the people of Cupids and Port de Grave who received phone calls saying that they will not receive money for the next four to six weeks? That is the question I asked; that is the question I want answered.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, that poor member has trouble enough doing up questions, so I do not want him to start doing up answers, too. I will do the answer based on the facts in Newfoundland. There have been 5,000 jobs approved in the Canadian Jobs Strategy programmes and ninety-one of those projects started on Monday or had full approvals from government. If you have full approval from government, you have your money. In some places the Fishermen's Committees or the municipal authorities, whoever applied for the project, may be longer in starting a project. But this government can only make money available and the federal government can only make money available. The federal government makes money available, it is there, the projects can start and they can begin to receive money. There is no need for a four week delay. If there is a problem with a certain committee, then all the member has to do is follow the regular route of making sure that the project gets done as quickly as possible. There is a mechanism in place, Mr. Speaker, to do that. There are 5,000 jobs created so far. We still have \$17 million or \$18 million to spend to create another 6,000 or 7,000 jobs for part of Newfoundland that need it. We are doing it as quickly as possible. The Jobs Strategy programmes that are in place this year are in place as early, if not earlier than they have ever been.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member

for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies what I expect from these committees like the one in Cupids, which received a phone call yesterday saying if they wanted money to go to the bank and borrow it, and when they went to the bank the bank manager said, yes, they would get the money if they mortgage their houses. Would the minister explain how an unincorporated community, a bunch of fishermen can be responsible for \$50,000 or \$60,000 at a bank?

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

As long as this government and the Government of Canada gives full approvals for the projects, there is no reason why the project cannot go ahead. If the member was really serious, if the member was interested in serving his district well, and has a problem with a committee getting a project started when they have already received approvals, if the member were really interested in serving his district properly then he would bring it to the department. He would get the thing moving the way it should be done. He simply wants to get a little bit of attention for the headlines in **The Weekend**. That is all it is. Programmes are in place. This government can only make money available, only give approvals, and we cannot go out and individually start projects in every community.

FUREY:  
Speaker.

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

FUREY:  
Speaker, to the same minister. It is quite a reference, Sir, to announce a project and to have a project started. There is quite a reference. I have had many phone calls from my particular district, and they are very worried and they are very hungry. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is with contracts. The contract has to go from Corner Brook to the sponsor, the sponsor has to sign it, send it back to Corner Brook, Corner Brook sends it to St. John's, St. John's Employment Development Branch sends it to Supply and Services, Supply and Services sends it back to Employment Development, back to Corner Brook, back to the sponsors, so it is four weeks before cash is in people's hands. What is this government going to do about that before Christmas?

THE HON. MEMBERS:  
Sir, hear!

SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

SIMMS:  
Did the rest of the projects start?

POWER:  
Speaker.

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

POWER:  
Speaker, there are projects that began on Monday. They have the approvals from government.

MR. FUREY:  
They have no money.

MR. POWER:  
This government have done everything that is humanly possible that could be done to get those projects off the ground as quickly as possible, earlier this year than any other year, Mr. Speaker. We cannot as a government department go out into individual communities and decide whether a project starts at 8:00 o'clock on Monday morning or 8:00 o'clock on Tuesday morning. That is not the role of the provincial government. We have made the money available. They can start the projects. There is simply no reason, Mr. Speaker, why delays of that nature should have to be tolerated by anybody.

MR. FUREY:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A supplementary, the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
Could the minister tell me if that is why I am getting phone calls from the people in Cow Head, those thirty fish plant workers, women who are poor and have nothing, threatening to be part of this human chain of hunger strikes, because when they go to the bank the bank will not give them an overdraft on a verbal contract? Mr. Speaker, they will not give them a loan because who will sign and be liable for \$100,000 or \$60,000?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Sit down! Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is making a speech. In between he asked one short question, and then carried on with his speech. I ask him now to pose his supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, this minister announced a \$9.5 million programme two months ago. Now, there is no money out there, and I want to ask him will this Province supply emergency money to those people until the other emergency money shows up?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

The money is there. The money is there.

MR. SIMMS:

Can you see them in government?

MR. RIDEOUT:

You have to work for a week before you get paid for a week.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, it seems with everything that happens in the Province, members opposite want to jump on it, if they think it is a bandwagon going in the right direction.

There has been a very significant job creation programme in this Province. It is in place, it is ready. We had an emergency in the fishery and this government responded to that emergency with compassion and understanding. We have created 5,000 jobs in the Province, up to last week, with many more jobs to come. If there

have been delays in the case of individual committees which cannot get a project started, everyone knows we have speeded them up every way we possibly can. To put in place another emergency fund to cover the emergency is absolutely unnecessary.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies as well. The minister is probably aware that seventeen fish plant workers in Markland, who worked at the FF plant in South Dildo, were unsuccessful in getting their project approved. Let me ask the minister, is all of that \$9.5 million used up? If it is, is there going to be some more money put into that so that committee like the one at Markland can also get funding? Because, Mr. Speaker, the member in Ottawa Captain Johnson, is on record as telling them that they are not in a fishing area. Whitbourne, the first inland town in this Province, is in a fishing area. How can that be? What can the minister do to rectify this situation in Markland?

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, again, it is very difficult. All persons here including the member who asked the question, have some experience in

the Legislature and acting as a district member. It is impossible for a minister to be able to say on very precise, specific, one-community related projects that something is going to be done. It is impossible to know about each individual community. Did they apply for a project in Whitbourne?

MR. CALLAN:

Yes.

MR. POWER:

Under the Job Response or under the Jobs Development programme?

MR. CALLAN:

Yes.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that if a member has a problem with a project, then obviously we can react to it. I was not aware that there were seventeen fishermen who fished out of Dildo but happen to live in Whitbourne -

MR. CALLAN:

Fish plant workers.

MR. POWER:

- who were not allowed to apply for a project. If they have an application in, then we will be glad to look at it to see if it can be done. Again, Mr. Speaker, we have tried to accommodate every single community that has a problem. But, again, it is impossible for me to respond to individual problems like that in the House.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, in reference to the specific concern raised by my colleagues from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) and St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), I say to the minister that despite the rhetoric or amidst the rhetoric there is a concern here. It is a very real concern. A number of people know they have approval. They know it verbally, they have had phone calls. They cannot trigger the project until they get the contract signed. He will know that. Is it possible, as the minister will know since he has the documentation on his desk, that the project has been approved, the sponsor has been informed, and to expedite the beginning of the project, for the minister to give maybe a telegram, something on paper, to the sponsors? Because he will know that short of something on paper the banks will not authorize interim financing to allow the project to begin, and those sponsors themselves cannot be expected to put up their own personal assets, houses and so on. Will he undertake to put something in writing to those sponsors as an interim measure to get the thing expedited?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, it is quite easy to do. We have tried to speed up the programmes as best we could. That is why they have been coming out, I guess, in batches rather than waiting for all of the programmes to be announced in one big announcement where you could announce every single project together. We have been announcing them exactly as they are approved, as they come to my desk and I sign

them and they go to Miss MacDonald and she signs them. What happens is an MP or an MHA will notify someone that their project is approved. They will do that verbally, usually over the phone, and the minute that that happens, or even before that happens, there should be a letter or a telex on the way from Miss MacDonald's office giving final approval for their project. The two things go together. Just because an MP calls verbally means that immediately behind that there should be a letter coming and giving formal approval. So there really is no need for this government to get involved in some kind of an emergency sense. There really is no need. The approvals should be there in a matter of hours after the announcement is made.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
My question is to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies. It is along the lines of the one asked by my colleague from Fortune - Hermitage and it has to do with the Jobs Strategy programme. For example, we all know that the \$9.5 million made available for the Emergency Response programme is going to be very much inadequate. In fact, it is probably about half enough to cover the number of projects applied for. What action will the minister take to ensure that the Jobs Strategy programme is pushed ahead, is made available to the people? A lot of fishermen will not be able to get assistance under the Emergency Response

programme, so, what happens those fishermen? Will the minister then make arrangements maybe, whereby they can qualify for assistance under the Jobs Strategy programme? If so, when can we expect some action on the programme?

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is just time for a short answer from the hon. Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:  
My regular short answer, Mr. Speaker, is basically we have done just that. We have I guess something like \$17 million worth of requests for the \$9.5 million funding that we had. That \$9.5 million worth of funding create just about 4,000 fishermen and fish plant worker jobs in this Province. Obviously it was not adequate. What we have done is that we have directed our staff to accept the exact same applications put it into the Jobs Strategy fund, and over that \$35 million Jobs Strategy, hopefully we will be able to accommodate all of those persons who have that need fishermen and others in the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
I would like to point out to the Premier there is a problem here. The minister, I know, has a lot of work to do and there are a lot of

these projects that he may not be directly familiar with, but Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Premier that there is a cash flow problem. We know projects have been approved but there are communities and there are groups which do not have the documentation to satisfy banks. Now maybe legally the minister is correct. Maybe once the minister's letter of approval has gone out, legally that should be sufficient. But the reality is that the banks, the financial institutions, are not accepting this as adequate security for these communities obtaining funds. Would the Premier take a look at whether in fact there is a need for some sort of assurance to be sent out? I am sure it need only be a form letter that could be signed in half an hour by the minister and sent out in order to give assurances that will permit cash to start flowing before Christmas to these people?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I do not think that was quite a point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if I were like some of the members opposite I would just get up and, on a technical point under the Standing Orders, say to the Leader of the Opposition that that is not a point and forget all about it, but I will not do that, I will try to respond.

MR. BARRY:

We will give you leave to speak.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You asked the question. I am not going to need leave to speak. We gave you leave to get up on a point of order, whatever, and I am not going to get up on leave by

you. I will get up to answer your question.

MR. BARRY:

The Speaker ruled there was no point of order, but we would like to hear what you have to say.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You have asked a question and I want to answer it even though I do not have to.

The long and short of it is if the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), or the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) or the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) or any member has a specific problem as it relates to this programme, then I would suggest to them to go down to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) before this day is out -

MR. BARRY:

It is Province-wide.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Just one second! Can I finish the answer?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You try to answer the question and be responsible and sympathetic to what members of the Opposition are saying, and all you get is an interruption. Now, then, if by going down to the minister and his people this afternoon, the minister sees that it is a Province-wide problem which crops up in Port de Grave, and St. Barbe, and Twillingate and so on, then we will take a look at it. I am not convinced that it is, but I would like to see, instead of abusing Question Period, members opposite go down to the minister's

office, sit down, say, 'Here is a problem here in St. Barbe, and here is a problem here, they are very common - in other words, the approvals are not being given - so that then we can act on it. But we are not going to act on it if, in fact, there are individual, unique problems which are not commonplace all around the Province. If they are, we will do something about it.

MR. BARRY:

It is in your own district.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is not in my own district.

MR. BARRY:

It is in your own district.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is not. It is not.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

There are interruptions from both sides. It is impossible to carry on unless we can carry on normally.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

At this stage I would like to acknowledge representation from the Federation of Municipalities and welcome to the galleries their President, Bill Dickson, their Executive Director, Doug Smith, and their Secretary, Woodrow Mullett. Also with them is Mayor Jerome Walsh.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

## Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

In accordance with the Medical Care Insurance Act, I wish to table the annual report from the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission for the year ending March 31, 1985.

## Petitions

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burgeo Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition from 95 people who live in Burgeo in the area known as Smalls Island. I will read the prayer of the petition. It says 'Whereas Smalls Island has a population of thirty families; and whereas the bridge leading to this Island is a bailey type which has been in use for thirty years; and whereas this bridge is in such a state of disrepair that it is no longer safe for vehicular traffic; and whereas the provision of a water supply, fuel oil and delivery of all goods and services to the Island, as well as the transportation of the needs of the residents, is dependent on that bridge, we, the residents of Smalls Island, petition the Department of Transportation to effect repairs to this bridge

immediately, before loss of lives or property result from vehicles breaking through this bridge.'

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to that petition. First of all, I have here a copy of a letter that was sent to the Minister of Transportation on November 21. There are two paragraphs I would like to read before I start. "Your department carried out an engineering study on this bridge on April 17 and 18, 1985. The study, contained in your department's report 'Bridge to Smalls Island, Bridge Site 3-059', gives several recommendations with regards to load limit, tightening up the braces, inspection by a diver, and an annual inspection should be made.

"Council is appreciative of this report. However, there is still great concern over the safety factor of this bridge and another inspection is warranted immediately. The immediate question Council would like to have answered is: Is the bridge safe for snow-clearing equipment, as Winter is close upon us? If it is not safe, what assistance your department will give us financially to have this problem corrected? Council feels that since the bridge was constructed by the Department of Transportation the department should be responsible for maintenance of same."

Mr. Speaker, this inspection was done, as the letter to the minister says, on April 17 and 18. The recommendations at that time were a load limit of not more than 15 tons be put on it and that the top be replaced. The first thing was very easy to do, because you could put a sign up saying that the load limit is 15 tons.

But the second thing, the recommendation that the top be replaced was a little more serious because that involved money. The Transportation Department, at that time, refused to do the necessary repairs.

The Town of Burgeo, as I pointed out to the Minister of Municipal Affairs sometime ago, had applied and was promised a guaranteed loan of \$100,000 to solve a water supply problem that has been in that town since its inception. The money that had been raised through tax revenues had to go to try and correct the water problem. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) agreed that in most towns, outside of the lucky ones like Gander and Grand Falls that had a water supply given them, the revenues that they raised from local taxes are about enough to maintain a water system.

In other words, what the Town Council and what the residents of Smalls Island are saying is that they are now living on an island in the middle of Burgeo Harbour, a part of the Town of Burgeo, and pretty soon they are going to have to go back to getting their by boat the same as they had to do thirty years ago, before the bailey bridge was put in, in another happier time in Newfoundland when we had a government that was caring about the people who lived on Smalls Island.

In view of the fact that their application for a grant was turned down by the Department of Municipal Affairs and that the Department of Transportation has refused to do the repairs to this bridge, they are making an appeal based on concern for the safety of

the people who live there. Also, with Winter coming they are afraid to take oil trucks over there to supply the necessary oil that they need to heat their homes through the Winter. Also, the Burgeo Town Council is afraid to send their snowploughs over that unless there are repairs done.

The immediate thing they would like to have is for the Department of Transportation to go and do a survey to recommend that 'yes, it is okay for the ploughs and oil trucks to go over it.' They want them to say it is safe to do it now. The town does not have the money, so they are appealing to the Minister of Transportation to enact some sort of help in order that the people may carry on in the lifestyle that they have become accustomed to over the thirty years since the bailey bridge was put in place.

I think it is well known that the bailey bridge has to be maintained within a period of ten to fifteen years, otherwise, it is unsafe. I ask the minister for his response on that.

MR. DAWE:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE:  
Mr. Speaker, in response to the petition presented by the hon. member, I would just like to say that, obviously, in his preamble and his discussion about the petition, there are a number of correspondences from the department. The department has, in fact, in the past, as was indicated, carried out an inspection and made some

recommendations to the town relative to the structure of the bridge and what repairs and things would have to be made.

As I understand it, as the end of his comments, he asked whether or not the department would engage the services of one of our statisticians to go down and do an assessment and indicate to the municipality just what the structural significance or deterioration of the bridge was and what necessary repairs would have to be made.

I will certainly undertake to have that particular activity carried out and report back to the town when the results of the particular survey are done.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Fortune Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I just want to take a moment to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert). The bridge connecting Smalls Island to another little island, known locally as Debbie's Island, is a bridge that I know very well. Looking at the petition before my colleague tabled it would indicate to me that just about everybody on the island signed that petition because it is their lifeline and it is their link to the community. It is a part of Burgeo where, if the bridge were cut off it would be very difficult to get access by boat. It is easy in normal times to get from the island to the mainland by boat but, of course, in stormy weather it would not be. So the bridge is

their lifeline in terms of medical, in terms of education, in terms of everything, it is their lifeline to the community and to the Province.

The bridge, as the petition notes, was put there about thirty years ago. It is a bailey type bridge. It is the kind of bridge that requires ongoing maintenance.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a bit of a sad commentary on the maintenance procedures of the Department of Transportation -

MR. DAWE:

Excuse me, it is not the Department of Transportation (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

It was put there by the Department of Transportation. It is within the municipality of Burgeo. Has it been signed over? Has the council taken responsibility for it?

MR. DAWE:

It has been responsible for years.

MR. SIMMONS:

Taken formal responsibility for it?

MR. DAWE:

Yes.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am quite familiar with the bridge. I know where it is. It is within the municipality of Burgeo. It was put there by the Department of Transportation a number of years ago, as the minister just learned. The beauty of new information. I acknowledge it is new information for me, too, but the difference between him and me is that I do not mind acknowledging it.

Mr. Speaker, I was about to say, before the minister got prematurely defensive, it is a sad commentary on the maintenance procedures of the Department of Transportation that roads, for example, like the Burgeo road, which is also a concern of these people, built by federal Liberal dollars, cannot even be maintained. One wonders if this is government by petition, that you have got to be petitioned on every matter, whether it is to do a favour to a council, to maintain a road or to provide snow clearing equipment. It is a sad commentary on the way government is run in this Province, the whole crisis management approach of government. You do nothing until you are clobbered over the head, until you get a petition from people.

Mr. Speaker, it must be just comforting for the people of Smalls Island to know that the great Minister of Transportation, this great government, would condescend to do them a favour. How nice, to do them a favour! Is that not nice of them? I mean, should we all not send them two Christmas cards for condescending to do those plebs down there a favour by engineering their bridge?

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

With all due respect, the hon. gentleman is abusing the rules of the House. In standing up to support a petition, he is sparking a major debate by attacking the government. Let us be fair, he is

out of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. Just let me say to the member for Bonavista South that the Assistant Deputy Speakership has been filled.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. member's time has almost elapsed. He has another minute.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to support the prayer of the petition and I want to tell my friend from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) that while we made no hard and fast decisions, we understand that there are some extra red chairs in other parts of the Chamber than where he sits now. He should not rush in and do all that coaxing up to people for positions that are already filled, he should not be so trigger happy.

I support the prayer of the petition and I would submit to the Minister of Transportation it is not enough to do favours for those people, they have a need which needs to be addressed. Although it falls within municipal jurisdiction, that municipality will require some government assistance in order to address the problem which is immediate.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:

Bill No. 46.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I would have hoped that the member for St. John's North (J. Carter) had been in his seat this morning but there is a matter before this House which is not being dealt with. I am referring, of course to the question as to whether the privileges of the member for Bonavista South has been breached.

I want to say this to the Government House Leader. The Opposition has indicated to the Chairman of the Committee, the member for St. John's North, on a number of occasions that we are ready to meet, to write the report, or at least to seek a consensus report. For some reason or other the member for St. John's North seems to be trying to avoid the issue. I suspect that the member for St. John's North wants this to hang out because of his biases against the member for Bonavista South and because he wants to keep this out of the limelight. He does not want a report to come in that may not be as favourable as he would like it perhaps cutting the legs out from under a member of this House. That may very well be the case but, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Government House (Mr. Marshall) to see that the member for St. John's North -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I do not think this is a point of order, I think it is a point of clarification - if there is such a point.

MR. TULK:

It is a matter of House privileges.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the House Leader called the orders. I am prepared to accept that as clarification.

MR. TULK:

I am on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, because we are talking about the privileges of this House on a ruling that should take place.

MR. SPEAKER:

You got up on a point of order. You are speaking to a point of order and there does not appear to be any point of order. It looks to me as though the hon. member is seeking clarification on a particular issue.

MR. TULK:

No. We accept the Orders of the Day, no problem. What I am doing is asking the Government House Leader, as the person who is responsible for seeing what the order of business is and that things are done with government, indeed for this House, to see that the member for St. John's North calls a meeting of that Committee to deal with the issue at hand, and not to allow him to sit in his seat day after day and this House go on and on and on and on, forever and a day, without that question being resolved one way or the other. It should be resolved, because it is a matter of the privileges of this House. It should not be left hanging and the member for St. John's North should not be allowed to keep it hanging, unless he is doing it with the consent of people on that side,

and I do not believe that for a minute. I cannot believe that that is the case. I would ask the Government House Leader to see that the member for St. John's North is put in his place and that he does his job.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

My only comment to that is that I am sure the member for St. John's North, like all members, is quite capable of discharging the duties that have been entrusted to him.

MR. TULK:

Well, he has not been doing it.

MR. MARSHALL:

I am also quite sure that the member for St. John's North will carry out his duties and not play politics with the issue, as the hon. gentleman is doing.

MR. TULK:

He is playing politics. To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have already said there was no point of order.

MR. TULK:

A new point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I want to tell the hon. gentleman that on this side we are more interested in preserving the privileges of this Parliament than in carrying on his nasty kind of comments and the nasty kind of reaction that we are getting from him.

This is a very important question

which has to be answered by this Committee. The member for St. John's North is apparently blocking it, and I am asking him to see that the situation is cleared up.

Do it, boy, you are in parliament.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Queen's Counsel Act", carried. (Bill No. 46).

On motion, Bill No. 46 read a first time, ordered read a second time, presently, by leave.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Now, these are third readings. Mr. Speaker, I want hon. gentlemen to know this is the proceeding: A bill is passed, it goes through second reading, Committee and third reading. Now, we are going into third reading.

MR. TULK:  
Oh!!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Order 2, Bill No. 8.

MR. TULK:  
Good! He finally got something straight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

On motion, the following bills were read a third time:

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Youth Advisory Council Act". (Bill No. 8).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Finance Act". (Bill

No. 56).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Liquor Corporation Act, 1973 (Bill No. 55).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Corporations Capital Tax Act, 1983". (Bill No. 37).

A bill, "An Act To Style The Department Of Development As The Department Of Development And Tourism". (Bill No. 9).

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

#### Committee of the Whole

MR. BARRY:  
'Bill', could you call Order before Order 7, because we have the amendment on the Workers Compensation Act and we have to go downstairs and dig it up. Otherwise, you just have to delay the thing.

MR. MARSHALL:  
All right, we will call Order No 8.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Order!

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Day Care And Homemaker Services Act" (Bill No. 18).

On motion, clauses 1 through 3 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Shall clause 4 carry?

MR. BARRY:  
Just on clause 4, Mr. Chairman would the minister indicate th

thinking behind this? If authority has been given to the Board, why take it from the Board and give it to the minister? Where is the minister?

MR. BRETT:  
I am here.

MR. BARRY:  
We are on your Day Care and Homemaker Services Act and the amendment to Clause 4 would remove from the Board the authority to make regulations and would vest that authority to make regulations in the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett). What is the thinking behind taking it from the Board and giving it to the minister of Social Services? Why was it with the Board in the first place? Normally the regulations would be made by the minister. We do not find it strange that the change is being made, but why was it given to the Board in the first place, and why the change of thought?

MR. BRETT:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:  
It is a very valid question, Mr. Chairman, and I am afraid I cannot tell the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) why it was vested in the Board in the first instance. Obviously, as the hon. gentleman says, it should be the minister who would make the regulations, so we are changing it. It does not, of course, take away from the Board the opportunity to make recommendations to the minister or to the department. I do not know why it was like that in the first place. Obviously, you will not

find that in any other department where a board would have the authority to make the regulations.

I do not know why it was there in the first place, but it was incorrect and this is simply a matter of correcting it. The hon. member realizes, of course, that the Board will still be in a position to make recommendations.

On motion, Clause 4, carried.

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

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Preservation Of The Historic Resources Of The Province". (Bill No. 7).

On motion, Clause 1 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Shall Clause 2 carry?

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Why do we not contemplate some system of bringing in an incentive, as the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) suggested? I guess the example I raised of the astrolabe is the one that brought it home most obviously.

In the astrolabe case, I think the gentleman in question had the thing bouncing around in the back of his pick-up truck for a goodly period of time before he finally got an assessment of the historical significance and the value of the artifact.

Why do we not have some system in place which encourages divers, or others, not just those involved in offshore finds but onshore finds as well, to bring these matters to departmental officials? Why not put in place some form of recognition, possibly a system such as they have under the federal act.

I bring to the attention of the minister the fact that this has come up. He might have noticed it was reported in, I think, The Globe and Mail a couple of days ago, that an individual found certain, not archeological, but paleontology finds. A Canadian discovered possibly the oldest known remnant of the squid encased in a fossil. He brought it down to the United States to a show and sold it to a museum in the United States. It sold, I think, for around \$3,000. He ended up being fined when he got back to Canada for bringing that object out of Canada because it is something that should be in a museum in Canada. Now, as far as I can gather, the gentleman did it in good faith in that he was not aware that there was a procedure in place under federal legislation for getting an assessment of value and for giving the government the option of purchasing. Should we not have the same type of system under our legislation? Should we not have a system where there is a body available to look at an object, whether it is found on land or offshore, to assess its value and indicate whether there is any historical significance? Should not government then be put to the option of purchasing the item? Should there not be some form of objective arbitration for disputes if there is a dispute as to value?

It may be that individuals are not entitled to the full value of items found on wrecks, whatever about fossil finds, because there is a long history under the British common law and statute law, and also under the laws of other nations, which recognize originally the king had the right to receive all wrecks in his kingdom. And then, for a period of time, there was a great trafficking in those entitlements and the king would give out the right to collect wrecks to individuals, Dukes or Earls or commoners, who were prepared to pay a fee. You found that there was great wealth to be obtained from having the right to obtain the proceeds from wrecks.

We have a carry-over with respect to salvage, a similar type of system. The right of the Crown to wrecks was more complete than the right entitlements with respect to salvage matters. So it may very well be that individuals should not be entitled to receive the full value of items found on a wreck. I know government will have financial constraints in terms of the money that can be put up. I think we would all agree that it is not healthy to have a situation where, even though individuals should not be prepared to break the law - an individual should be prepared to be a good responsible citizen. Unfortunately, we all know that greed sometimes is a greater motivating factor than honour or respect or recognition. I think that the minister could do well to look at putting such a system in place.

I do not know if such a system exists for wrecks but there is for fossils, as we would gather from this recent case that has come up,

where under federal legislation the value of a find is evaluated and then the Crown has an option, to buy or let the individual sell to third parties, whether in the country or out. I think it would be well worth it, Mr. Speaker, if the minister would look at that particular thought in terms of improving this legislation that is now before the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Shall Clause 3 carry?

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:  
I would just like, Mr. Chairman, if I could, to just react to the remarks and suggestions of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. As I said very sincerely yesterday, I appreciate the comments as made by the three hon. members yesterday and this morning by the Leader of the Opposition. I think it has been a most useful exercise.

I would certainly just like to inform the hon. member that I will take his suggestion under advisement and go about doing some investigation as to procedures that are in place and how this whole act can be improved. I will certainly do that and deliberate and consider it very seriously. I would just like to say to him that if he has any further suggestions on any aspects of the bill that could be useful to us in its overall improvement, I would be most receptive to receiving them so that in the near future we can implement improvements if they indeed would be improvements. So

I certainly appreciate his remarks.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
The other thing that should be mentioned, Mr. Speaker, is that the minister and government is going to run into trouble with respect to merely designating buildings or sites as provincial historic sites and thereby preventing, for example, a person from building in the area or selling property. You are going to get into the same situation as a result of that Supreme Court of Canada case that I mentioned earlier with respect to the freezing of land.

The minister is going to have to tie in this process of preserving historic sites with a system of making sure that individuals are not shafted in the use of their properties.

I mentioned yesterday the example of a stone barn in Brigus that was at one time about to fall down. There is an interesting property out in Portugal Cove that I know an individual has inherited, and I guess it is the oldest house in the Cove. I forget the name of the property now but it is quite an extensive property up behind the community, looking out towards Bell Island. For that type of building, there should be some incentives available to maintain it. In many cases, what is done in other places is you see these areas tied in with commercial establishments, whether it be a little museum and a souvenir shop or whatever, but there has got to

be some mechanism from the department for funds becoming available to keep these buildings in a state of repair before they fall down. I think the owner of this one had some problems financially in getting the necessary money to keep a roof on the place. Once the roof goes on a building, the building itself is not going to last much longer.

I would like to ask the minister to look very carefully at doing more than is being done now in terms of seeing money provided for the maintenance of buildings such as this.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Mr. Chairman, again I would just like to thank the hon. member and tell him that we will certainly give very serious consideration to his suggestions and any other than he might have for improvements to the bill.

On motion, clauses (3) and (4), carried.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BARRY:  
This is an interesting one, this clause (5). I have written the minister a letter from a constituent on Bell Island who - and this was sometime ago so I can understand if the minister does not recall it - made a donation of

certain property, I am not sure it was to the Archives or to the Newfoundland Museum and, as will happen from time to time, the question arose as to whether the individual was entitled to the charitable deduction and, if so, how much. Does the minister recall that? This individual was completely ticked off by the very low value that was placed upon the object that he donated, or the records. I forget now exactly what it was. Has the minister given any thought in terms of the acquisition of gifts or bequest and making sure that there is an appropriate tax deduction? I know the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will fight you tooth and nail, hammer and tongs, he will claw and he will scratch, to keep every copper of taxes that he can. It is going to be up to the minister to wage an unholy battle against the Grinch who stole Christmas, who is going to try Mr. Speaker, to keep the largest amount of taxes payable as possible. But the minister will have a responsibility. The greater the tax credit that he can get for donors, the more donations the minister is going to see delivered for the benefit of the people of the Province. That is one form of incentive, money in peoples' pockets to save on their taxes, which will encourage them to donate family heirlooms that are lying around, that might not otherwise be made available to the museums of the Province. So I would ask the minister to look very closely at this notion.

On motion Clauses (5) through (10) carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Shall Clause (11) carry?

MR. BARRY:

Clause (11), Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

That is the one that says that title is vested in Her Majesty. It says, 'No person shall sell, etc.' It seems that here there should be some provision for compensation that would tie into this particular clause. We will approve it for now, but it would be on the understanding that the minister would take a look at getting a system in place for compensation.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall Clause (11) carry?

On motion Clause (11) carried.

On motion Clauses (12) and (13) carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall Clause (14) carry?

MR. BARRY:

Clause (14), Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

What is a provincial cultural property? Could the minister give us an example of what is contemplated with respect to a provincial cultural property? I think of the convent at Brigus, for example. Would that be cultural property or would that be a historic site, for example? It was one of the first places that you saw the Sisters of Mercy come in and start a very long and commendable career of providing music lessons and other cultural

pursuits for the people, and not just of Brigus, Conception Bay. What are the things the minister would contemplate under this section?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of properties and sites that we would be looking at under this kind of cultural properties. I think the one that the hon. member identified is certainly very, very much a cultural property. These are the kinds of things we are looking at in the Province, and the home that the hon. member for St. Barbe was born in.

MR. BARRY:

Oh definitely!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

The minister is aware that the Tablelands of the Gros Morne area on the Great Northern Peninsula is probably going to be designated an international heritage site.

MR. MATTHEWS:

International what?

MR. FUREY:

Heritage site. I wonder is the minister aware of that and what initiatives the Province is taking towards speeding that up?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of areas that we are looking at as international sites of very historic significance in the Province. We are in correspondence with the federal government and other federal agencies trying to push a number of these. Of course, we have had some problems with the minister in and out and one thing and another, but we will be following up on that very shortly as well.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

The reason being, of course, that the Tablelands, as I pointed out the other day, are the bowels of the earth. When the plates were shifting in the continental ice age, 600 billion years ago, the middle of the earth moved up top and that is what is called the devil's minerals. As a result, when you drive through there, it is almost like driving through Arizona during the Summer because all of the land of the Tableland is rust. It is like something out of a Western movie, to be quite honest. They are trying to look at that site, because of the historic significance of it, 600 billion years old, to initiate it as an international heritage site. I appreciate the minister's support and I am encouraged by it.

On motion, Clauses (14) through (37) carried.

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

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act." (Bill No. 10)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall Clause 1 carry?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked a question yesterday and I told him I would look into the matter and bring what information was available back to the Committee. That was in regard to the interest rate applied to premiums which are refunded to recipients, if they leave public service and therefore are not eligible for deferred pension benefits. The rate in the act is 5 per cent compounded. I should point out that up until 1977 that was 3 per cent simple and it was changed to 5 per cent compounded, which was quite a change, in 1977. It has not been changed since then but we have an actuarial study underway into all aspects of pension plans and that is one of the ones that will be looked at in that actuarial review. We will be getting that information in the near future. We have not undertaken to make any changes at this time because that would be wrapped in as part of the total actuarial review.

I should point out, though, that in comparison to what goes on in other jurisdictions, where the interest rates range from 4 per cent to 8 per cent, we are in the

middle range. I guess there are a couple of reasons the interest rates are not higher. One is because the premiums go in at various periods in time when interest rates may be very low. They may vary, obviously, but some of the premiums came in when interest rates, generally speaking, were very low. That is one reason.

The second reason, perhaps not a very good reason, is that these contributions are not looked upon as investments, strictly speaking. If you wanted to go and invest, I suppose you would put your money into something else. They are really put in from a pension point of view. That is probably not a very good reason, but that is the rationale that people dealing with pensions have used in setting interest rates.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Would the minister agree that right now government is making money on the pension funds, is able to borrow this money and utilize it rather than borrowing externally, which will cost 8 per cent or 9 per cent? What was the last bond issue interest rate?

DR. J. COLLINS:  
It depends on what market. If you are in foreign currencies you might be anywhere from 6 to 8 per cent, but if you are in dollars you are up around 10 per cent.

MR. BARRY:  
Basically, right now the minister, the Grinch, is making 5 per cent

on the money of the employees of this Province and is providing no service for this. That is horrendous. That is a scandal, is it not? Is the minister prepared to continue this rip off? Is the minister prepared to continue to take advantage of the employees of this Province?

They have been stuck with a wage freeze, so is this not adding insult to injury to have their pension fund being made available for the extravagant uses of the minister at this low interest rate?

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, with that attack, I was just wondering whether 'Grinch' was unparliamentary, but I will let that slide by. I might just point out that we do not borrow from our pension fund. Hon. members may remember that some time ago, in a very restricted way, we did borrow a very restricted amount, under very restricted circumstances.

The pension fund is invested by professionals on behalf of the Province and they work within certain guidelines applicable to the federal government pension fund. We do not borrow as a Province from our pension fund. As a matter of fact, by regulation we are restricted from borrowing for our own operating purposes from the pension fund.

I do have to point out though that the contributions to pensions do not satisfy the requirements of pension funds, so there have to be contributions by the employer. I

do not know if the Leader of the Opposition meant this or not - if he did mean it, he should not have meant it - when he said we are not giving back to the employees as much as they put in. Indeed, we are giving back much more than they put in because of our employer contributions on behalf of each employee in the pension fund schemes.

MR. BARRY:

A very weak explanation.

DR. COLLINS:

It was excellent.

On motion, clauses (1) and (2), carried.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order 7, Bill No. 19.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act, 1983". (Bill No. 19).

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, this is the Minister of Labour's bill, and at this stage we would like to move an amendment. The member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), who wished to move it, unfortunately had a doctor's appointment, I think, and could not make it. Where is the appropriate place to stick this in here? It would be on Clause 1, I think, because if we go to Clause 2 we are going to be past the section, just to keep the sections in order.

Mr. Chairman, we will wait and add another Clause 5 to the bill

before approval of the title.

On motion, Clause 1 and 2 carried

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall Clause 3 carry?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of Council

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, consequential on the information that the minister gave when he introduced the bill, I move that Clause 3 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted therefore: Clause would then read "Section 69 of the said act is amended by adding immediately after subsection (ii) the following: 'any periodic benefits relative to an injury that a worker is entitled to receive under the Canada Pension Act may be considered as wage that the worker is capable of earning in calculating the compensation to be paid by the Commission for the loss of earning capacity'."

I move that amendment and it is for the reasons already given in second reading by the hon. minister. The hon. minister will respond, of course.

MR. BARRY:

Did the minister give a reply to the Committee about 'On the expiration of twelve months from the date of commencement of the loss of earning capacity resulting from the injury,' which is what was in the original clause? Could the minister explain that?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. As I explained when I introduced it, the original bill, said, "On the expiration of twelve months." It was thought when that bill was drafted that Canada Pension Plan benefits only came into effect twelve months after an injury. There are a couple of ways you can get it, either by retirement or you can get benefits from an accident or an injury. We found out after this bill was drafted that they can antedate the payments and start from three or four months after the injury. So we took that out.

Also, toward the end of Clause 3, in the initial bill, it said, "In determining the surviving spouse's entitlement." We just want to make sure that the worker's benefits do not go beyond what he would be able to earn. We do not want to affect the surviving spouse's benefits, so that is altered to take care of that too.

On motion, amendment carried.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Chairman, we do not support the notion of reducing payments to Workers' Compensation recipients. They are small enough as they are. We will not be supporting the section to the extent that it has the effect of reducing Workers' Compensation payments. The minister indicated it could increase in some cases, or it could reduce. We would suggest the minister should go back and re-draft it so that an increase is

possible, a reduction is not.

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:  
No, it is not altering anything. In the administrative practice now it is taken for granted that you cannot earn more from an accident than you would earn in your regular earnings. Apart from the fact that there would be no incentive to rehabilitate a person back into the work force, nobody at the present time, because of a computer linkage between Canada Pension Plan payments and Workers' Compensation Commission payments, gets more than their previous pay, or they reduce it. That happens now, at the present time, and all we are doing is making it clear there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Shall Clause (4) carry?

MR. BARRY:  
Clause (4), Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Clause (4), Mr. Chairman, we note that there is a retroactive effect to this clause. However, we do not object to retroactive legislation which provides for benefits, Mr. Chairman. It says, "This section is deemed to have come into force on the first day of September, 1969 but applies only in relation to a worker" who was employed in fluorspar extraction. That is designed, I assume, to preserve the right of the St. Lawrence widows and so

forth. Is it? So it would preserve benefits rather than take away rights?

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Chairman, that was the time of the report, the investigation into all of the illness that occurred from working in that mine. The date of 1983 is mentioned there now. So it was anytime after the cessation of operations by Alcan and anytime prior to the operation of a new company.

On motion Clause (4) carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Shall the enacting clause carry?

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Before the enacting clause carries, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move, seconded by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), that the motion before the House be amended to add as Section 5 the following: 'The said act as amended by deleting Section 21', which gives the Workers' Compensation Board the right of appeal, by adding the following section, 'Section 21 (1) there is hereby constituted a tribunal to be known as the Workers' Compensation Appeals Tribunal.

(2) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall appoint a Chairman of the Appeals Tribunal, one or

more Vice-Chairmen of The Appeals Tribunal, and as many members of the Appeals Tribunal, equal in number, representative of employers and workers respectively as is considered appropriate.

(3) 'Subject to Section 22, which provides for an appeal to the Supreme Court on matters of jurisdiction or law, 'the Appeals Tribunal has exclusive jurisdiction to hear, determine and dispose of any matter or issue expressly conferred upon it by this act. All appeals from decisions, orders, or rulings of the Commission respecting the provision of health care vocational rehabilitation or entitlement to compensation or benefits under this Act; and (c) all appeals respecting assessments, penalties, or the transfer of costs.

(4) The Appeals Tribunal shall not hear, determine, or dispose of an appeal from a decision, order, or ruling of the Commission unless the procedures established by the Commission for consideration of issues respecting the matter mentioned in Clause (3) (b) or (c) have been exhausted and the Commission has made a final decision, order, or ruling thereon."

I will table that, Mr. Chairman. The affect of that would be to put the Workers' Compensation Appeals Tribunal in the position of being the final appeal, rather than having the Workers' Compensation Commission, as it is now, being the final appeal. It would require that before an appeal is taken to that tribunal, that any individual would go through the normal process of application, getting the initial decision, getting a hearing by the

Commission itself, and it would only be at that stage that the appeal would kick in. It is wording taken from the Ontario act. We did not include all the sections of the Ontario act that tie into this, which are housekeeping, as I mentioned, involving compensation and pensions and so forth, for the members of the tribunal. They are various technical matters. We wanted to keep it simple so that the principle would be clear.

We know the minister has expressed a positive response and we know that he is concerned about the numbers of complaints that are being received with respect to Workers' Compensation. We ask that he look seriously at this. The minister earlier said he is not sure that this is the complete answer. We would agree with the minister, this is not the complete answer but, Mr. Speaker, this would be a good first step, and if the minister is going to bring in other changes, we commend him for looking at the whole system and will support him in changes to improve the system. But we would sincerely suggest to him that this would be a good, positive first step to take. It would give a lot of people out there now who have lost faith in the system some assurance that there will be an objective, independent body looking at their problems as they occur from time to time.

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Chairman, in my remarks yesterday in closing the debate, I addressed that particular

question, but I want to thank the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I am sure he is sincere about this and well-meaning about it. I thank him for bringing it out.

I want to say also that I am not against that type of an amendment. I am not satisfied with the appeal process right now and I do not think anybody on this side of the House is entirely satisfied with the appeal process. The only thing I am saying is that we do plan, under a provision in Section 114 of the Workers' Compensation Act, for a committee to be established to review not only the act, but to broaden the terms of reference of that committee and have them look at, also, the administrative practices. Largely, there is a feeling among the people who have complained to me about it, that perhaps it is largely administration of the act and regulations that is causing the problem.

I see the Leader of the Opposition shaking his head and I do not disagree with his feeling about this. We are very well-intentioned, very well-meaning with respect to the idea of having an external appeal. I guess, I am saying - and I gave you an example yesterday - that, as you know, external appeals are very new in Canada. Up until just a short while ago, there was no provision in any Province for an external appeal. In one of the provinces where they have introduced it, they found five or six months after they introduced that amendment that they had a backlog of something like 1,500 cases.

MR. BARRY:

There must have been a need for it then.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Obviously, but the thing was brand new and as soon as it came in, everybody said, "Well, I am going to appeal my case. I have nothing to lose." I am not suggesting there is anything wrong with that, but I do not want to say to a worker who has been unfortunate enough to suffer an accident in the course of his employment, "Look, we are putting in something for you here that is going to give you some help out of this." We want to make sure that it works. I am not certain that, taken out of context, that kind of an amendment is the answer to it.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure exactly what is going on here. Let me just review a little bit. Our amendment calls for an independent appeals tribunal so that the same people handling the case in the first place are not handling the appeal. I think that is kind of the idea behind it.

Secondly, the minister has indicated that there is in the act itself provision for a committee to be set up that kind of handles part of the duties of this tribunal that we are suggesting. Is that correct?

MR. BLANCHARD:

No, that is not correct. Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Labour on

a point of order.

MR. BLANCHARD:

I just want to explain, if you understood that from me, that is not accurate. The committee that is provided for is under Section 114, subsection (2), in The Workers' Compensation Act. The provision is for a committee to be set up, once in every five years to review the legislation and also review any administrative or policy matters of the board that are not working. It has nothing to do with the appeal thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

I thank the minister for his explanation. I think that there was one thing that he said that perhaps may be a little misleading. I think that Section 114 says that the Committee may be set up within a five year period and not set up at the end of five years. The point I would like to make with regard to that, Mr. Chairman, is as follows:

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), who was deputy minister before he became Minister of Labour, has some responsibility in this regard and had some responsibility to set up this committee to review the legislation over the past four and a half years. One of my points is this: if we accept the fact that the minister says that there is a real problem, he also said he does not like to see people not perceived to be receiving fair treatment. I think he said that the process was felt not to be fair because the people who made the original decision would then rule on the appeal. He mentioned the word "fairness". This is my

problem with it: if, in fact, this was the minister's perception, and obviously was while he was deputy minister, how come this particular section has not been invoked before now? How come there has not been a review of the legislation pertaining to this one particular point?

That leads me to what I started with. I am not quite clear on what is going on here. I think what the minister is saying is that they are not going to support our amendment. He has never actually said that but I think the gist of his comments is that members opposite are not going to support our amendment. The reason given is that where it was tried in other provinces there was a big backlog of cases. I think that is what I hear the minister saying.

I am wondering is this an instance where, simply for partisan reasons, that members opposite really are not willing to accept a good solid, sound, suggestion or an amendment made by the Opposition, simply because it is made by the Opposition. This is the question that crosses my mind. I know that the minister has said he is concerned, that he recognizes the problem, but again I go back to the fact that the committee process existed before. If the concern was there that this particular part of the legislation was unjust, if there was a real concern, it should have been dealt with through this process, if, in fact, the process can do it.

I am wondering why that process has not been invoked before; if it has, why was the legislation not changed to take care of the minister's concerns, the minister who was deputy minister before; and if in fact the non-support of

our amendment is simply because it is coming from this side?

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Chairman, there are two or three points that the hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) has raised here. Number one, he asked why the committee has not been established before. I would like to tell you that since the original act was introduced in 1950, as a matter of fact there has been a committee struck every four to five years. As the Act says, "Shall at least once in every five years from the commencement of the act," so there has been a review every four or five years and recommendations have been made. We have given effect to many of the recommendations. The last time the Committee reviewed just mainly the act and they did not really go into any depth of a review of the policies and procedures. Now we are saying that within the framework of that section we are going to expand the terms of reference of that Committee that we will be establishing. I mentioned yesterday, in closing the debate, that I was going to be taking this matter up with my Cabinet colleagues in a matter of a couple of weeks.

The other thing is it is not because the amendment is coming from the opposite side of the House that we do not think it ought to be done. Your amendment may come out in the final analysis to be the way that you have suggested it because, as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition said,

he has taken it practically verbatim, I think, from the Ontario act. Now, Ontario's experience is brand new. They have just brought in the process of an outside appeal. There are very few provinces which have it. The majority of provinces still do not have it. We are all looking at it. We are not waiting for any other province to move on it.

I repeat once more that I would not want the workers of this Province to think that they will have to continue to go to the same people. As a matter of fact, as an internal policy, since I have become minister, I have discussed with the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Commission that idea that he not have the same faces, even while it is as it is now. When the hearing takes place, which is provided for under the act, one of the commissioners will Chair the panel, the hearing, that is being held. If in fact there is going to be an appeal from that final ruling, then a different commissioner and perhaps one of the executive directors in the Worker's Compensation Commission would sit on it.

So, I am personally monitoring the thing very, very carefully. I just simply think that the amendment would kind of take out of context what is being planned within the framework of section 114.

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BAKER:  
I just want a very brief comment further to my reason for suspecting that, because it is

coming from this side, maybe that is the reason it is being rejected. I am not questioning the minister's sincerity, let me get that straight right away. What gave me the impression really was a comment made by the Premier yesterday.

It seemed to be a very unusual kind of thing, where the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), believe, or the Leader of the Opposition - I forget which person now - was talking about the amendment and happened to mention that this amendment was pretty much like the situation in Ontario and what has been done there. Right away the thing that was shot back was, "We are doing it in Newfoundland. We are not going to follow Ontario," and this kind of thing. It seemed to me to be a very shallow response to a serious situation where the Premier of the Province says that, in effect, it does not really matter whether this amendment is good or not that he does not want to follow Ontario's lead in anything. This was the impression, Mr. Minister that was given yesterday in the debate. It was completely out of tone with the rest of what was going on here. It seemed to be a good discussion, a good airing of the situation up until that point where the Premier somehow saw fit to interject himself and again brought it to the level of petty politics. That really concerned me and I just wanted to give this explanation as to why I considered that there may be some petty little, partisan political thing going on here but not from the point of view of the minister.

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anybody on this side needs to explain a comment by the Premier. But I think this deserves an explanation because the Premier simply stated that because Ontario does it does not mean it is necessarily the best. We said the same thing, and I think it was taken in the wrong context when we talked about the ILO thing. We said we would look at it for the best way to improve upon it. Just because Ontario did it or somebody else did it, does not mean that it is best. I said to you that Ontario just very recently brought in the idea of an outside appeal, and I think that is what the Premier's comment arose from. The Premier is very concerned about this, too. I personally discussed it with him since I have been minister. We are all concerned about it. Your point is well taken, but I think that should explain what was said.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall the amendment carry?

MR. FLIGHT:

No, Mr. Chairman, the amendment shall not carry yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the minister is not taking the opportunity to accept this amendment and wipe out what has got to be one of the silliest things that is happening with regards to the Workers' Compensation Board. He talks about sending new faces out to represent people on the Appeal

Board. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to take the minister through a scenario that makes a member of the House of Assembly feel silly, let alone the injured worker.

I have had, in the past six months, three or four cases where the Workers' Compensation Board turned down an application for compensation, or disrupted the compensation pay to workers, or reduced it, or refused rehabilitation - any number of things that in the workers' mind left the feeling that they were unfairly treated. So I went, as the member, to the Workers' Compensation Board and I outlined the case using the same facts as the worker would do when he finally appealed the decision.

Mr. Chairman, I found myself representing that worker at an appeal hearing in Grand Falls. I knocked on the hotel door of the Mount Peyton, and who opened the door? The member of the Board whom I had spent three months dealing with back and forth over the telephone and sending written correspondence to.

Mr. Chairman, I realized the futility of the operation, but the worker did not realize the futility of the operation. I could have taken time to explain to him how stupid and how silly and ridiculous and actually hypocritical this process was about to be, because I knew the worker had been put in a position to drive sixty or seventy miles. It cost the Workers' Compensation Board a fair amount of dollars to send that member of the Board to Grand Falls, house him in Mount Peyton and probably house him on his way back in Gander, knowing when he left St. John's he was going to take the same attitude in

that appeal in Grand Falls as he took when he made the decision in St. John's. I will tell the minister this, and it may or may not be important, but I have sat to date on five or six appeals and not one of those appeals was successful in the sense that it changed the original decision - not one. There is no way, Mr. Speaker. I am amazed that the minister is not taking action now to get out of that silly situation by accepting this amendment and permitting an appeal process that is quite independent of the Workers' Compensation Board and independent of the people who made the decision in the first place.

It is ludicrous to think that a member of the Workers' Compensation Board, having been involved in the original decision, had set out before him all the facts relating to that particular worker, will then come to Grand Falls and change his own decision. There are blind spots there, Mr. Chairman. When a member of the Workers' Compensation Board finds himself acting for the board in an appeal process, there is a blind spot, there is a desire to support and uphold the original decision of the Workers' Compensation Board. It is grossly unfair, it is unfair to the workers and it is hypocritical.

There is another fact, Mr. Chairman, that has been bothering me for some time. The process is publicized as an appeal board. I have seen case after case where one member of that board, with no support staff, comes in and sits and hears an appeal. How can that be construed as an appeal board? It is a dictatorial situation where that particular member has nobody there to say, "Let us

reconsider this point or that point."

Mr. Speaker, if the minister does not accept this amendment, then I find it difficult to believe that he does indeed question the system. He stood here for five minutes and he indicated that he was concerned with the process that he had problems with it, that he was going to look at changing it. I find it difficult to accept his sincerity in that. If that is the way he feels, here is his chance. It is a simple amendment. It is not politically based. The minister should accept this amendment and wipe out the unfairness and hypocrisy that he is permitting in the Workers' Compensation Board, to the detriment of the worker in this Province.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, if I could just for a few moments.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I have listened to the minister and the minister is giving the government position with respect to this proposed amendment. What the minister is quite clearly saying is that nothing is carved in stone; that the minister is going to take that under advisement; and that there is a committee being set up to look at these things which will assess all aspects of this particular issue including remarks that have been made by the hon. gentlemen there, opposite. But the government is not prepared to make an amendment of this nature at this particular time without having it fully and absolutely assessed.

I can tell the hon. gentlemen there opposite, as the minister has already done, that when a committee is set up certainly their views will be taken into account. I do not want to incite the hon. gentleman, we can talk to Doomsday about this, but the government at this particular time is not going to pass it, but will take into consideration the remarks that have been passed.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
On the attitude that is being taken on this bill, I appreciate the position that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) finds himself in. He wants to close her down, at the same time he wants to be nasty, which is typical of him.

MR. MARSHALL:  
I cannot avoid that.

MR. TULK:  
No, you cannot avoid that. I will tell you something else that this government cannot avoid and that is the hypocritical stance that they take on certain issues. I have to tell the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), as well-intentioned as he might be, that I believe that his stance on this amendment is full of hypocrisy. His stand is full of hypocrisy. He gets up and he sympathizes after having all those cases pointed out to him - I have another load of them here which I could go through one by one by one - after our going through all those cases of hardship and injustice being carried out today in the appeal process -

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Now, take care. If we had no problem, there would be no committee.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Chairman, try to keep old soccer balls quiet there.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
You should not have been down at the hotel so late last night.

MR. TULK:  
I would like to have the hon. gentleman over there quiet. I have to tell the hon. gentleman that his stance is totally full of hypocrisy. He knows the problems are there, he admits that. He stands in this House and admits that he knows the problems are there, he has known that for years, but the two reasons he gives for not accepting this amendment are not at all what the Government House Leader said, that they are going to put it into Committee. Those are not his reasons at all. He says, "This is only a band-aid." Well, I have to tell him that if you are bleeding to death, a band-aid can stop you from bleeding to death on certain occasions.

His other reason is that he is somehow going to put it into a Committee later on and he is afraid that he is going to get a large number of people coming back looking for justice. That is what he is afraid of. He is afraid he is going to get swamped. He is afraid the Appeal Board will be swamped. So he says, "No, we cannot take this amendment. Somewhere down the road we are going to set up an appeal procedure."

I want to ask him a question. I hold in my hand here a letter from

the Workers' Compensation Board dealing with a certain Mr. Collett from Carmanville whom the Workers' Compensation Board tried to force into hospital for treatment for an injury where he had a fifty/fifty chance of being paralyzed or not being paralyzed. He choose another method of medical treatment for his back problem. He had a brace prescribed for his back. Consequently, his back is better, he is back working, but the Workers' Compensation Board - the tribunal, the appeal people - they refuse to give him Workers' Compensation for the time that he was under a different kind of treatment, so he would have to take their treatment or none at all.

How is the minister going to explain to that man that he is going to wait a little while longer to see that an appeal procedure, where he can get some justice, is put in place? How is he going to explain to that gentleman, even if he is one of 10,000, that he has no right to an appeal process right now, today?

If the minister's stance is not full of hypocrisy, what is it? It is full of hypocrisy, the whole stance that is being taken by the other side. It may very well be an issue which could be debated and probably should be debated for the next five or six days until the minister gives in and stops playing politics, stops being led by that fellow over there, who will play politics with anything.

MR. WARREN:

Get ahold on yourself, boy. Sit down.

MR. TULK:

Old Snuggles is at it again. He is being led by that gentleman

over there, who will do anything politically, and he is really not concerned about whether people in Newfoundland get justice under the Workers' Compensation Act or not. He is not concerned about it at all.

MR. WARREN:

You are making a fool of yourself.

MR. SIMMONS:

Would the member permit a question?

MR. TULK:

Yes.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Chairman, about my friend from Torngat, just to put a quick question to my colleague, does he know what you would call a stuffed toy that has a diaper at both ends?

MR. TULK:

Is it called the Warren doll or the Garfield doll?

In any case, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister to stand in his place and to tell his colleague that this is a very worthwhile amendment." We may have to change it later on. We may have to do something else with it but at least the band-aid could stop the flow of blood, and I would ask him to accept the amendment and to encourage his colleagues to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Carried! Carried!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, did you not announce that that amendment was carried?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. TULK:

Yes, Hansard will show.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

On division.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, you do not have division in Committee and the hon. gentlemen do not rule the roost. If the hon. gentlemen want to they can say, 'Have it noted it is on division' but you do not have division in Committee. Those experienced parliamentarians over there, we will have to move them next time so we can get some sense into the House.

MR. BARRY:

We have an enlightened Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

'The same procedure for a division in the House shall be followed in Committee of the Whole.'

Call in the members.

### Division

MR. CHAIRMAN:

All those in favour of the amendment please rise:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Flight, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Callan, The hon. Mr. Simmons, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Baker, Mr. Furey, Mr. Decker.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

All those against the amendment please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms),

the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell), the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), Mr. Baird, Mr. Hickey, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Reid, Mr. Tobin, the hon. the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt), Mr. Hodder, Mr. Warren, Mr. Mitchell.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

There are eleven for the amendment and twenty-three against.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 19 with amendment, carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bills Nos. 7, 10, and

18 passed without amendment, and Bill No. 19 with amendment, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, amendment ordered read a first and second time.

On motion, amendment read a first and second time, bill ordered read a third time, presently, by leave.

On motion, the following bills were read a third time, ordered passed and their titles be as on the Order Paper.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act". (Bill No. 19).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Day Care And Homemaker Services Act, 1975". (Bill No. 18).

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Preservation Of The Historic Resources Of The Province". (Bill No. 7).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act". (Bill No. 10).

Adjourned debate on second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Housing Corporation Act". (Bill No. 20).

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker, most of the points which needed to be made on this bill were made yesterday, so the minister only has to answer most of the concerns we have. I just want to say to the minister that

we have a big concentration of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing units in my district, and in the adjoining town of Grand Falls. We are aware of the blessings, but we are very well aware of the shortcomings, Mr. Speaker, and our biggest concern is the way the committee system has gotten off the tracks, the committee for selection is no longer working.

We are having meetings with only one member of that Committee attending, we are finding that most of the allocations are not based on the sole advice of an employee of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. There is evidence that the allocation, itself, is no longer based on need, it may well be based on the attitudes of an employee of the Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to prolong the debate, but we had a perfect example in St. John's week or two ago when Newfoundland and Labrador Housing refused to allocate a house to a family whose house had burned down because they had no fixed address.

I am running into that sort of thing constantly - not the same nature - and there is great frustration, there is great suffering by people who desperately need houses. They feel they are not being listened to, or heard, by their representatives in the regional offices of the Housing Corporation. The regional offices have evolved into little empires. As the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) said publicly a few days ago, there does not appear to be any sense of management in the regional office in Grand Falls and people seeking houses find themselves at the mercy of

person, an employee of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, who, if he does not like your attitude, if he does not like the way you present your application, if he does not like the fact that you complained because you are not being well treated, you will never get a house.

That is basically all I have to say, Mr. Speaker. I would like to hear the minister comment on some of the concerns we have raised and, further, I would like him to follow through on the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands' recommendation that the regional offices be looked at - there is no sense of management in those offices - and that management and leadership will be provided by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the main import of the amendment to the Act has been outlined very adequately by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

To answer some of the concerns expressed by the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), I concur with what the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands said with respect to management in the regional offices. Of course, the hon. member knows that up to a very short time ago there was no regional office in Grand Falls. We have corrected that situation now. Grand Falls has been moved up to the status of a full

regional office. It will have a regional manager in place in a very short order.

With respect to the case which was brought to public attention, the case of the lady down in the East End of St. John's who had the unfortunate circumstance of having her house burn down, she approached the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation on November 19, she was allocated a unit on November 21, which was the quickest time in which we could get a Tenant Selection Committee in place, and it took something like two days to get an allocation. Fortunately, or unfortunately, the lady misunderstood what was said to her over in the office. Arrangements were being made by her sister for her to live in her sister's unit, which is also a Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation unit.

There is a policy in place with respect to who lives in a unit. If you assign a unit of two bedrooms to a family, then you cannot have three or four families in that unit. There was a misunderstanding there. That was corrected by myself, personally, and the lady has been looked after. She did not accept the unit which was assigned to her because of the problem with her two children getting back and forth to school. She will be living with her sister, in the unit which her sister is in now, and she will be assigned one in the location she wants and requires so that her children can go to St. Joseph's School. That situation has been looked after to her satisfaction and, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, everything with respect to that case has been handled since that information was made public on CBC Radio here in

St. John's. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Housing Corporation Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, presently, by leave. (Bill No. 20).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act". (Bill No. 40).

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, the Province is party to the tax collection agreement with the federal government. That means that our Income Tax Act has to be in conformity with the federal Tax Act, so this bill is introduced regularly. When the feds change their act, we have to come along and just bring an amendment to make ours continues that conformity. If we do not do that, of course, we will be in violation of the Tax Collection Agreement, which works much to our benefit, so, obviously, it is in the best interest of the Province to do this. I move second reading.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Oh, no! We have here, Mr. Speaker, about the only thing on the Order Paper which gives us a chance to debate the fundamental issue before this Province today,

which is the necessity of reducing taxes.

DR. COLLINS:  
There are finance bills on the Order Paper.

MR. BARRY:  
Yes, there are finance bills, but we do not know when they are coming up. This is one, Mr. Speaker, which is going to require a certain amount of debate. It is going to raise certain fundamental issues, such as what should be done in terms of job creation through stimulation of the economy.

We are going to have to get into the question of why is it that the Province has gone meekly along behind the Tory government in Ottawa which has reduced capital gains, Mr. Speaker, given \$500,000 lifetime allowance for capital gains, which is a reduction of tax for the rich and the rich only. Why is our government meekly following along behind this?

The Province of Ontario, the Liberal administration of the Province, Mr. Speaker, has indicated that it is going to take up the room that has been provided.

DR. COLLINS:  
It may take up.

MR. BARRY:  
Yes, it is looking very closely at taking up the tax room that has been provided by this reduction in tax by the federal government. It would suggest very strongly to the minister that that is the one area where a reduction in tax is not necessary, Mr. Speaker. Economists have pointed out that a reduction in the capital gains tax does not ensure the creation of jobs. All it does is ensure

speculation in land, it ensures speculation in the stock market, but it does not ensure the type of investment that we need here in this Province in order to create jobs.

During the last election, Mr. Speaker, I think it is generally accepted that we developed a pretty good momentum during that campaign, and we have to say, Mr. Speaker, that our plan for stimulating the economy was a very important element in the development of that momentum, a momentum that in a few more days would have seen our forming the government. Do members opposite know how close they came to being turfed out? They do not realize. Switching, 1,631 votes, Mr. Speaker, in twelve districts would have done it. That would have given us twenty-seven seats. The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) just turned white, he did not realize how close it was. By the way, these 1,631 votes plus have now been gathered since the election campaign.

MR. SIMMS:

I like the timing you used.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, the timing was a little bit off, Mr. Speaker, it was a little bit off. It took us a little while, Mr. Speaker, to get the roll started, but a big part of the roll that was started, a big part of building up that momentum was our plan for the stimulation of the economy by the reduction of taxes in this Province, not the reduction of capital gains tax, the tax for the rich, but by the reduction of the retail sales tax.

Mr. Speaker, I can say that that is an idea that grabbed the imagination of the people of the

Province. We have already had an admission, Mr. Speaker, by the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), when he came in the other day with this great, "Hurrah, hurrah! Praise me, praise me, praise me! Look at what my department has done for crafts in this Province. We have tremendously increased the sale of crafts in this Province." How, Mr. Speaker? How did he tremendously increase the sale of crafts in this Province? Was it by increasing the taxes? Was it by reducing the capital gains tax? Mr. Speaker, it was by doing what we had recommended for all sectors of the economy during the last election, reducing the retail sales tax.

Mr. Speaker, it is really government cutting off its nose to spite its face now. They have seen how effective that idea can be but because, as the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) pointed out earlier this morning, because it is an Opposition idea, they are stubborn. They refuse to accept that this is what has to be done, and it is about the only thing left for members opposite to do. They have lost their credibility, by and large, so the moral suasion that they could have exerted, the creation of a general economic attitude that welcomed the development of business in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that is gone.

By the way, I have to make a note now I think of it, in terms of welcoming business in this Province, we have a few incidents where the Department of Development, despite the minister's speeches down in New York, Mr. Speaker, has missed out in terms of going out and dealing

with businesses that could be encouraged to locate in this Province. They missed the boat. They were not even contacted. We know of companies, Mr. Speaker, that are prepared to locate here that did not even get a contact by the minister when they publicly made it known that they were looking for sites to locate.

I am getting off the track here. I want to get back on my first issue, the stimulation of the economy by reducing taxes that can see the economy of this Province turned around. We get a slight clue that the Premier is having to reassess his own philosophy in this area. He is having to reassess his own approach, when we see him, after the First Ministers' Conference say, "I think that the deficit reduction has to be slowed down. We have to go more slowly in terms of reducing the deficit." Remember, his line all along has been restraint, restraint, restraint, cut spending, cut spending. The effect of that, of course, is an economy that is ever shrinking, contracting.

He is finally starting to get the glimmer that that is not the way to go for this Province, that this Province does not need cutbacks in spending, Mr. Speaker, that this Province needs additional spending to put money in consumers' pockets, Mr. Speaker, so that they have something to spend. They will go out and use the money that they will have in their pockets from reducing retail sales tax, and they will purchase consumer goods, they will buy cars, they will buy trucks, and they will build homes. Yes, and the member for Grand Falls I noticed started to nod very quickly when I mentioned buying cars and trucks.

I am happy to see he recognizes -

MR. BAIRD:

He is not the member for Grand Falls.

MR. BARRY:

I am sorry, the member for Haystack. The member for Burgeo Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert), out of Haystack in Grand Falls, I see him nodding and agreeing that, yes, this would be a good thing.

DR. COLLINS:

Would the hon. member permit question?

MR. BARRY:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Has the hon. member ever calculated what the gains from such cutbacks on taxes on cars would mean to Newfoundland. In other words, our automobile manufacturing industries, how much stimulus do they get from that?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not, despite my interest in ensuring that the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) continues to have that highly successful business of his, I would not point to the car industry as the one that is going to make the significant difference in job creation in Newfoundland. I am just starting my list, Mr. Speaker - but it is in the area of giving people money in their

pockets where they can go out and they can buy, Mr. Speaker, the few things that are still being manufactured in this Province. Heaven knows members opposite have done their thing, to a large extent, to discourage manufacturing, to drive away manufactures in this Province.

The free trade issue, by the way, is another item that we are going to have to deal with here. The free trade issue has put a great cloud over our manufacturing industries. They are very concerned with what might happen, Mr. Speaker, to our manufacturing industries.

For example, the brewers' industry has expressed grave concern that the competition from the U.S., if free trade comes in, is going to wipe out local breweries. While I am on that, and before I forget, I wonder if the minister could make a note to tell us why it is that he has given the order that local beer will not be sold in the liquor stores in this Province, that all that is available is U.S. beer?

Presumably it is because he wants to get rid of that stock that the Liquor Corporation purchased. Well, Mr. Speaker, the consumers of this Province are entitled to have a choice available. Put both in the liquor stores! Christmas is coming up. I know nobody in this House takes a beer or a drink, but there are still a few people out there who like to have a beer over Christmas and they prefer to buy local. They would prefer, Mr. Speaker, to buy local. They would prefer to support local industry. Instead of that, the Grinch who stole Christmas, once again is now trying to keep the bottle of local

beer out of the mouths of the consumers of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, this is an arbitrary and high-handed tactic by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to instruct the Liquor Corporation to keep local beer out of liquor stores. The minister is going to get up and say, "Oh, no, it is not my decision, it is the Liquor Corporation's decision itself." I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, then it is the duty of the minister to give instructions to the Liquor Corporation to change that decision and get local beer into our liquor stores over Christmas. It is bad enough, Mr. Speaker, to have the brewing industry being threatened by free trade, but we do not need government preventing the purchase of local products for its own financial reasons.

Mr. Speaker, we have yet to receive an answer from the minister as to how much the coffers of this Province have been improved by the beer strike. The minister gave a very sly answer as to how much money had been transferred from the Liquor Corporation to the Department of Finance, but he did not say how much was left there in the kitty. He said it was about the same, the amount that is being transferred. He has told the corporation, "I do not want to see a dollar of your ill-gotten, strike-breaking gains until after this fiscal year or until after this session of the House, anyhow, is closed."

So we will see, Mr. Speaker, a large, lump sum transfer, once the House closes, coming from the Liquor Corporation to the Grinch and he will not then have to include that in the answers that he has given to members of this

House. We are on to these little tactics of the minister because we have seen them before.

IF I could get back, Mr. Speaker, to this concept of economic stimulation through tax reduction, for heavens sake, why will the minister not look at reducing the retail sales tax in this Province? What a Christmas present he could deliver to the consumers of this Province and what a shot in the arm he could provide for the economy by doing this! The minister knows that the Newfoundland economy has been battered over this Summer by a poor inshore fishery. We have seen, Mr. Speaker, a loss of dollars from the pockets of our fishermen and our plants workers. We have seen, Mr. Speaker, the economy of our Province not take off as has been the case in other provinces. We have seen in other provinces the end to the recession already. The recession has ended, Mr. Speaker, and their economies have taken off, but not here, not in Newfoundland, and, to a large extent, we know it is because of the wet blanket of this administration, Mr. Speaker. The cold hand of the Minister of Finance and the Premier, has chilled the economy of this Province.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have to, before this session of the House closes, focus on job creation, which is one of the clearest examples of government neglect that we can bring forward right now in this House.

Government, despite going into the last election to seek a mandate to create job -

MR. WARREN:

Who won the last election?

MR. BARRY:

We did, Mr. Speaker, absolutely no doubt about that. There is absolutely no doubt about who won the last election. It is just that it will take, Mr. Speaker, a little more time for us to take the benefits of that.

The decision of the people of this Province has been made. Now there is an interregnum, Mr. Speaker, while members opposite are going to be given the opportunity to get their affairs in order. It is like having received a notice of execution. The people of the Province said "It is not fair, it is not right, it is unkind, it would be too cruel, Mr. Speaker, to wipe these members out before they are given the chance to get their souls in order, to get their consciences clear." So there is that brief period that follows after an execution order. The condemned person is given the opportunity to get his or her affairs in order both spiritual and physical material.

That is what the people of this Province have done as far as members opposite are concerned they have put them on notice. The condemnation order, Mr. Speaker, has been issued but the people of the Province decided that they would like to provide a little period to permit members opposite to get their affairs in order.

We have seen little indication, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite are doing so. Regrettably, we have seen the same complacency in effect as has been there, Mr. Speaker, basically since - I was going to say '79 but while I was there there was still a little bit

of spark on the other side, Mr. Speaker - so it has to be since 1981 that we have seen this period of constant complacency.

MR. WARREN:

You are wasting time.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there are members opposite whom we hear now squawking from the back benches on the other side from time to time who were in complete agreement, Mr. Speaker, with this position as of a year ago. They, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, have gotten up in this House and taken exactly the same position, have pointed out the lack of job creation, Mr. Speaker, the lack of economic stimulation.

MR. WARREN:

You are wasting time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, one of the diapered ends is making a noise.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, if I could continue this very interesting and informative debate with silence from the other side.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has asked for silence.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have received information that there are certain companies which could be attracted here. For example. Litton Industries, has in process a decision to locate somewhere in Canada for the manufacturing of certain items. We understand, Mr. Speaker, that there has been no

approach by the Department of Development of this Province to that company.

MR. EFFORD:

Do we have a Department of Development?

MR. FUREY:

Yes, it is called the Grey Cup department.

MR. BARRY:

Well, they changed the name. Right now it is the Department of Development and Tourism - a rose is a rose is a rose.

Mr. Speaker, we understand that there are companies, such as Litton Industries, which could be attracted here. Now, there are car plant companies as well, like the Hyundai plant that went to Quebec. The Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) obviously decided there are certain things that would be reaching for the stars, that it would not be possible for his powers of persuasion to entice to this Province.

Mr. Speaker, maybe that is so with respect to car plants, but I am not convinced. We have seen the Volvo plant located in Nova Scotia, in Dartmouth. I understand that it seems to be going along very well. It is a job creator in that Province. Where were members opposite, Mr. Speaker, when we had this opportunity of attracting the Hyundai plant? I think Honda or Toyota is also indicating that it wants to locate to Canada. Have there been any approaches made? Not an approach, Mr. Speaker, to Litton Industries either.

Here is a dandy, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite may not know,

although we have copied the Premier, I think, on this, but the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) and myself had to bring to the attention of the Newfoundland minister the fact there is going to be a move for the Sea Cadet Training Base. This is not a manufacturing thing, but it is another job creator. There is going to be a move of the Sea Cadet Training Base, which I think is now in the Cornwallis Base in Nova Scotia. Because they do not have enough room where they are, Mr. Speaker, they are going to move.

We have suggested to the Newfoundland minister (Mr. Crosbie) in the federal Cabinet that that is something which this Province should go after, which ties in with our marine heritage, and ties in with our emphasis upon things marine, things nautical. Mr. Speaker, we are the only Province in Atlantic Canada that does not have a cadet training centre or that type of military installation. With the unemployment on the Port au Port Peninsula, I would have thought that other members of this House would have taken the same approach that the member for Stephenville took where he wrote the Newfoundland minister in the Cabinet and said, "Look, here is the Stephenville Base, an ideal location for such a naval training facility." Mr. Speaker, I have to say we received a very positive response back from the Newfoundland minister in the federal Cabinet. We are hopeful that Newfoundland will get its fair share of the defense dollar in this instance because we know further, Mr. Speaker - let us share this with members of this House - that there are members of the military who are very

sympathetic to such a move to the Province.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the percentage of naval cadets, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir has information of that -

MR. GILBERT:

Seventy-one per cent of the sea cadets from Atlantic Canada come from this Province.

MR. BARRY:

- seventy-one per cent of the sea cadets from Atlantic Canada come from this Province, Mr. Speaker. Should not that statistic in itself be justification for moving such a base, such an installation to this Province? The move has to be made, Mr. Speaker. I am mentioning this just as an example of the lack of initiative by members opposite in terms of attracting jobs to this Province.

Time after time we see opportunities develop. We see them on the mainland or in other nations with indications that companies are seeking around for sites where they might locate.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The Stephenville free trade zone might be used by Hyundai.

MR. BARRY:

Yes. The member for Stephenville has suggested that the Stephenville free trade zone concept might be employed by the Hyundai plant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

What did we see from member opposite? We see how much interest there is in job creation when we have three members in the

House and two lally-lags leaning in the doorway, Mr. Speaker, on the other side. That is the extent of the interest in job creation. You mention jobs and members opposite head for the hills. That is why they are trying to get out of this House, Mr. Speaker, because they know that this greivous failure on their part is going to be brought home to the people of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention to the Government House Leader that we are going to need an extended debate on job creation. We are not going to consent to the closure of the House today because we have not yet dealt with this issue in this session. We have been waiting for government to bring forth measures to show action with respect to job creation. We could not believe, Mr. Speaker, as we saw bill after bill coming up that the latest job creator is the bill to increase the number of Queens Counsel from three to five. That is the type of dramatic job creation initiative that we see from members opposite. Even, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the make-work projects, the incompetence of members opposite becomes clear when, first of all, members on this side of House since August have been pointing out that there was a failure of the inshore fishery which required action and attention. You know what the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies said on television the other night, Mr. Speaker? I am sure Your Honour was as shocked as I was, riveted to the television set when that statement was made. "We learned in October," the minister said, "that things were not moving quickly enough, that there was a delay." Mr. Speaker, Your Honour

knows that the fishermen of this Province, through the Liberal Inshore Caucus Committee set up by this side of the House, have communicated to the minister and to the government the urgency of getting these programmes moving. If the minister had started to act in August, we would not be looking at what we are looking at today, where even though there have finally, after much delay, been approvals, there is still no money flowing. The cash is not moving because there are administrative details which the minister has not yet worked out, which members opposite have not dealt with.

Never, Mr. Speaker, I would say, has there been such a show of incompetence and neglect as there has been with respect to politicians dealing with so-called buddies and friends in Ottawa - a great era of consultation and co-operation - seeing close ties, seeing immediate access to minister's offices and to the Prime Minister's office, or so we were led to believe. Why then, Mr. Speaker, has this infliction of prosperity taken so long?

You know something? The infliction of prosperity is like the death of 1,000 cuts, Mr. Speaker. That is how they are going to inflict prosperity. It is going to take 1,000 botched make-work projects, Mr. Speaker. With each one we see more and more of the lifeblood of this Province leaking away. The economic death of 1,000 cuts is what is happening, Mr. Speaker, in this Province. That is what is happening. You know what the death of 1,000 cuts is. Your Honour would know that. Your Honour might even have participated in one of two or them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is where under certain barbaric conditions a prisoner is tied up and the first one is just a little tiny nick that you can just barely see, a little droplet of blood. Then in half an hour or fifteen or twenty minutes, after the dancing and drinking has stopped for a moment, there is another little nick taken out of the flesh of that poor creature, bound and helpless.

MR. PEACH:

Sounds like the Speaker's party.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, it does sound a little bit like the Speaker's party. But, Mr. Speaker, after another half an hour or an hour there is another little nick taken. By the time there have been 1,000 of those nicks, Mr. Speaker, the poor creature is there and although each little one is just a tiny, tiny nick, after 1,000, the blood is streaming out, the life forces just leaving that poor bound creature. Well, that is like the economy of this Province which is just being bound and gagged, Mr. Speaker, and put in a straightjacket by members opposite. Then they would be nicking, a nick here and a nick there, and the nicks consist of their bureaucratic bungling, their bureaucratic incompetence in terms of even a make-work project.

Now, my good heavens, how can anybody fool up a make-work project after approvals have been given? Once the Government of Canada has said, "Here is the money," how is it that the provincial government cannot get that money out to where the people are? We heard this morning members get up and say, "Oh, no, it has all been approved. Letters have been signed. That should be

enough." Well, Mr. Speaker, may I legally, in four or five months this is, in fact, going to be proven true, that the letter of the minister is sufficient. But by that time, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be people who have passed through the Christmas Season with no income. Mr. Speaker, we wonder on this side of the House whether this is not a deliberate strategy by the Government of Canada, to force members opposite, who are of the same political party, to abet and participate in a conspiracy by the Government of Canada to reduce the numbers on unemployment insurance or the length of time individual are on unemployment insurance? Is this a technique for reducing the deficit? Because we must realize that every week or every day that passes, when an individual is not on the make-work project, the that is a day or a week longer before that individual is going to become entitled to unemployment insurance. That is very cute Your Honour. That is a very long key way, Mr. Speaker, of cutting down the expenditures on unemployment insurance in this Province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not going to work. We, on this side of the House, want to see a week or so of debate upon the economy of this Province. We want to see debate Mr. Speaker, on job creation. We want to know why minister opposite have not been doing their job in terms of attracting projects which could see jobs for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. We want to know why the minister when he sees the success of reducing taxes in areas such as craft creation, Mr. Speaker, has not been prepared to use the same technique, which even the Premier is starting to realize may be

needed, of going more slowly with respect to reducing the deficit, and reduce the retail sales taxes, Mr. Speaker, take up the room that is being supplied now in the capital gains tax area and use that money, Mr. Speaker, to reduce retail sales tax for all the people of the Province. Instead of just benefitting the rich, Mr. Speaker, why do we not have action by government to see the benefits of tax reductions spread throughout all sectors of our Province? For heavens sake, before it is too late, let us have the economy of this Province stimulated. Let us have, Mr. Speaker, a reduction in retail sales tax that will translate into increased consumer spending, that will translate into the expansion of many small businesses, that will translate into more people being hired. That is the way it will be done.

That is the way Ronald Reagan did it in the United States, Mr. Speaker. Even though he probably would not admit it, it was his expenditures on military spending which improved the U.S. economy.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! It is now one o'clock, Would the hon. member adjourn the debate?

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, we have to continue on. This is a debate which is going to continue.

MR. SIMMS:  
No.. The House adjourns until three o'clock.

MR. TULK:  
The Speaker leaves the Chair. You do not need a motion.

MR. SIMMS:

All you have to do is sit down.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
You adjourn the debate and it continues later.

MR. BARRY:  
I will continue to speak until Your Honour says it is one o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The House stands adjourned until 3:00 p.m.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

The House resumed at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
I have a few minutes left, I think.

MR. PATTERSON:  
You do not have anything left.

MR. BARRY:  
The Christmas Spirit has filled up and is overflowing from the member for Placentia, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to say a few words about free trade. Mr. Speaker, we have a very serious debate commencing in this Province on the issue of free trade. It is an issue which has very serious ramifications for many of our export industries. The figures for Atlantic Canada alone are that 60 per cent of total merchandise exports go into the United States. It is probably higher, I would say, in Newfoundland than for the Atlantic Provinces generally. I do not know, about 70 per cent, maybe, of our exports are going into the United States, or 80 per cent, probably more considering the iron ore. What is it, 80 or 90 per cent? The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) cannot help me, obviously, but some other member may be able to give us a figure. Anyhow, I think we can safely assume that more than 60 per cent of our exports go to the United States.

The reason that Canada is into

free trade negotiations seems to be because of a threat. It is not, Mr. Speaker, because we have all been going around for years saying, 'by heavens, if we could only get into the United States how beneficial that would be,' it is because over the last year or two years, as the American dollar grew strong, exports from the United States became more expensive and industries in the United States were hurt by the fact that they could not sell their goods overseas, or, indeed they could not sell their goods in competition with foreign imports. Witness the automobile market, the North American car manufacturer could not compete with the Japanese.

So what we have seen, Mr. Speaker as a result of the American dollar becoming stronger is the protectionist element growing in the United States, a protectionist attitude which has said, 'By God if we cannot compete - they ignore this is because of their own economic policy, which is to strengthen the American dollar then we are going to put up tariff barriers, or non-tariff barriers to make it more difficult for products to come inside the United States to compete with us in our own country.' And that is what has led, Mr. Speaker, to Canada's eagerness to jump on the free trade bandwagon, the fear that the United States is going to make it more difficult for Canada to export its merchandise to the United States.

It is already started. We have already seen the start of it with respect to salt cod. Do you know something? On that one market alone we saw the naivete and we saw how far out of touch gentlemen on the opposite of the House

were. Your Honour will recall that when we raised the possibility of these problems occurring, we had members opposite stand, ministers opposite stand up and say, 'Oh, no, that is all nonsense, that is not going anywhere.' 'That is not going anywhere', said the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and said the Premier, and they did not give it the serious consideration it should have gotten.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Not true.

MR. BARRY:

They did not put the emphasis on fighting that protectionist approach, so what we have seen is one small part of the fishing industry affected and, Mr. Speaker, indications that fresh fish, frozen fish, cod blocks and so forth, could be affected as well.

We see the US lumber industry threatening to block exports of timber and forest products from British Columbia into the United States, and the same thing could occur with respect to our own forest products.

Mr. Speaker, what I am basically pointing out is that free trade negotiations has come about because of a fear, not because of a positive attitude on the part of Canada - all provinces - but because of a fear that the United States is going to block off its markets to Canadian goods and the notion is, therefore, that we should sit down with the United States as quickly as possible and try and work out a so-called free trade agreement.

When this was proposed originally by the Prime Minister, again,

apparently, without adequate consultation or co-operation with the Provinces, it seemed as though it was going to be completely free trade, that everything was going to be on the table for discussion. Now we are seeing, Mr. Speaker, a bit of a backing away. The Prime Minister of Canada and, indeed, the Premier of this Province are now backing away and saying, 'Oh, no, we are not talking about free trade, we are talking about freer trade,' and they are backing closer and closer into the position that we on this side of the House, and the Liberal Party of Canada, have traditionally taken since this issue came up, which is that really what is needed is bilateral discussion on specific areas of the economy which require the assurance that protectionist measures are not brought in.

We are not now talking it seems, according to the Prime Minister of Canada, about going in and negotiating everything, we are now going to talk about taking certain things off the table. Unfortunately, they have now weakened their bargaining position considerably, because Mr. Reagan welcomed with open arms the discussions on free trade, as well he should, he saw a couple of fish coming along, a couple of sheep that could be fleeced, namely, eleven of them.

MR. FUREY:

Joe who?

MR. BARRY:

Well, do you know something? I would rather have Mr. Clark in charge than the Premier of this Province and, indeed, I would rather have Mr. Clark in charge than Mr. Mulroney. If I could be assured that he was in charge, I

would not mind, because Joe Clark did not run down, when he was the Prime Minister, and start giving away Canada in chunks, as quickly as he could. He did not run down and give up 25 per cent of Hibernia the way Mr. Mulroney did.

Instead of the Prime Minister and the Premiers being in a position to bargain with President Reagan as to what goes on the table, Reagan is entitled to say, 'Everything is on the table, is it not?' You said you wanted free trade, okay, let us have free trade.' Let us have the level playing field as well, which means that all our social programmes can be questioned, all our cultural subsidies can be questioned, and our unemployment insurance programme, our Medicare programme, our regional development programmes, they are all up for questioning, they are all on the table for negotiation, as far as the President of the United States is concerned.

Now you see what a terrible mess members opposite and the Prime Minister of Canada have brought this country into. They now recognize that our publishing industry needs protection to ensure we maintain a Canadian content, as they now see the regional programmes and unemployment insurance and Medicare and the many things which make us different from the United States in a very worthwhile fashion. The reason why, I would say, all of us in this House are living North of the Canada/US border rather than south of it, is because we appreciate the things that make Canada different, the social programmes we have in place, a free enterprise economy with a social conscience, rather than the strongest-take-all

philosophy that all too often prevails in the United States.

Anybody who read that story in The Globe and Mail by the wife of the Canadian Ambassador to the UN would get a feeling for this. When she goes into Grand Central Station in New York and observes the thousands of men and women making their homes there, men and women, some of whom have been unable to lie down for so long because, you see, in New York, and in many other places, it is all right for you to fall asleep standing up, or fall asleep sitting down, but if you actually lie down to rest, you are going to be picked up for vagrancy, or loitering, or God knows what laws they have. So you have men and women who have been unable to find a place to lie for so long that their legs are swollen and they are gradually dying. They are at the stage now where many of them cannot walk. They have to have people distributing food, who have to go in and find them where they are, in Grand Central Station because they do not have the strength to walk out to get it where the food is being distributed outside. That is the sort of social condition about which members opposite are prepared to say, 'Let us go for it. Let us go for that. Let us ignore the humanitarian, social conscience we have in this Province and in this country, let us put it all on the table and let us have President Reagan and his right-wing Conservative religious, fundamentalist type negotiate it all away from us.'

MR. PATTERSON:

Are you anti-American?

MR. FUREY:

The Argentina accord is in bil-

trouble.

MR. BARRY:

I went to university down in the United States, Mr. Speaker, and I have a lot of friends down in the United States, and I have a great respect for the contribution that the United States of America has made not only to my personal development, in terms of assisting me in increasing whatever amount of knowledge I might have been able to acquire while I was down there, but also in terms of what they have contributed to the notion of freedom and the notion of the dignity of the individual, Mr. Speaker, and it is as a friend of the United States and, as a friend of Americans, that I say - and they said the same thing to me when I was down there, they said, 'We respect what you have in Canada. We look to Canada, we admire your programmes and we are working toward those social programmes which you have in your country.' I know it is no insult to the American people to say, 'Look, we are different.' We have things we can offer them in terms of how they should see their society grow and develop and, Mr. Speaker, they have things they can offer us, and I can mention the great progress they have made in technological high tech development and so forth, I can mention the way in which some of their - I will not say all of them - universities are run. There are many ways in which we can learn from the United States.

I even have a little tape from the United States, **The Best Political Campaigns of 1984**, which I would recommend to members opposite. The best political advertisements in 1984. They actually have a republican/democratic joint political institute down there. I

think it is called the Political Campaign Institute.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, what does this have to do with the debate?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about what makes us great as well as what makes the Americans great. In terms of the different approaches, Mr. Speaker, they actually have down there an institute where parties from both sides get together to improve the professionalism of the politician, in terms of improving the level of the campaign. And, believe me, when I look at what came out of the last election from that side, the level of campaigning in this Province can do with some uplifting, with some raising.

MR. POWER:

When you are a winner, you do not change.

MR. BARRY:

The member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) said, 'When you are a winner, you do not change.' He still does not understand that they lost the last election. The execution order has been issued by the Province. There has just been a stay of execution to permit members to get both their spiritual and material affairs in order. The decision is made. Members are gone. The next election campaign will be just a pro forma thing; the decision has already been taken. We won the last election.

MR. POWER:

That is why you are over there and we are over here.

MR. BARRY:

That is only what is called a

transition phase, we are going through now. It is a transition period for members to clean up their affairs. Because we do not want to walk into a complete sewer when we cross to the other side, the public of this Province has said, 'we are going to give members opposite a little bit of time to clean up their mess, get their affairs in order, before we effect an orderly transition.'

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that members opposite have made a fundamental, strategic mistake in going along with Mr. Mulroney's eagerness to get into a free trade negotiation without being prepared. What they should have done, as we have been suggesting all along, is say, 'yes, we are prepared to get together and discuss how we can improve trade, remove barriers to trade on a sector by sector basis, but let us not throw everything on the table, our Medicare, our unemployment insurance, our regional development programmes,' and right now this is becoming obvious to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, how are these negotiations going to be carried on? Is there going to be a provincial veto? The Premier will not answer whether or not there is going to be a provincial veto. Let me answer it for him. There is a provincial veto, because under our constitution there is a veto. There is a veto on the Government of Canada making decision with respect to the economy of this Province. Matters which fall within property and civil rights under the Canadian Constitution, are matters for the jurisdiction of this House, not for Parliament and not for the Prime Minister of Canada.

Even since the Labour Convention' case, Mr. Speaker, there is provincial veto.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
It is not something that the Premier need negotiate, the veto is there. The only question is whether the Premier will give up that veto, and I am very much afraid, because of the way he has responded to our questions -

MR. DECKER:  
If 'Brian' says to, he will give it up.

MR. BARRY:  
Yes, if Brian Primus says it, the Brian Secundus will follow, and that seems to be what is happening, Mr. Speaker. Brian Primus has said to the premiers 'There will be no provincial veto.' Brian Secundus has said 'Okay, we will have to talk about this. We have ninety days to talk about this.'

Now, the Liberal Premier of Ontario and the Liberal Premier of Quebec have said, 'Hey, we have Canadian Constitution. The provinces have a say in what goes on with respect to trade and what goes on with respect to industry in our provinces.'

MR. TULK:  
Are you telling me that our Premier would carry on another charade?

MR. BARRY:  
A charade, a sham, a deception, yes. That is what we have, Mr. Speaker.

If we are to listen to the Premier, they have had their

studies done, and, if we listen to the Premier, the studies are unanimous, unanimous that free trade is going to benefit this Province. He has not been able to tell us how or how much or where, which jobs have been created, where they will be created, what jobs will be lost, where they will be lost - No, he has not said anything along these lines. Mr. Speaker, Your Honour knows, I am sure, that all economists, all commentators, all those who have studied this from various angles are not of the same mind. There are some very legitimate questions being raised as to whether, Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Provinces and Newfoundland specifically will benefit from a free trade arrangement. I would refer members to an article in this month's edition of Policy Options where Barry Lesser -

MR. POWER:  
Barry major.

MR. BARRY:  
This is Barry major. Barry Lesser is in Halifax.

MR. TULK:  
Do you have any more of those quips that you want to make?

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, this is not an off the cuff remark, this was a presentation made to the Special Joint Committee on Canada's International Relations when that joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons met in Halifax in July of 1985. Now, Professor Lesser is an Associate Professor of Economics at Dalhousie University and he is the Director of the Regional Employment Opportunities Programme of the Institute for Research on Public Policy. He raises very serious

questions as to whether free trade, Mr. Speaker, will benefit Atlantic Canada.

In another edition, I think it was either the September or October edition of Policy Options, we have another Professor from the University of Western Ontario, making the same point and coming down very clearly in terms of for Canada as a whole that free trade negotiations can and probably will harm Canada's trade on balance. If you weigh what we stand to lose and what we stand to gain, there could be a loss and from the way that it is now being approached there will be a net loss for Canada.

DR. COLLINS:  
Why do we not withdraw from the human race?

MR. BARRY:  
Well, the minister has already done that.

MR. TULK:  
Anybody else? One, two, three. Are you fellows tired?

MR. FLIGHT:  
You will have lots of time before we close the debate Mr. Minister, do not rush.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, we have a large number of articles on free trade that have to be dealt with. We have to say and this is what we have been consistently saying, Mr. Speaker, that we need to have an honest and open debate on these questions. Regretably the Premier is taking the same approach that he has been taking on so many issues lately. He is not prepared to have an opened debate. He is not prepared to table the studies which he has received that would

indicate the benefits of free trade for this Province. He is not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to indicate the position that he will take before the Prime Minister. You heard him when we asked in the House the other day, "What is the position as far as a provincial veto is concerned?" and he said, "Well, we are carrying on discussions over the next ninety day period." and that is all that he will say.

MR. POWER:

What is the relevance of this?

MR. BARRY:

The minister wants to know what the relevance is. Let us have a little lesson in economics for the Minister responsible for Jobs. Let us have a little economics seminar here. The Bill is about income tax. How will income tax be generated? Will it be generated by the unemployed? Will income tax be generated by people who do not work? Will income tax be generated by people who only get ten weeks work on make-work projects? Where is the income tax going to come from? Where is the income tax, which is the subject of this bill, going to come from? It should be coming from policies being put forward by the minister. Unfortunately, that is not the case, so we on this side of the House have to put forth some ideas.

MR. POWER:

Five thousand jobs have been created.

MR. BARRY:

The minister has given me the opening I was waiting for. Where are my figures? He said, '5,000 have been created.' Let us look at the Statistics Canada figures. Mr. Speaker, can you believe

this? The unadjusted figures now, unadjusted, in other words no finagling with the numbers - if you look at November 1985, the number of people employed 173,000. What were they last November, Mr. Speaker? Take a guess. It should be 168,000 if you listen to the minister, he has created 5,000. Last year there were 179,000. There were 6,000 more people employed last year than there is right now, today. Statistics Canada figures, the best we can get.

Mr. Speaker, how does the minister explain that? Has the minister been misleading this House when he gets up and says there were 5,000 more people working? You know the number of people unemployed. Mr. Speaker, has gone up 2,000 in the last month. Since October they have gone up 2,000 - 40,000 unemployed in October, now there are 42,000.

Now, do you think that those are all of them? Well, let us take a little look at what APEC, the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, says. It says - this was commenting on last month's figures, it is even more true this month - that the statistics on the level of unemployment, which has remained static, by the way, it was 19.6 last month and 19.6 this month - 19.5 unadjusted, 19.6 adjusted, the same as last month. The Atlantic Provinces Economic Council says this is purely due to fewer people participating in the labour force.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Good! Good!

MR. BARRY:  
Statistics Canada speaks, Mr. Speaker, and when Statistics Canada Speaks, let the minister answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Sit down! Sit down!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do not adjourn at 11:00 p.m. tonight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
A non-debatable motion.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
This, Mr. Speaker, is a debatable motion.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
No, it is not.

MR. BARRY:  
Yes, it is.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker, the precedents will clearly show that the motion that this House not adjourn at 11:00 p.m. is not a debatable motion. The precedents will show that a motion to adjourn is debatable, but this is a motion not to adjourn. In checking those precedents, they are very clear.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
What is being put forward here is an adjournment motion not to adjourn.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
No, it is a non-adjournment motion.

MR. TULK:  
It is a negative adjournment motion, and the motion is debatable. Mr. Speaker, we would like for you, Sir, to do the research on that for when the appropriate time comes to debate the motion.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
The precedents are very clear.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To the point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
The precedents of this House, Mr. Speaker, are very clear on this particular motion. A motion to adjourn the House is a debatable motion. But, Mr. Speaker, a

motion of this nature, which is not to adjourn the House, is not a debatable motion. It has been decided over and over again by Your Honour's predecessors. The thing is that motion is made, there is to be no debate, Mr. Speaker. The motion is to be put to a vote of this House and is subject to the determination of this House. Neither can it be amended, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, if it is not of a great consequence to us the terms of debate that is going on now, but as far as precedent is concerned, we want to have it researched and we want to have a ruling. Our submission is that it is a debatable motion.

However, let us understand what is happening. The Government House Leader is saying that we are going to continue and we are going to continue to debate over the weekend. Let the minister know that the debate will continue, it will continue through the weekend, it will continue through next week, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:  
It will continue all night.

MR. BARRY:  
Oh, yes, all night, tomorrow, Sunday, Monday.

MR. TULK:  
No problem!

MR. WINDSOR:  
Delighted.

MR. BARRY:  
No problem, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:  
On what?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
On the motion to adjourn.

MR. BARRY:  
Time for what?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:  
You are getting mixed up now  
That is your other staff.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, that is plan B that the minister inadvertently gave away that time. This is plan now. Plan A is to try and wear you down.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Unless the hon. member has some further information that he would like to convey to me, I will recess for a few minutes?

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Carry on.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, if I could just briefly say as I see this so that

we have no misunderstanding on what is being suggested by the Government House Leader. The Government House Leader is suggesting plan A which is to keep her going as long as they can. Now, that means that the bills will come up for debate, they will be voted on and then other bills will come up. There are a lot of good bills to be debated. A lot of good bills, a lot of important issues such as job creation which we wanted to debate. We will debate this well into next week, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That has nothing to do with the actual point of order.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order?

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, I wish to make a submission that the motion not to adjourn is quite debatable. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to Beauchesne, the Fifth Edition, page 98, Paragraph 300, Item 2 (a) 'Examples of motions which come under Standing Order 32 (1) (p) - that is the reference to the House of Commons Standing Orders - and are debatable motions are motions (a) relating to the time of sitting and the business of the House.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it can be any more clear than

that. It is very clear there that a motion relating to the time of sitting and certainly a motion which would adjust or extend the time of sitting falls under that parameter. As I submit, Mr. Speaker, there is the authority and the only authority you require, right there on page 98, Paragraph 300 (2) (a). I submit it is an entirely debatable motion for the reasons I have outlined.

MR. SPEAKER:

I think I have heard enough. I am going to recess.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

I will hear just one more submission then.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I would like to point out to Your Honour, Standing Order 33 which reads 'When a question is under debate no question is received unless to amend it; to postpone it to a day certain; for the previous question; for reading the orders of the day; for proceeding to another order; to adjourn the debate; or for the adjournment of the House.'

If the Government House Leader wants to stand up on that side and say this is not an adjournment motion then I would suggest to Your Honour that this motion is out of order.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, it is out of order.

MR. TULK:  
It should not be received. I would like for Your Honour to take a close look at Standing Order 33.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I will now recess for a few moments.

### Recess

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

I read Standing Order 33 in conjunction with Standing Order 22 as referring generally to the question of adjournment of the House, and I therefore rule that the motion of the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is in order.

On the question whether the motion is debatable, I refer hon. members to Hansard, February 15, 1979, where it was ruled by Mr. Speaker that an identical motion was not debatable.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, I move that when this House adjourns today it stand adjourned until Thursday, February 6, 1986 at 3:00 p.m., provided always that it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker or in the case of his absence from the Province, the Chairman of Committees, after consultation with Her Majesty's Government that the House should meet at an earlier time than the adjournment, the Speaker or in his absence, the Chairman of Committees may give notice that he is so satisfied, and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated by such notice,

and shall transact its business if it had been duly adjourned at that time.

MR. BARRY:  
What was the date?

MR. MARSHALL:  
February 6.

Mr. Speaker, I so move the resolution, and I want to explain why this resolution is being made today, at this particular time rather than completing the full legislative package which the government had led into this House for the Fall session.

Mr. Speaker, we reconvened the sitting of this session on October 21. On September 24, almost a month prior to reconvening, the Premier and I had conducted a press conference at which we gave a complete list of the legislative which was to be transacted at the sitting for the 1985 Fall legislative programme. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, as having given this information, we also gave to the hon. gentlemen the opposite a complete list or pretty well the complete package, of the legislation which had been drafted up to that time, which constitute substantially all of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we reconvene and we came to this House and we saw what I consider to be one of the -

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

The Speaker has just ruled that the motion which was formerly put by the government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) be regarded as under the general overall adjournment motion and because of our precedents in this House it was not a debatable.

Mr. Speaker, before we can have a second adjournment motion, there has to be some intermediate proceedings. That is part of our Standing Orders as well, and it is a precedent that is very well established in this House. Since that motion was ruled in order under the adjournment section of Standing Orders 22 and 33, there has been no intermediate proceeding in this House and, therefore, that motion is not allowed to be put at this point.

MR. BARRY:

That is right! That is right!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is only a formality, the Speaker can put the question on it, and then I will make the motion.

MR. TULK:

No.

MR. MARSHALL:

Sure, I can.

MR. BARRY:

No, there has to be an intermediate proceeding.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I asked for the question on sitting beyond

11:00 p.m. which Your Honour ruled in order and not debatable, so we can resolve that question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question. Question.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

The question has to be put, it is not debatable.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, to that point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is ridiculous.

MR. BARRY:

It is not ridiculous. The Premier says it is ridiculous. What is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, is the attempt by government to take the House on its back, to get out of this House and to close it down. We have a debate going on matters relating to employment in this Province. We have a debate going with respect to the economy and it is ridiculous for the Premier to try and close the House down. Now the point, Mr. Speaker, is that under our rules there is a provision. We will need a moment to refer Your Honour to the exact provision, but there is a provision which says that when there has been an adjournment motion there must be an intervening proceeding. Section 22, "A motion to adjourn shall always be in order, but no second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some intermediate proceeding has been had." Your Honour, has ruled that the first

motion was an adjournment motion and we now have the minister getting up with another motion to the same effect, Your Honour. If the first one is adjournment, the second one is adjournment and we would submit that there has to be, under our rules, an intermediate proceeding before that motion is in order.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
On that point of order because the motion which was ruled in order and which is now before the House does in fact have to be voted upon. That is the motion, that the House not adjourn at eleven. That motion has to be voted upon. That vote is then the intermediate proceeding and, Your Honour, will see that a motion to adjourn is always in order. Question!

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
There is no doubt that that adjournment motion that Your Honour just ruled in order is a proceeding and the vote is part of that one proceeding, but there has to be something else happened in this House before you can put another motion. Mr. Speaker, to back up what I say, Your Honour, will find in Beauchesne, I do not have the exact reference here -

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
No, you never do.

MR. TULK:  
Is the Premier touchy?

- Your Honour will find that proceeding is regarded as something that can be entered upon the journals of the House. Of course, there has been or proceeding but it has not been an intermediate proceeding, and the one is not finished and when Your Honour puts that question that or proceeding of the first motion of adjournment put by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) will be a proceeding, but it will only be one. There is not something that is intermediate or intervening in between. There has to be something other than the question put and then there has to be some other proceeding because the vote is part of the same proceeding. The journals will show, for example, and we know the government will carry that order the journals will show that the motion to not adjourn at 11:00 o'clock was carried. That is one proceeding but there must be another one in between before you can put another adjournment motion

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I do not like recessing the House but I want to be as clear as possibly can in this matter so I am going to recess for a few moments.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the President of the

Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I would think it appropriate that Your Honour having rules that the motion that the House do not rise at 11:00 p.m. tonight is in order and is non-debatable, but perhaps Your Honour would wish to put that question first before considering the other.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That motion, I have ruled it is in order and we are going to take a vote on that now. All those in favour "Aye" -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, there has been a point of order raised in this House and that has to be dealt with, I submit to Your Honour that that has to be dealt with before any other proceeding can take place in this House. There is a point of order on the floor.

MR. SPEAKER:

I called for a vote on these proceedings.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, that is wrong. It cannot be done like that.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour "Aye", all those against "Nay", carried.

I am going to take a recess for a

few minutes and look into this other matter.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Will Your Honor hear another submission?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No!

MR. SPEAKER:

I will hear another submission and then a submission from the other side.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, you have already said that this House is recessed. Your Honour has already said, "I am going to recess the House for a few minutes," and immediately we see the Intergovernmental Affairs Minister standing on his feet to try to get another submission in, when Your Honour has already called the recess.

MR. SPEAKER:

I cannot see why I cannot recess and call the House to order immediately after which I am doing now.

MR. TULK:

So that recess does not exist.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, very briefly on this and just so we will try to be clear, what was brought in was a motion that the House not adjourn at eleven and that motion was ruled to be in order and it was carried. Now, what the point of order is about is the fact that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is going to move the adjournment of the House, that the House do now adjourn. What hon. gentlemen opposite have said is that, referring to Standing Order 22, there has to be a proceeding

in between. I would submit that the vote which is a determination of the House, a motion is a motion and a vote is a vote, and obviously if there has to be a intermediary proceeding, then a vote is such a proceeding. But quite apart from that if you will look at Standing Order 22, "A motion to adjourn," leaving out what is in parenthesis which is irrelevant right now, "A motion to adjourn shall always be in order, but no second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some intermediate proceeding has been made." With respect to the intermediate proceeding I submit that the vote is the intermediate proceeding, but quite apart from that where it says that "a motion to adjourn shall always be in order but no second motion to the same effect shall be made." These two motions do not have the same effect. One is a motion that the House not adjourn at eleven, the other is a motion that the House now adjourn.

MR. BARRY:

We agree with that but the Speaker has said it is an adjournment motion.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It is a form of adjournment motion obviously and that is why it was ruled in order, but it is of such a specific form which says that the House shall not adjourn. Surely hon. members cannot say that two motions have the same effect, if one says the House shall not adjourn at eleven, and another one says the House shall now adjourn. There is no way that they can have the same effect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I will hear or final submission now from the hon member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

The gentleman from Waterford-Kenmount (Mr Ottenheimer), himself a former Speaker, should know better than to question the ruling of Mr Speaker, because that is what he has done in his last utterances.

Mr. Speaker I submit, and he will recall, has based his ruling finding the previous motion in order, on the very premise that we are dealing with one and the same thing here. That was the ruling that Mr. Speaker, that was the premise on which he made his ruling. Now we see the gentleman from Waterford-Kenmount, who normally do not engage in this kind of tactic, now questioning by the backdoor the ruling of the Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

You have never done that I guess.

MR. SIMMONS:

I have done it by all doors. But I am not the gentleman from Waterford-Kenmount and I am little disappointed in him today that he would do that. More to the point, Mr. Speaker, there are two points I wish to make. The first is that I, as I always do in this House, Sir, respect and rely on not only the rulings you make but the premises on which you make them, and certainly, this one is a case in point. I recall the premise on which you made the ruling, I stand by it, and I believe it cannot be turned against us now, having been just used to find a motion in order.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, and I believe equally to the point,

under Standing Order 22: "A motion to adjourn (except when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance), shall always be in order, but no second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some intermediate proceeding has been had."

Mr. Speaker, the drafters of that particular Standing Order, of whom my good friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) was a principal scribe, I submit, must have realized that every motion to adjourn would be determined in the affirmative or the negative. They must have determined that you just were not going to make a motion under Standing Order 22 and then leave it there without taking a vote on it, and then go on to some other matter. They must have taken into account that a motion to adjourn includes the vote on that motion, either for or against it.

MR. TULK:  
That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Because, Mr. Speaker, if they did not take that into account, what was the need for the second half of the sentence? Why did they need to make that provision? If you are going to have a motion, it follows that you are going to have a vote on that motion, and that cannot be construed to be the intermediate proceeding because, if it were, there would be no need for the second half of that provision in Standing Order 22. It would be axiomatic that there would have been an intermediate proceeding, i.e., the vote.

MR. CALLAN:  
That is right.

MR. SIMMONS:  
So I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the proposed motion by the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is quite out of order and therefore, I would urge, Mr. Speaker, to find it so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

### Recess

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

I could not find any precedent in our own House to guide me in my ruling. I must apologize for the delay, but I wanted to consult with the law clerk of the House of Commons in Ottawa. According to the practice in Ottawa, a vote constitutes an intermediate proceeding. 'Intermediate proceeding', as used in Standing Order 22, means a proceeding that can properly be entered in the journals, and I refer to Beauchesne, page 91, paragraph 284. The recording of the vote on the motion not to adjourn would appear in the journal as a separate proceeding. I therefore rule that the vote was an intermediate proceeding and that therefore the motion of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is in order.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Just to be sure because the vote was taken just before you left the Chair I want to formally make that motion. Mr. Speaker, I move that when this House adjourns today it will stand adjourned until Thursday, February 6, 1986, at 3:00 P.M., provided always that if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, or in the case of his absence from the Province, the Chairman of Committees, after consultation with Her Majesty's Government that the House should meet at an earlier time than the adjournment, the Speaker, or in his absence the Chairman of Committees, may give notice that he is so satisfied and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated by such notice and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time. Mr. Speaker, I so move that motion.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
You can speak to the motion.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, the motion I take it that the hon. gentleman has just put is a debatable motion and an amendable motion.

MR. SPEAKER:  
It is a debatable motion.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, that has not been ruled on as I understand it.

MR. BARRY:  
Your Honour just said yes it is debatable.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, my point to the Speaker, as I understand the motion, if the motion has been put that this House stands adjourned then that is not a debatable motion and is not amendable, the House stands adjourned. However, once and there are precedents in this House to show this, and I would refer Your Honour to Hansard, February 15, 1979 in which a motion that sets a condition becomes a substantive motion and because it is substantive motion it is debatable and amendable, Mr. Speaker. The ruling was made, as I said, in 1979 and Your Honour has to be guided by those precedents. I understood Your Honour to say that it was debatable. If it is debatable, of course, it is substantive motion, and therefore amendable. Once the conditions are attached then it is debatable and amendable.

Now I would like to have the Speaker make a ruling on the point.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker, motions to adjourn can be, in general, of two types. This specific motion of adjournment did not come as Your Honour is aware, like at one minute to six or at the regular time where everyday a motion is made to adjourn. This motion came sometime ago and it is therefore the kind of motion which is called a dilatory motion. Now Beauchesne and Erskine May will, of course, have a great deal about dilator

motions in them, or at least Erskine May does. I will draw to Your Honour's attention, Beauchesne, page 151 where the question of dilatory motions is referred to and under 417 (1) (b) (ii), the heading "Dilatory motions," it is basically a definition of them, "are designed to dispose of the original question either for the time being or permanently." in this case for the time being. "They are usually of the following type:" and it gives a fair number of different types there and one of them, of course, is for the adjournment of the House. I submit to Your Honour that this adjournment motion, which did not come at the regular time for adjournment motions, but which came considerably earlier, obviously is dilatory and fitting the definition of dilatory given by Beauchesne, which is to postpone consideration of the question which was under discussion, the question under discussion was the particular Bill which was being debated and then a member got up and moved, after the intervening motion, that the House adjourn until whatever the date is. I would submit, therefore, that it is, by definition and nature, a dilatory motion. Now, I think Your Honour will find in checking the precedents that dilatory motions, whatever their form may take, are not debatable.

One defines a dilatory motion by the purpose for which it is used and obviously the Chair has to be guided by circumstances because nobody gets up and says, "Hear ye! Hear ye! I am going to make a motion and this here motion shall be called dilatory." It is by examining the circumstances and nature and inferring from that, the purpose, that the Chair must

make the decision whether the motion is dilatory. It is not that it adjourns until tomorrow or until January or until February or until any specific time which identifies or characterizes a motion as dilatory but, the purpose, and the Chair can only infer the purpose by making an assessment of the circumstances and I would suggest that as it said here, 'Dilatory motions are designed to dispose of the original question either for the time being or permanently,' here being for the time being and it being obvious that the time at which it was introduced and the circumstances that the motion is dilatory and the precedents of the House will show that dilatory motions are not debatable.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I refer Your Honour to the ruling that was made by His Honour, the current Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on February 15, 1979, carried from Tape 339, Page 841, which deals with the matter of dilatory motion and points out that 'if a dilatory motion is carried the House must adjourn, but then it would meet at the time prescribed in the Standing Orders which is in usual cases is the following day or in our parlance tomorrow, although tomorrow may be after several days or a weekend intervenes. So that is a dilatory motion.'

Under those terms, we could accept that that is a dilatory motion. If we are missing a point here and if the members want to adjourn

until Monday at three o'clock, we would have no argument. However, Mr. Speaker, that is not what we understand the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is seeking and the minister nods his head. The relevant Standing Order, if I would refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, Standing Order 283, MOTIONS TO ADJOURN THE HOUSE, (3), which is on Page 91. "A motion to adjourn the House may not have conditions attached, otherwise it becomes a substantive motion which may be moved only after notice." That is an interesting little point, Mr. Speaker, the notice period. We have had no notice given of this substantive motion and we would submit to Your Honour that it is not in order for it to be proceeded with, at this point in time. It may be in order to make and it have it considered notice, what the minister has done but, there has to be notice made. Anyway, on the main point here, as to whether it is dilatory or substantive, I think it is quite clear that the conditions are attached. When the minister said "until," if he just said, "The House do now adjourn." that would be fine but, as soon as, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:  
Yes, but then it is a dilatory motion which carries it over to the regular sitting the next day. But, Mr. Speaker, there have been conditions attached there, there have been on condition that the Clerk of the House be notified and so forth and so on. All the terms that are set out there are clearly conditions that are attached to that motion so, that is a substantive motion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have to say to Your Honour that we understand what members opposite are up to and we understand that the government wants to have the House closed but, Your Honour, this is not a minor little procedural game that is being played here, the Rules of the House are there to protect the process and to protect the system and to permit, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition to have the protection of Your Honour, the protection of the rules. That is the only way that a free and open and fair debate is permissible, if the rules are enforced. If there are shavings of the rules and, Mr. Speaker, if we have them cut to suit the cloth of a particular occasion, Mr. Speaker, forever after this House suffers because there is another restriction on the ability of the Opposition to do the job for which it is here.

Mr. Speaker, the government can take action to have this House closed, but it must be done under the rules and it has not been done in this case. There are very important matters, Mr. Speaker, that remain to be debated. We are in the middle of a debate on the economy, on job creation and on reducing taxes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Fifteen days on one bill.

MR. BARRY:  
No, it is fifteen days, we are on a bill here.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, apart from everything else it is the earliest time that we have seen the Premier try to get out of the House, in at least the last three years, if no

longer. It is the earliest time,  
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
It was the earliest time we ever  
opened and you spent fifteen days  
on one bill.

MR. BARRY:  
We can understand the Premier's  
desire and the minister's desire  
to get out of the House and head  
off where they can get away from  
the people of this Province and  
the problems of this Province.  
But there are crucial matters  
here, matters like the hunger  
strikes that are going on. The  
hunger strike at Point La Haye  
which has started now today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
He is not speaking to the point of  
order.

MR. BARRY:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying  
is that we ask for your  
protection, we ask for a careful  
ruling on a crucial point which  
can restrict the Opposition  
forever hence. And there is no  
doubt, Mr. Speaker, the precedents  
are there, the precedents are in  
our House, the precedents are  
there in the House of Commons, and  
it will be a sad day, Mr. Speaker,  
if we are now blocked from  
debating whether or not this House  
should adjourn when the issues  
that we just mentioned are facing  
this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Your Honour to

look very carefully at these  
precedents because this motion is  
a debatable motion without doubt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I think  
what the matter at issue now is  
whether this is a dilatory motion  
or not. That is essentially what  
it boils down to. It being agreed  
I think that if it is a dilatory  
motion, that it is not debatable.  
If it is a dilatory motion, it is  
not debatable. The matter under  
issue is whether the motion is  
dilatory or not.

The basic thrust of the hon. the  
Leader of the Opposition's  
argument was that this is not a  
dilatory motion because there is a  
condition attached, and that  
condition being, in his words,  
that we are adjourning until  
February 6.

MR. BARRY:  
Not only that, there are other  
conditions there as well.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that  
the question of the time of the  
adjournment, that we adjourn until  
tomorrow, until the day after  
tomorrow, until February 6, or  
whatever is not a condition, that  
is a time factor. It is not a  
condition whatsoever. I would  
point out to Your Honour when  
considering whether it is a  
condition or not to again refer to  
Beauchesne, page 151, under the

heading 'Dilatory motions' and among the examples given of dilatory motions are: 'That the consideration of the question be postponed to.....(date),' a time, it could be January, or February or March. It is a time. One of the very examples given for a dilatory motion has the indication of time. Therefore, the fact that there is a time has nothing to do whatsoever with the question of condition.

The hon. gentleman or one of his colleagues might get up again and say, well say irrespective of that time factor, the fact is at the call of the Chair etc. Mr. Speaker, knows that when there is an adjournment beyond the usual twenty-four hours that that is always there as a safety net in the public interest.

But I would suggest to Your Honour that the dilatory motion, I think it is generally agreed is not debatable and that all that has to be decided is whether the motion is dilatory or not. The fact that there is a time factor obviously does not make it dilatory because among the examples given in Beauchesne on page 91 is a motion which has time in it. And, therefore, one has to go back to the circumstances and the assumed purpose of the motion to decide whether it is dilatory or not. It does not come with a tag on it, 'dilatory', 'not dilatory', like, you know, made in Bay Roberts or made in Harbour Grace. It is the circumstances surrounding it and the purpose which the Chair has to examine and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it will be quite clear from the circumstances that it is dilatory and the only argument put to the contrary with respect to the time factor, what the hon. Leader of the Opposition

calls, conditions, that that does not invalidate the arguer whatsoever when one of the very examples given of dilatory motion has the time factor in it.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I refer also to Page 151 of Beauchesne, the same reference that the gentleman for Waterford-Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) used a moment ago and when he refers to dilatory motions he ought, in fairness, to read the sentence in which the terms finds itself because it says, "Dilatory motions are designed to dispose of the original question either for the time being or permanently." It does not say dilatory questions are designed among other things it says it is designed for this particular case and this case only. The question before us is Bill No. 40 Order No. 15. We are dealing with revisions to the Income Tax Act, that is the item before the House at the moment. If the motion put down by the hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is designed to stop the debate, then in that context alone, I suppose, it could be construed to be a dilatory motion except for the additional arguments that have been put by my colleague the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, before I go onto that just look at the paragraph in which that term, 'dilatory motions', finds itself and it is interesting to note that the examples they give, the first one,

the only one where you have a blank to fill in, is 'that consideration of the question be postponed to . . . . .', a time definite. Now, that was not the motion, Mr. Speaker. The motion was that the House adjourn, etc., so if you want to see what this paragraph is saying about adjournment motions per se you have to go down to the last line of those examples, 'that the House do now adjourn,' and then the explanatory note, 'Adjournment motions are in this class because they may be used to stop a debate,' adjournment motions without any conditions attached, "that this House do now adjourn." Mr. Speaker, you have to relate that to what my colleague for Mount Scio has mentioned with reference to page 91, paragraph 283. My colleague, my friend, my leader, whatever my cousin wants. Mr. Speaker, on page 91, paragraph 283, (3), "A motion to adjourn the House may not have conditions attached, otherwise it becomes a substantive motion." Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall not repeat -

MR. BAIRD:  
Get on with it.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I do not need to get on with it, I have all the time in the world. I say to my good friend for Humber West (Mr. Baird), I have the right to be heard in silence and if they want to have some intermediate chat, I am prepared to wait.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
What we are arguing here is a very important point which can set some very important precedents and I intend to take the time, I intend to do it briefly, but if I am

going to be interrupted several times, I will just wait until I get that brief moment without interruption.

MR. TOBIN:  
That is part of the parliamentary process to the Russians.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Goonery is not part of the parliamentary process, no. You made it part of the parliamentary process.

Mr. Speaker, page 91, paragraph 283, (3), "A motion to adjourn the House may not have conditions attached, otherwise it becomes a substantive motion which may be moved only after notice." Now, the question of after notice should be but just leave that for the moment and ask yourself, Mr. Speaker, again why did the framer of that particular clause put it in there in the first place? Because you see if a motion to adjourn to a time definite, which is part of the motion of the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the motion to adjourn with conditions that you can come back prior to a certain date, etc., etc., and so on, if all those conditions, all those qualifying clauses are not conditions under the intent of this clause, what is a condition? What could you conceivably put into the motion that is a condition, if it is not a condition relating to time or circumstance? What else could be a condition, Mr. Speaker?

So I ask you to look very carefully at the 283, subsection (3), where it provides that once you have conditions attached to an

adjournment motion, it becomes a substantive motion. Mr. Speaker, these are not some words of wisdom that I just stumbled upon, these reflect the tradition of this House and the finding of other Speakers, in this case the eminent Deputy Speaker of 1979, the now Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in this government, at which time he found that the motion, he was talking about an adjournment motion, he ruled at that time, "The motion we are considering here and which was ruled in order was that the House adjourn to a certain date. This is not a dilatory motion, this is a substantive motion."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Page 841 of Hansard, Tape 339.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! What reference is that?

MR. SIMMONS:  
I am referring to Hansard, February 15, 1979, Tape No. 339, NM - 1, on the bottom there is the number 841, presumably page 841 and the third paragraph in which Mr. Speaker, Dr. Collins, is giving a ruling that says, "The motion which we are considering here and which was ruled in order was that the House adjourn to a certain date. This is not a dilatory motion, this is a substantive motion."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! To that point of order, I did have an opportunity

of looking at Hansard of February 15 while I was waiting to get your advice and help from Ottawa and also before that, in connection with the first ruling that was made. That exact question did not come up on this particular date in the House and it was ruled at the time that the motion was in order and that it was debatable.

MR. MARSHALL:  
If that is the case then, Mr. Speaker, since I led the motion, I assume that I can lead the debate.

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

MR. BARRY:  
You were sat down.

MR. MARSHALL:  
I sat down on a point of order Mr. Speaker. I did not sit down -

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, the minister had sat down and we had arisen on this side to start debate on this matter. Mr. Speaker, we were interrupted, the Premier raised a question of whether it was debatable and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) asked Your Honour for a ruling on it, but we were ready to go. The minister had sat down.

MR. MARSHALL:  
They got up on a point of order Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:  
No, you were sat down before that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I have recognized the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

If it is a debatable motion, surely the person leading in the motion has a right to explain why the motion is being put. So I am going to explain it, in very few words, Mr. Speaker, as to why this motion was made.

First of all we reconvened this sitting of the House on October 21, which in the days of this administration was the earliest time in which we had reconvened the House for the Fall sitting. At the time, a month before, on September 24, the Premier had a press conference in which the complete package of legislation to be considered in the Fall Session was given. I note that was one month prior to the reconvening of the House and at that point in time, at least seventy per cent of the legislation which was to be considered, Mr. Speaker, was given to the hon. gentlemen there opposite, as a matter of fact, a lot of it had been on the Order Paper since last Spring.

Mr. Speaker, what happened then? Did they deal with it? Did the hon. gentlemen deal with it and if it was not dealt with, why has it not been dealt with? Well, the first thing we did, Mr. Speaker, was consume fifteen debating days on Supplementary Supply. Now what is Supplementary Supply?

DR. COLLINS:

How many days?

MR. MARSHALL:

Fifteen days on one single Bill and all that Supplementary Supply is, it certainly is important.

Supplementary Supply relates to increased expenditures over the fiscal year that have to be brought before the House for approval but, in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, the warrants relating to those had been tabled in this House by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), in most cases, months before. So, here we have fifteen days, Mr. Speaker, on one particular Bill.

You talk about efficiency, Mr. Speaker, we also were treated to two full days debating the Bill to Amend the Department of Finance Act. All that Bill did, which was explained to the hon. gentlemen, was to give the Minister of Finance the same power to sign routine agreements as had been given to every other minister in the Cabinet at the previous session. A Bill, which at that time passed, as it should pass with a minimum of debate but, the hon. gentlemen went for two days on that. Then, Mr. Speaker, last Friday we brought in Committee of the Whole for clause by clause consideration of the few Bills that had already been passed and what happened? The hon. gentlemen spent all day Friday re-debating Bills that had already been determined by this House.

So, Mr. Speaker, what has happened and the whole tenure of this House has shown, what the Opposition under its present leadership, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), Mr. Murphy and his friend, the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk), the triumvirate now in the Opposition, are completely and absolutely bankrupt of any ideas, of any policy and are completely and absolutely incapable of debating the important issues that face and confront the people of this Province. What happens, Mr.

Speaker, today? The hon. gentleman gets up and tries to put a smoke screen up by trying to debate on the Income Tax Act, some of the various issues. But, Mr. Speaker, if this House is to operate, it takes the co-operation not just of Government but, of Opposition and it is not a matter of -

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The minister has made a very important point about the co-operation of Government and the Opposition. I would like to just point out to the minister, that the minister did not consult with the Opposition as to when he wanted to close down the House. He came in and said that he was going to ramrod the closure of the House, shuff it down the Opposition's throat, and run roughshot over the Rules of this House. That is what the minister said. He did not ask for co-operation.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Look, September 24, we gave the Opposition a list of all the legislation that would come before the House. At all times I had said to the members opposite, "All we will consider will be what is on this list." Furthermore, I told them that if any of these bills were not circulated because of drafting difficulties they

would not be considered.

So, Mr. Speaker, you cannot -

MR. FLIGHT:

Could we have a quorum call, Mr. Speaker. We do not have a quorum Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

### Quorum Call

MR. SPEAKER:

The three minutes have now elapse and there is a quorum present.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I will not speak to much longer. I think I have mad the points. I mean, the fact of the matter is, we have tried to deal with the House of Assembly in a systematic manner and in a effective manner. We had provide over the past six or seven year for a Spring Session which deal primarily with the financia matters and the Address in Repl and in the Fall Session to deal with the legislation. A mont before this Assembly reconvened w gave to the hon. gentleman complete list of the bills and, in most cases, the bills themselves. They had ample opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to deal with them efficiently and effectively, and instead they spend some fifteen days on one bill, and when they finally get off that bill they waste time again themselves. It is an indication of a bankruptcy of ideas. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman in the interim I have some very interesting calls, Mr. Speaker, from very interesting

people over the past six or seven -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

You will get more too.

MR. MARSHALL:

- weeks and I can tell the hon. gentleman would be very surprised of the source of one of them, who tells me that the hon. gentleman, who wants a sound proof room, how he operates himself with his Chief Advisor, Mr. Murphy, and the Opposition House Leader. Make no wonder he wants a sound proof room, Mr. Speaker. He does not want his other colleagues to hear what is going on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, what else is new? Mr. Speaker, what else is new? Was not that the same reason why the hon. gentleman left the Cabinet? He wanted to do it all himself with one or two little advisors that he had pegged outside of the elected process? He has, Mr. Speaker, no room for people who have been elected. He cannot associate with people and we have seen the fruits of that in this Session in this House.

When we reconvene on February 6, Mr. Speaker, we will be considering the bills that are on the Order Paper, but primarily we will be reconvening on February 6, when we will give notice of the bill to implement and legislate the Atlantic Accord. We will be meeting, Mr. Speaker, primarily for that particular purpose. The rest of the legislation that is here, we will deal with, if we possibly can, but the fact of the

matter is we will probably have to carry a lot of that over and it is really an abuse of the rights of the people of this Province, because they are obstructing the business of the people of this Province. Hon. gentlemen can get up and say that certain bills, like one that did happen to be passed, the Psychologist Act, that has been on here over and over again, they might say it is not important or what have you, but it is important to a large body of people in this Province, and so you can go through the rest of the Order Paper. There are left on the Order Paper some very interesting bills. For instance, the hon. gentleman was crowing on the air the other day, 'Oh, they do not want to talk about the Conflict of Interest Act.' Well, I wonder who does not want to talk about it? Because, Mr. Speaker, that was the next item of business, and I notice the hon. gentleman stood fast and kept on the one before.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we will be happy to debate that bill if the minister wishes to call it. That is the bill that is coming up next after this one and before next Friday, I suspect we will get to the Conflict of Interest bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! To that point of order, there is no point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

The thumps from the hon. gentlemen are very hollow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear,, hear!

Mr. Speaker, as you look across, I mean, the two members from Labrador could not stay here and listen to their leader and I am sure a lot of the others from the other side.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this is an exhibition of the bankruptcy of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland under the leadership of the present Leader of the Opposition. We have seen an example of that in this sitting of the House. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we are moving and considering this motion now, and we will now proceed to consider it. It will be debated to its end and we will not rise after 11:00 p.m., if that is what hon. gentlemen there wish. But we are the government of this Province. We led in and we gave ample opportunity for debate. It is a shame on hon. gentlemen opposite that that they could not conduct the normal parliamentary process for the benefit of the people of this Province, and that is why this motion is before the Chair today..

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear,, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order,, please!

I should have drawn the attention of all hon. members before the hon. the President of the Council spoke that the debate is confined strictly to the motion. I would refer hon. members to Erskine May, page 423.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

It was quite obvious from the previous speech, Mr. Speaker, how free-ranging this debate shall not be.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, I could say that I have witnessed procedural wrangle. I would say Mr. Speaker, that the people in Point La Haye also just saw procedural wrangle, because that is where the latest hunger strike is. These are some of the people who are inheritors of the day 'when have not shall be no more.' One day the sun will shine, I am told. They are going on a hunger strike not just because they want work, they are on a hunger strike because they want to get a few stamps. It is a sad day for Newfoundlanders.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will address this motion. A motion to adjourn on the face of it, would appear to be a very simple matter. Someone could quite logically and quite reasonably say, why the wrangle Mr. Speaker, what we are witnessing here is an attempt by government which is under the gun is an attempt by the government which is continually conducting polls and every day are learning that they are slipping and slipping badly. Somewhere the word is gone out, Mr. Speaker saying get out of the House as fast as you possible can. So we saw the stream roller come into this hon. House.

MR. BAIRD:

You look like you were caught

under it.

MR. DECKER:

And they are determined that, no matter what. Remember, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are members of the Loyal Opposition. When we stand in this House we are symbols of our fellow Newfoundlanders who have the right to know what is going on with the government which was elected a few months ago. Mr. Speaker, the motion to adjourn, a simple motion one would think, but nothing is simple, Mr. Speaker, in this life, nothing is black and white. There are arguments, Mr. Speaker, which would lend itself to closing this hon. House of Assembly and there are arguments which are against closing this House.

It should become quite obvious by now to Newfoundlanders that the Opposition does not want to close this hon. House because, Mr. Speaker, there are too many problems that have not been addressed. Someone says we spent fifteen days on a certain bill. I ask, is that all we spent? I am a little bit disgusted with ourselves, because as members know, when we were on the Interim Supply, we had far-ranging debate and we could have debated the problems in this Province for a hundred and fifteen days, Mr. Speaker, and would barely have scratched the surface then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

So I am disappointed to learn -

MR. CALLAN:

The problems in Davis Inlet alone.

MR. DECKER:

- I feel I have let down my district. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I could well be a failure for not spending more than fifteen days in a far-ranging debate where I could have discussed from here to eternity things that are wrong in this administration, things that are wrong in this Province today, and we, Mr. Speaker, only spent fifteen days in that kind of debate. I would challenge the Premier to open it up again and we will discuss from here until doomsday, Mr. Speaker. If we were to discuss it from here until doomsday, and if we were to extend the length of those sessions from three hours a day to twenty-four hours a day, Mr. Speaker, then time would not permit us, Mr. Speaker, to address all the problems.

MR. BAIRD:

Do not start to cry now!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Time would not permit us to address the problems which exist in this Province. The problems, Mr. Speaker, which are not being addressed, the problems, Mr. Speaker, which are being laughed at and mocked at and scorned. Fifteen days, we should have taken fifteen years and have not will be no more, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are pros and cons to adjourning this House.

MR. CALLAN:

The con artists are over there.

MR. DECKER:

There are a few pros and they refer to reasons why this House should close. The first and obvious reason, Mr. Speaker, is

that some hon. members do not live in the Capital City. One reason to adjourn this House, one pro, should be, I suppose, to give hon. members the opportunity to leave St. John's and go back to their homes for Christmas. I could sympathize with members in that position, Mr. Speaker, I am in that position and at this very minute, Mr. Speaker, there is a place in my district called The Tickles, accessible at this time of the year, only by ski-doo.

I should like to be able to adjourn this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

It is now six o'clock and, according to our Standing Order No. 7, we will recess until 8 p.m.

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, just before we broke for supper I was trying to point out some of the pros or some of the reasons why it might be a good idea to adjourn this House. Since that happened I had my supper. Mr. Speaker, I should tell hon. members that I had a good supper. I had a considerable supper, Mr. Speaker. It was extremely filling. Unlike, Mr. Speaker, some of my fellow Newfoundlanders out in the district that is served by the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) who are on a hunger strike, so desperate are they -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Where is that?

MR. DECKER:

Point La Haye, I do not know how you pronounce that. It is a French word, Mr. Speaker. How would you say it? Point La Haye, the fact of the matter is that while all of us were eating our supper, I even went far enough to have a glass of wine, Mr. Speaker. Like Paul told Timothy, it was for my stomach's sake, Mr. Speaker, and there is simply no other reason for that.

While I was eating this supper my fellow Newfoundlanders in Point La Haye are on a hunger strike because of the mess that members opposite have made of this economy. I was trying to point out some reasons why it might be a good idea if this House would adjourn and I suggested, Mr. Speaker, that some hon. members

who do not reside in this city permanently, do not have their principal residence here, would like to go home early for Christmas. Now, Mr. Speaker, if all the problems in this Province were solved, if all the legislation that was on the Order Paper had been dealt with in an orderly way, allowing Opposition members, who are the people of Newfoundland, to speak, fine. Do not forget that. When this hon. gentleman stands up in this House, it is really 10,000 from the Strait of Belle Isle who stand up in this House, when my colleague from St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) stands up in this House it is really 10,000 or 11,000 people from the Strait of Belle Isle who stand up in this House.

So, Mr. Speaker, from the point of view of hon. members it might be a good idea to go home.

MR. PATTERSON:  
Your halo has tipped.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Speaking of halos, Mr. Speaker, has anyone tried to buy some polish for halos lately? It is taxed like everything else in this Province, it has a 12 per cent sales tax on halo polish. This is what is happening to this economy. I thank members for calling me back because there are so many problems in this Province today, Mr. Speaker, that I find it extremely difficult to confine myself, I find it difficult to control, Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult not to get mad with emotion.

DR. COLLINS:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, it has been mentioned a number of times in this House that, even inadvertently, hon. members cannot mislead the House. The hon. member says that halo wax is taxed. I am not sure of the absolute truth of that but, I can say that if the halo wax is used in the fishery, it is not taxed; if it is used in certain aspects of the forestry, it is not taxed; and if the halo is worn by a child under the age of thirteen, it is not taxed. So I think it is incorrect to make the blanket statement that halo wax is taxed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. REID:

Good point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I would remind all hon. members that we are speaking strictly to the motion but, there is no point of order.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To that motion, I am trying to put forward some arguments as to why, now it is difficult to find arguments as to why this motion should not pass and I suggest that solely in the interest of hon. members going home is one. Another point, Mr. Speaker, why this might be a motion worth passing this House is there are hon. members in this House who are unable to devote their full-time to their portfolios.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying this in any way to cast anything

bad on any hon. member who come to this House and who is prepared to devote even a quarter of his time to the work of the Cabinet. I think that Newfoundlander should be pleased, Mr. Speaker, that there are hon. members in the Cabinet who are willing to devote a part of their time to the governing of this Province. Now I think it is admirable that I have them here, and I realize the inconvenience that the hon. gentleman and woman, let the House realize I am saying man and woman. Hon. members who do not have the time to devote all their energy to being a member of Cabinet or to being a member of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is wrong with that?

MR. DECKER:

There is nothing wrong with that Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

At the moment we are debating the adjournment of the House. I think the hon. member is straying.

MR. DECKER:

To that motion, Mr. Speaker, to adjourn this House. I am trying to put forward some reasons why I believe that this motion should be defeated. There are some hon. members, Mr. Speaker, who, because of other commitments, are unable to devote full-time. I am saying that in consideration, Mr. Speaker, for those hon. gentlemen who have to do their own work at night time and weekends, even on Sundays, members who are so dedicated to the work of this Province have to take their night and their Saturdays and their Sundays to attend to their law

practices. Mr. Speaker, in my own opinion, it would be a good idea that we pass this motion so that these hon. members can have some extra time to devote to their other professions.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite are trying to suggest that I have some motive for saying this. I will even concede that there may not be people who fit that category but, suppose there are people. We all know ourselves whether we have other work to do.

MR. REID:

What is wrong with that?

MR. DECKER:

There is nothing in the world wrong with that, Mr. Speaker, it is a good thing. That is one of the reasons I am suggesting that this motion might be allowed to pass, to give members time to get away from the daily grinding in this House, which much get boring, I am sure, when you are on the defensive day in and day out trying to fend off attacks from the Opposition. Surely goodness that must be one argument why this hon House should close and why this motion should be carried.

Another argument in favour, another pro I am trying to amass, and mind you I am having a difficult time, Your Honour, I am trying to amass arguments which would be in favour of closing the House at this time. From the point of view of expenses, maybe we could save a few dollars if we were to close this House and the Lord knows with the mess that members opposite have put this Province in since they have been the government in power - the provincial debt of this Province - when you consider all these things, if we could save one

solitary cent, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that that would be a logical reason for closing this House at this time.

Let me suggest a few items of expenses that we could save. We have four Pages in this House who are making \$10.00 an hour, four times \$10.00 is \$40.00 an hour, and if we keep it open for a week that would be another fifteen hours which would mean \$600. There is a potential of saving \$600 if we were allow this motion to pass and when you consider the desperate straits - I am saving my voice because this could go on for three weeks - when you consider the mess, and here is where I am trying to keep the emotion out off my voice because I tend to get beside myself, Mr Speaker, when I reflect on the mess that this Province is in today, I tend to become very emotional and I am trying to contain myself, I am deliberately refusing to pull out all the stops when I consider the desperate straits that this Province is in.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the expression, "Tory times are hard times." I remember at one time I used to think that was a pack of foolishness. I used to think that was foolishness. I did not believe my ancestors, my grandmother and grandfather who said, "Crissy my son, Tory times are hard times," but I have learned, Mr. Speaker, that they were right and the reason is quite simple. A Tory government, Mr. Speaker, is geared to favour the rich, it is hard times for the middle class, the poor and the average people. It is not hard times for the wealthy.

Take for example today, we have no wealthy people smarting and we

have no wealthy people on hunger strikes like the people out in Point La Hay. The wealthy people, Mr. Speaker, have never been better off. It is the average, it is the middle class, it is the people up in Ship Cove who are phoning me trying to see if there is some way we can keep this House open a little longer until we get a commitment from the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) that their make work programme is going to indeed start up so they can get enough money to buy a roast for Christmas, Mr. Speaker. I am not talking about a turkey. They are talking about a roast of beef, Mr. Speaker. Members opposite in their usual way just laugh it off again. Something funny! Something funny!

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if this motion were to pass tonight we could save about \$600 on wages to the Pages. Some of the Commissionnaires could save us a few dollars, \$300 or \$400. Water, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what kind of agreement we have, but I would suspect that there is a meter somewhere on the Confederation Building, and if this motion were to pass now, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the motion, if this motion were to pass and the House were indeed to adjourn, then the consumption of water would fall off in this building by about five gallons a day. That could be translated, I am sure, into a few pennies, Mr. Speaker, and that is highly relevant.

MR. BAIRD:  
Look at the toilet paper would save.

MR. DECKER:  
When you consider the depths of

poverty to which this Province has been subjected by the actions of that hon. Premier, Mr. Speaker, by the actions of those hon. members that hon. crowd, Mr. Speaker, it is important to the people of Newfoundland that we would save a few cents in our water tax, Mr. Speaker. That might be an argument in favour of closing down this hon. House at this time.

Mr. Speaker, electricity, the longer we keep this House open the more electricity we are going to spend. What do we have, about 3,000 or 4,000 watts, I suppose?

MR. PATTERSON:  
Stick to lanterns.

MR. DECKER:  
Speaking of electricity, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Is this on the main motion?

MR. DECKER:  
On this motion, Mr. Speaker, as to why we should not adjourn this House -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
The hon. member only has a half hour.

MR. DECKER:  
Now he tells me I only have a half hour. I thought I had an hour, have to get to some of my commitments now. I will come back to it later on, when we get on the fifteenth or the twentieth amendment, I will come back to it, that is what I will do, Mr. Speaker.

If we were to close this House, Mr. Speaker, we could save a few measly cents on electricity. When I speak of electricity, I am mindful of the people in this Province, Mr. Speaker, who do not

have enough money to pay their light bills because the light bill has gone up, up, up and away, while their income is gone down, down, down to the depths, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

You are not trying to mislead the House now are you, like the hon. member for Port de Grave?

MR. DECKER:

I would not dare, Mr. Speaker, try to mislead this House.

MR. BAIRD:

Your mother is going to heaven. Anybody who rears a fool goes straight to heaven.

MR. DECKER:

Because, Mr. Speaker, no matter what I were to say in the negative sense about electricity I could never mislead this House even if I wanted to because I do not have enough of a command of the language. My command of the language is not great enough to say all the evil things that should be said about electricity in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to see an investigation done when the Public Utilities Board sits down with the consumer rep, I notice on T. V. the other night, Mr. Speaker. Did anybody see the consumer rep? Mr. Speaker, if the commentator had not introduced that corporate rep as the consumer rep I would never have known that he was sitting on that board to represent the consumers of this Province, who are ground into the earth with electricity bills. The consumer rip-off might be a much more appropriate name for that fellow who was put there to represent his Tory buddies, Mr. Speaker.

Speaking of electricity, there is a way that we might be able to save a few solitary cents, Mr. Speaker, if we were to pass this motion and allow this hon. House to close down, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Hansard Office, the tape recorder, I am sure we could pick up a few cents up there if we closed this House down a few days earlier. Mr. Speaker, I have a few more arguments in favour of keeping this House open, but I realize my time is getting short so I am going to now move to some of the arguments against keeping this House open, which is the sole reason for this exercise, Mr. Speaker.

I am not unaware of what went on in this hon. House. The people of Newfoundland are not unaware of what went on in this House, Mr. Speaker. The people of Newfoundland know that the government in power promised the people of this Province that if they were elected, then they would start creating jobs - a mandate to create jobs, Mr. Speaker.

I remember the last election, when was it, April, May, June, July, August, six or seven months ago, and I was trying to fight in this election, and all of a sudden I heard the Premier. "We want a mandate to create jobs, a mandate to create jobs." Mr. Speaker, of all the planks in their platform, I will be quite honest, that is the one which gave me the most problem. I would compliment the hon. the Premier for such a political game that he played.

That was the most difficult plank because every voter in the Strait of Belle Isle said, "What does the Premier have? Maybe he is onto something." And I will be quite

candid, Mr. Speaker, I too wondered what the Premier was up to. I wondered what the Premier was up to. Did he indeed have some secret weapon that he kept hidden away for the four or five years previous? Was he going to bring this vicious, never before tested weapon, onto the scene and start creating jobs all over the place, Mr. Speaker. I began to feel somewhat embarrassed that I would try to stop such a gentleman who said, "Give me a mandate to create jobs." Mr. Speaker, after this government got re-elected, they were going to come up with this new way to create jobs.

What did we see? We saw the same thing, Mr. Speaker, that we had in 1952, when the hon. J.R. Smallwood entered into a deal with Ottawa and got federal money for make-work programmes. Now I cannot remember what the fancy name was at that time on those make-work programmes but they were basically make-work programmes, something to give the people a few temporary jobs to keep them from starving to death through the long winter.

After this government was elected on a mandate to create jobs, they were going to do away with the Canada Works philosophy. They were going to create well-meaning jobs not digging holes and filling them up again, Mr. Speaker, not work for the sake of work but, work that has a meaning. This is what they are going to do, they were going to give us meaningful work. Newfoundlanders are going to have to wait a few more years before they get that meaningful work, Mr. Speaker, but, it will not be much longer because the Newfoundlanders have taken about as much as they can take with this hon. crowd, Mr. Speaker. They are

straining at the bit. They are saying among themselves, "When will there be another election? When can we get another chance?" They are straining at the bit, Mr. Speaker.

There are many arguments against closing the House at this time they are numerous but, one of the main arguments is this: the government promised that they were going to create jobs and they did not create jobs. They took the Canada Works Programme and gave it another name, they called it Jobs Strategy Programme. They have done exactly the same thing that happened in 1952, the same thing that happened in 1953 and 1954 and 1963 and 1964 and 1974 and all they did was change the name. A few make-work part-time jobs so that people can get their stamps. That has not been debated yet, Mr. Speaker, and we are not going to allow the government to get off the hook.

They had a sacred promise which they gave no more credit to than Mulroney gave to his sacred promise and his sacred trust, Mr. Speaker. They had a sacred trust a sacred twist might be more appropriate, to create jobs. That is the sole reason that they were elected. I have yet to see very many of those jobs created except a few Tory patronage jobs, about forty-five or fifty faithful Tories whose jobs were created to give them full-time work. Apart from a few political patronage appointments, we have not seen a single, solitary job. All we have seen is Canada Works with a name change and Mr. Speaker, those members have not even got enough sense or ability to make a Canada Works Project work like it should.

Christmas is coming upon us and there are still thousands of people in this Province who are waiting to go to work on Canada Works Programmes or Jobs Strategy Programmes, it is the same thing, and those hon. members cannot even find a way to make this money available for the people who are depending on this for their Christmas dinner, who are depending on this for their September light bill and their October light bill. Mr. Speaker, a mandate to create jobs is the silliest, biggest farce that I have ever been exposed to in all my life. Never in the history of this Province have we seen such a farce perpetrated by one group of people upon another group of people, Mr. Speaker.

The main argument against closing down this House is that we are duty-bound, Mr. Speaker, not to let hon. gentlemen get off the hook because they made a promise. It is our solemn obligation to make sure that when they plotted a mandate to create permanent jobs, that we are going to hold them to task so that they live up to that promise. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wish to move that this question be now put.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

It was a good try, Mr. Speaker. We noticed him over there desperately trying to find a way to get her closed down but, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne deals very clearly with this and we have it ready. It is covered both in Beauchesne and in our own Rules as well, Mr. Speaker. If you look at Standing Order 42, Mr. Speaker, it says that 'The motion for the previous question may be superseded by: (a) a motion to adjourn or for reading the Orders of the Day.' Now, what we have here, Mr. Speaker, as has been decided about three different ways, is a motion to adjourn and the motion to adjourn supersedes the previous question.

Also, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, Paragraph 456 on Page 158, I will go slowly now so that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) can pick this up and maybe he should point out to the Premier that he should leave these matters to the Government House Leader and he would not get himself in trouble. 'The previous question cannot be moved upon a motion relating to the transaction of public business,' listen to this, Mr. Speaker, 'or to sittings of the House.' Q:E.D., the previous question does not apply, Mr. Speaker, and cannot be employed to cut off debate on adjournment of the House.

Mr. Speaker, let us understand what is going on here. I suppose everybody and perhaps the general public can get lulled into it but, we must not get lulled into this assumption that just because the Premier wants to get out of dodge that, therefore, the Standing Orders are torn up. Remember, Mr.

Speaker, that a government fell on the attempt to bring in closure, it brought in closure on the pipeline debate and the government fell - a Tory government fell. Now, what is the Premier saying that he can bring in closure, that there is no tradition of the House interfered with? Mr. Speaker, let us leave those few points there. Let us get to the basic principle that is at stake here. Is the Premier saying that he can close this House anytime he wants to, ignoring the rules? Is he saying that we have come to this stage in this Province that closure by another name can be invoked at any point in time?

MR. SPEAKER:

I do not think that that is absolutely relevant.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could for a moment just point out what is happening here now. Mr. Speaker, what we have here is an attempt to cut off debate. There has been one speaker on a motion to adjourn when we have serious business that has to be dealt with, not the least being job creation, reduction of taxes and if we have 115 days before the government starts to act, until the Premier starts to act, we are entitled to debate!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

All I am trying to determine from what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and any other one says is just to see if this matter is in order. It is just as simple as that.

MR. BARRY:

Your Honour, we referred Your Honour to our own Standing Orders

and to Beauchesne.

MR. SPEAKER:

Which number in Beauchesne was that?

MR. BARRY:

Beauchesne was 456, I think it was on page 158. But, Mr. Speaker, you also have here something which I think is unprecedented in Newfoundland and probably in the parliaments of Canada generally. We have the Premier employing closure after one speaker. This is what is happening, cutting off debate after one speaker, I mean do we accept that? If this is what this Legislature is coming to, if this is accepted in this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have only just to determine if the matter is in order according to our rules and precedents. It is as simple as that.

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, what I am pointing out to you is that this is not a matter of an casualness. If the Premier can do what he is doing now, we can come in, Mr. Speaker, on day one that the House is open and we can get up one speaker on a first bill previous question; the next bill one speaker, previous question Mr. Speaker, the government can have this House opened and closed and everything rammed through with no debate.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is up to the House at any time, as it is in any parliament.

MR. BARRY:

And here, Mr. Speaker, is where we see the Premier's total lack of knowledge of how democracy and democratic parliaments are run. Here we see that is up to the government at anytime. Has anybody ever heard that in this Province before, that is up to the government as to when the House of Assembly closes down?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Call in a doctor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Again, I am only just trying to determine in my mind from our own Standing Orders and from Beauchesne and any comments that any hon. members want to make and then I will consider the matter. That is the only thing I want to hear.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Mr. Speaker -

MR. BARRY:

No, I am not finished, if you do not mind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is we want Your Honour to understand the consequences which flows from this atrocious action on the part of this Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I do not think that is relevant. I just want to determine if this is in order, and the consequences are not.

MR. BARRY:

May I explain something to Your Honour?

MR. SPEAKER:

Go ahead.

MR. BARRY:

The interpretation of our Standing Orders and the interpretation of Beauchesne comes within the context of how the parliamentary system operates and Your Honour has to appreciate it. We are entitled to set out the context in which the Standing Orders of our parliament or the federal parliament operates. This is what I am setting out for Your Honour, the context. And the context is that it is not at the whim of government as to when a legislature opens or closes and it is certainly not at the whim of a majority of the House. Mr. Speaker -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If government has a two-thirds majority, then you can change the rules if you want.

MR. BARRY:

Exactly, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have some - we may as well raise it now to give Your Honour time to consider it. There was motion passed here today that this House shall not -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

What has this to do with this point of order now, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is all part of the same plot, it is all part of the conspiracy to subvert the legislative democratic process in this Province, subverted because you cannot take the heat. The Premier wants to get out of dodge.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I do not think that we should get into any discussions about anything that was passed earlier. We are discussing whether this matter is in order and it is only this matter that we are discussing now.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour would look at Standing Order 8, just to let Your Honour understand the full context in which this is now happening, 'At eleven of the clock p.m., unless the closure rule (SO 50) be then in operation,' - Pretty blunt, is it not? - 'the proceedings of any business under consideration shall be interrupted and Mr. Speaker shall adjourn the House without question put, provided that all business not disposed of at the termination of the sitting shall stand over until the next sitting day when it will be taken up at the same stage where its progress was interrupted.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, what members opposite are trying to do, by passing a motion, is to avoid the application of the closure rule and this Standing Order says that

only the closure rule applies here. Let us look at the closure rule, Mr. Speaker, look at Standing Order 50. This is the protection for the Opposition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of privilege, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now, I realize the hon. gentleman is confused, everybody in this House and in this Province realizes just how much the hon. gentleman has been confused over the last little while. He got up on a point of order and he is floundering now all over the place because he does not understand the Rules on the House. I suggest Mr. Speaker, that he should not be allowed to continue just to go on ad infinitum on the point of order.

My understanding is that he rose on a point of order to say that the previous question was out of order but, now he is getting into all sorts of superfluous things in his confusion. I do not think that this House should be inflicted by his confusion and he should be specific on the point and he should not be allowed to go on ad infinitum and into eternity. The point of order that the hon. gentleman got up on was with respect to the legitimacy of the Premier's proposal for the previous question and that is what he should be confined to, with respect to that point of order.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of privilege, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

If Your Honour would look at Standing Order 50, Your Honour will see that there is a provision, the government can force things through this House and government can close down this House but, Mr. Speaker, it has to do it by following the Rules of Closure. That is where there has to be previous notice given and that is where the Government House Leader has blown it. There has not been the necessary notice for closure and they are now trying to persuade Your Honour by certain other devious tactics to get closure in by another name. Mr. Speaker, they cannot cut off debate by the previous question and particularly, Mr. Speaker, they cannot on a motion for adjournment we have given Your Honour the precedents on that.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of privilege, I do not think that there is any point of privilege. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition was speaking on the point of order and I did not interrupt him when he was doing that. I do not think there is any point of privilege.

I would like to hear perhaps one submission from each side and then I would like to have a little time to consider this matter.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I want to make it perfectly plain that this is not a motion of closure. This, Mr. Speaker, is a perfectly legitimate parliamentary proceeding taken by the Premier, that is set forth in Beauchesne and Erskine May and in all of the authorities, most specifically under our Standing Order 40. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, I would draw to your attention that it occurs in the sections designated as motions and in those motions it deals with motions of adjournment. It says quite specifically in Standing Order 40, "The previous question, until it is decided, shall preclude all amendments to the main question, and shall be in the following words, "That this question be now put". If the previous question be resolved in the affirmative, it can be debated, obviously, the original question is to be put forthwith without any amendment or debate.'

So purely all the Premier is doing is saying, "We have a simple motion here for adjournment, now if anybody who wishes to debate it, debate it, but then the question will be put' and we are not going to get on with the kind of tactics that the hon. gentlemen have been doing throughout the whole Fall session of this House by making a mockery of it.

With respect to the specific matters that the hon. gentleman brought up, under Standing Order 42, he showed his confusion because it says, 'The motion for the previous question may be superceded,' in other words it may be put aside by a motion to adjourn afterwards, Mr. Speaker. The motion for the previous question relates to a motion of adjournment that has preceded, not superceded. So that answers that

fully and sufficiently.

The hon. gentleman made that reference to Beauchesne. 'The previous question cannot be moved upon a motion relating to the transaction of public business or to sittings of the House' and he trumpeted about sittings of the House, but if he knew Beauchesne, and if he knew the terms of Beauchesne, I could have referred him to - now I have lost it, but I have it here and it is in black and white, now, Mr. Speaker, I will have it for the hon. gentleman so he can - I hope it will not put him in a feet of pique but -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down, I want to get up.

MR. MARSHALL:

If the hon. gentleman will speak he will speak on the motion before the House now which is the previous question. Now on page 85 of Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, it clearly says what sittings of the House are, paragraph 253, "The expressions 'next sitting', 'next sitting day', or 'next sitting of the House', when used to state the time until which a question is ordered to stand over, mean the future sitting at which this question shall come up according to the precedence given to it by the standing Order." So what it does, Mr. Speaker, what really it does -

MR. BARRY:

Exactly.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, not exactly. The hon. gentlemen cannot put their interpretation on it. It means a future sitting of this House. It does not relate to the matter of adjournment and what this motion

is is not with respect to the sitting of a House as such, with that context, it relates to the adjournment of the total House not just a sitting of the House but the total House until February 6.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a motion for the House to go to February to consider that particular question; at a next sitting. That is what that particular one refers to, and, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious here under Standing Order 40 and under the rules of Beauchesne, that the procedure to move the previous question is perfectly acceptable parliamentary motion. If it is resolved in the affirmative, Mr. Speaker, what happens is the main question is put and that is all that it means. The reason why this motion was moved was because of the fact as the hon. the Premier indicated or as the government now indicates, that the reason why we are putting the House into adjournment is because of a lack of capacity of the Opposition to deal with the normal issues of the day, fifteen days on one bill wasting time, doing what they have done over this period of time. It is not closure, Mr. Speaker, and the motion is perfectly in order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will just hear one final submission now from the hon. the member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

I said one final submission from the hon. the member for Fogo.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me point out to Your Honour, and I know Your Honour will consider this anyway, because it is so obvious what is being done here, the previous question is being moved on a motion to adjourn. The motion to adjourn has to do with the sittings of this House, when this House sits and when it does not.

MR. SIMMS:  
No. No.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Listen to the expert.

MR. TULK:  
You were a bad Speaker when you were there so do not make a fool of yourself again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the real -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
That is the exact reason why the previous question cannot apply to adjournments of the House because if it applies to the adjournments of the House in essence what that means is closure. That is exactly what it means. That is the reason why that the adjournment motion supercedes. It is so simple. The Government House obviously knows the difference, as does everybody on that side, that you cannot move the previous question on a motion to adjourn because if you do that then basically what you are doing is bringing in closure through the backdoor. I am going to say this very quickly, Mr. Speaker, because we have business to get on with. For somebody to stand in this House and say that the adjournment motion is not related to sittings

of the House is so simply nonsensical that it is hard to believe that a man of the supposed ability of the Government House Leader would do it.

MR. SPEAKER:

I did mention some time ago that I was going to hear two hon. members and the hon. the President of the Council spoke and the hon. the member for Fogo. So if the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs would like to make a contribution, then I will call on one on your side.

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I only rise out of a sense of numerical equity, not that the hon. the House Leader is not worth in his argument too or fifteen of the hon. gentlemen on the other side, it is only matter of numerical equity. So obviously the hon. gentleman is worth all of the arguments of the Opposition House Leader or the Leader of the Opposition and all the other little gentlemen and big gentlemen and all those other little gentlemen who are over there.

But the hon. members seem to base all of their argument on the fact of sitting, and the next sitting day, and the next sitting of the House. They say that the previous question cannot be moved with that connection. But, the particular motion to which the previous question has been moved is not a motion with respect to the sitting of the House. What business will be considered at this sitting or that sitting or when a matter under debate will next be determined, whether it will be at this sitting or that sitting. The sitting of the House refers to a

determination that a specific item of business will be debated at a specific time. The motion to which the previous question has been moved is a motion that the House adjourn until February 6 and it has nothing to do with what particular item of business will be called on February 6. That is the difference between sitting and adjournment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I will recess for a few minutes and consider this matter.

### Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have to rule whether the previous question moved by the Premier is in order. Page 158, paragraph 456, Beauchesne states: 'The previous question cannot be moved upon a motion relating to the transaction of public business or to sittings of the House'. That is an extract from May, page 379. I had to decide whether a motion to adjourn to February is a motion in relation to the sittings of the House. I have interpreted sittings of the House to be a term in respect in the specific hours and days that the House meets and would not include the concept of a motion to adjourn. I rule the motion is in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, with respect, we have to appeal that ruling.

MR. HICKEY:

Call in the members.

### Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

A quorum is present.

The motion is that the Speaker's ruling be upheld.

On motion, the Speaker's ruling was upheld.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we are debating the previous question and the previous question that the Premier has moved is that the question be not put on a motion to adjourn. What this is by the Premier is an attempt to get out of this House to get out of answering to the people of this Province, to get out of answering for his lack of action in regards to certain things that are going on and certain things that are not going on in this Province. The Premier is feeling the heat of the day. He is feeling the heat of people who are telling him that his supposed dream of 'no more will be no more and the sun will shine in a fuddled job.' He is now using the ruling of the Speaker, the previous question, to try and get out from under a motion which, of course, he knows is amendable, namely the motion to adjourn. The whole purpose of the Premier putting the previous question in the first place, Mr. Speaker, was to stop the Opposition from moving any amendment to his motion to adjourn. As the Speaker ruled this afternoon, the Premier this afternoon tried to use the

Standing Orders of the House to get a motion to adjourn and to get that declared a dilatory motion, to put this House into place where it would have no choice only to vote on a question now. He has effectively closed down debate on matters such as the fishery, he has effectively closed down the ability of this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

It is not a point of order. I am debating the question, I am debating that the question be now put. I am debating the motion put by the Premier that the question be now put.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Hansard will show it is a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Wake up. I did not get up on a point of order. We are debating the previous question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are debating here is an attempt by the Premier not to deal with the real issues of the Province but rather to scuttle out from under them. He tells us that he gave us an agenda this Fall, an agenda that he wanted to follow, he laid out a plan for the House and we know where that plan fell. We were told in this House that by, I think it was the second week in November, we were going to see the Atlantic Accord legislation and the government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) uses the argument that

the reason we want to close so early is that he gave us an early start this Fall. Now, Mr. Speaker, the real reason why the Government House Leader supposedly gave us an early -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We said early December back in September.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier will have a chance to say his thing.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

He gave us, he said, an early start so we would get out early in December. The real reason why this House was called together this Fall, at the time that it was, was that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) really believed that he was going to have the legislation ready on the Atlantic Accord. He has not got it and I wonder why he has not got it. Is he having some problems?

MR. PATTERSON:

We have an agreement.

MR. TULK:

Not having any? Mr. Speaker, I wonder if they are having any problems with Clause 54 of that agreement? I wonder are they trying to iron them out? Would that be the case? He sits there and smiles. Now, Mr. Speaker, he may smile on the other side of this face because we have recently seen -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:

Do you want to speak?

MR. DECKER:  
Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, let me digress for a moment and say it is a pleasure to see you sitting that chair.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I accept the hon. gentleman's benevolence and you can now continue with the debate.

MR. TULK:  
You are welcome Sir and the next time, Mr. Speaker, I will try perhaps not to incur the wrath of the Speaker. I will try not to do that.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to you that this government knows that they are dealing with their own buddies in Ottawa, their own buddies who have recently broken a restructuring agreement that the Premier said was the most important agreement since Confederation at the time it was signed but, we have seen him on certain days say no, he was forced to sign it. Depending on whims or what is going on, the Premier will change his mind at any time. Now, we see them, their programme for the Fall has failed and now we see the Premier using the notion of the previous question to close this House down, to get from under for Christmas and hopefully come back like his buddy in Ottawa, the other Brian, with a new start in February. He hopes to get out of here so that he does not have to answer why there are hunger strikes in this Province or why his Minister of Manpower could not put into place an emergency programme to help fishermen. He does not have to explain some of

the legislation that is on the Order Paper. He will not be held accountable, he hopes, in this House for his lack of action and his inability to get anything done on FFTs or on the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation which has been proposed and is part of the restructuring agreement.

The restructuring agreement in this Province, Mr. Speaker pointed out that the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation should be put in place and we know that the Minister of Fisheries down there submitted a paper in August or early September, I think it was.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Wrong!

MR. TULK:  
Wrong? Alright, the Minister of Fisheries, we know, submitted a paper.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
What day? What month?

MR. TULK:  
I do not know the exact day and really do not want to know the exact day. I would like though for the hon. gentlemen to have the courtesy-

MR. DINN:  
He does not want to be confused by the facts.

MR. TULK:  
The hon. gentleman can give this gentleman no facts that will confuse him. If he can read them I can understand them. That is a fact. If they are written simple enough for him to read, then there is no problem for me to understand them. I would like for the hon. gentlemen though, perhaps in

debating this previous question to stand in this House and tell us just what it is that he has proposed on the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. I would also like for him to tell us. I hope Mr. Speaker is not upset enough with me that he will not protect me from the hon. gentlemen but, I would also like for him to tell me why it is or how he expects or does he believe that the federal government, the people who are selling off Crown Corporations in this country because they see no use for them, that right-wing government that is in Ottawa, I would like for them, in debate on this previous question, to tell us if indeed he believes that the federal government is going to put that NFDC in place.

The money is supposed to be there. I wonder is it, or is that frozen too. Let us see the hon. gentleman stand in the debate on this previous question and tell us. Let us have the hon. gentleman also tell us in debating this something that he is trying to get out from under. Just what is happening in regard to overfishing on the Grand Banks? Let us also have him tell us in debate on this question that this question be now put, let us have the Minister of Fisheries tell us just how successful he has been in getting the implementation of a resolution that was unanimously passed by this House regarding the discrimination of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Let us have him tell us that, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you know I am getting -

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Where have you been?

MR. TULK:  
FFTs, I said UIC. Have you got that through. Where has the minister been is a more pertinent question? Where has the minister been? Has he been off hiding somewhere because we see very little action coming from the hon. gentleman.

MR. BAIRD:  
Do you still hang up your stocking?

MR. TULK:  
Now listen to old landslide over there.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
Do you sit by him, Mr. Speaker? I would have thought your good manners would have rubbed off on him. Let us have the hon. gentleman tell us in debate as to whether this question should be now put for the adjournment of this House, let us have him tell us just what action he has got on the unemployment insurance issue. Let us have him tell us. Mr. Speaker, that minister has failed to do anything.

Yesterday the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) came in here and glossed over a meeting of Premiers that he attended and I suspect carried the Premier's bags, and he got into all of those beautiful things that are needed in the fishery and how -

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Where has he been?

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman seems to be touchy - got into all the things that needed to be done in terms of quality control, in terms of overfishing, the same

kind of things that we have heard coming from this gentleman and this government for the past five years but yet, Mr. Speaker, there was not one bit of action contained in that five-page statement that the hon. gentleman gave us.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would with the Premier, sitting in his Chair, that he should use any technique possible to get out of here, because as Mr. Speaker well knows, in relation to the Department of Social Services, for example, where Your Honour had the pleasure of serving as a minister, as you well know, there are serious issues involving that organization, that department, that needs to be addressed in this House. We have seen in the last couple of days a real problem the present Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) fails to take any responsibility for.

There are a few other things that need to be brought out about that, there are a few other things, Mr. Speaker, that need to be brought out as to how long this minister has known. Just how long has he known? Was it November that he really did know? Or is it longer than that that he knew that those things were going on?

So, Mr. Speaker, if I said, if I were the Premier and I were the Government House Leader, I would want to move the previous question to get out of here because there are many questions that they have failed to answer and that they are getting scalled on.

The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has been in a terrible fit for the last two or three days, trying to manipulate things. He walked into this House

on Monday, as arrogant a procedure as was ever undertaken in this Province, walked into this House and announced that he was going to close it down on Friday. Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been tradition, and hon. gentlemen know this, but he has been so upset that he refuses and fails to talk to anybody. But the hon. gentleman knows it is a tradition in this Province and in this country that, unless there is something worked out between the Opposition and the government then it is the government who opens the House and it is the Opposition who closes it.

MR. MITCHELL:

It is not the way it is working today.

MR. TULK:

It is not the way it is working today and you are dead on. Because we have reached a place in this Province where tradition means nothing to the hon. gentleman, where all that he is interested in doing is getting his own little way. We are the government. We stand there as the government and we rule supreme.

MR. BAIRD:

And will be for a long time with the likes of you over there.

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman is a prime example of where power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. He is a prime example of that. Mr. Speaker, yet he can stand over there tonight and this week and he has tried to destroy tradition which belongs to this parliament and which is one of the very foundations of our democracy and he has moved in with the heavy boot, the heavy hand and he is going to lay down the law. He is

going to wear the Opposition down. He is going to wear them down to the point where he believe they are going to fold. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell him something. He is in for a little bit more debate yet before he closes. We will see where the last person is standing, whether it is on his side or on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. gentleman get ready because we have not closed yet. We will at least, hopefully, accomplish one thing in this whole debate, and it is this: we will teach the hon. gentlemen and this is what we are doing, we will teach the hon. gentleman that he should get away from being the arrogant person that he is because he holds a very real office in this House, he is responsible, as much as the Speaker -

MR. MATTHEWS:  
What was your major?

MR. TULK:  
It was not in basketball.

MR. BAIRD:  
That is an office that you will never hold.

MR. TULK:  
The hon. gentleman must realize something, that he -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh,, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
What is your problem?

MR. DAWE:  
I have no problem.

MR. TULK:  
Go read a book and be quiet, boy!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
The hon. gentleman must know something and he must learn something that he owes -

MR. BAIRD:  
He certainly was in physical fitness or he would have failed that.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BAIRD:  
He has wax in his ears now.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! The hon. the member has a right to be heard in silence. However, I have to also say to him that he has to temper his provocation to the other side. So it is a sort of two-way street.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, let me ask you, where were the provocations?

MR. BAIRD:  
He was provoking.

MR. TULK:  
If I understood it I was addressing the role of -

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. members seemed to be enjoying the provocation. I am just saying to him, certainly, he has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. TULK:

Well, I am suppose to get sick with it, Mr. Speaker, because they are provoking us? Is that the idea?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. gentleman has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. TULK:

Of course, and I have that right and I expect Your Honour to see that that right is exercised.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:

Now let me come back - I would not dare challenge the Speaker, that is only done on that side.

MR. BAIRD:

You would not challenge 'Jim Reid' last night either.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. gentleman may continue.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me come back to the hon. gentleman and the role that he plays in this House. His role is perhaps as important in perserving parliamentary democracy in Newfoundland, it is perhaps as important or close to being as important as Your Honour's, very close to it. Because to him is charged the right to govern this Province, him and the man who sits next to him. He advises him. He is hungry now, Mr. Speaker. There is a rule over there on that side of the House now, Mr. Speaker, being broken right now, Mr. Speaker. The hon gentleman in the last couple of days has decided to get out from under the problems that he has been having in this House himself, he has decided to

use every little rule that he can find to close this place down: that he does not have to answer the questions we have put to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

Mr Speaker, what is going on over there?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence. He has asked that that right be assured him and I would ask hon. members to allow him that right.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me come back to some very serious question that are facing our people. Let me come back to the question of unemployment insurance. There are many people in this Province tonight who are hungry, there are many people in this Province who do not have money to buy food and of course, Mr. Speaker, that, in the Newfoundland that we know today, is unacceptable. Yet, when you raise a question or when you speak on a motion concerning the economy, like my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, was doing this evening, we find ourselves facing all kinds of little trickery, all kinds of little movements by the Government House Leader to try to quiet the Opposition and to try and get out of this place. That cannot be allowed to continue.

There are some very serious questions that have to be answered, perhaps by the Chair as well, as to whether that hon gentleman is not abusing his privileges as a member of this

House by trying to subvert the democratic process that rightfully belongs to the Opposition. That is a question that that hon. gentleman will have to face himself. I know he is upset because of the points we have made. For some reason or other the President of the Council always seems to believe that we on this side are trying to say he is a dishonest person, by bringing questions to him, for example, on conflict of interest. He has tried to portray to the Newfoundland people that we are somehow saying he is dishonest and that has not been the issue from the start and well he knows that.

The issue has simply been and has boiled down to whether you can be a minister of the Crown and practice law at the same time. Mr. Speaker, the examples that we have brought out, any person who really believed in the democratic process and really believed that as a minister he had a job to do would have done one thing or the other. He would have submitted his resignation as a minister or he would have submitted his resignation as a minister of the Crown. He holds one of the most important portfolios in the Province. He is the minister without portfolio responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, and, Mr. Speaker, that is perhaps one of the most important resources that we have in this Province and yet we find a minister, who himself confessed that he was a half-time minister. He was sorry he said afterwards for confessing to it, but yet he did.

MR. BAIRD:

You could not shine his shoes.

MR. TULK:

I have no desire to shine neither

his shoes nor the hon gentleman's, no desire at all, and I do not intend to.

MR. BAIRD:

I have something better for you to do.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is willing to make his maiden speech I will sit down and let him stand up. He has been here six years and if he is willing to make his maiden speech, as I say, I will sit down and let him stand up.

MR. BAIRD:

If I could not make more sense than you I would go down to the deaf mutes.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we have another sentence of his maiden speech out. Is there any more?

MR. BAIRD:

I believe you were a grudged baby. Your aunt had you.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, can you protect me from the wit of that hon. gentleman because he is just cutting me up, I can feel the blood running down on my fingertips where is taking those little slashes.

MR. MARSHALL:

(Inaudible) talk about stability or instability.

MR. TULK:

Yes, we will talk about stability; we will talk about the stability of the man who sits next to the Government House Leader; we will talk of how the other gentleman will go off in a fit and will come in here and rant and roar and try to tell the Speaker what has to be

done as we have seen him do all day today. Like the person who sits next to him, he will stand up at one point and tell us he is the great defender of democracy and at the next point we will see him doing some of the most undemocratic things we have ever seen done in this legislature. He is the real Jekyll and Hyde in Newfoundland politics. I am not sure which part you see at which time to be quite frank with you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), let me deal with that famous and hon. gentleman. He is a person who fits in very well with the Premier and the Government House Leader, a person who takes taxpayers dollars.

MR. DAWE:

Relevancy?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, it has everything to do with the previous question because there are very many questions that should be answered. If the previous question was not being used as a form of closure in this House, those questions would probably be put to the Minister of Transportation. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that he is the person who fits very well with the Government House Leader and the Premier. Why? Because he is the person, Mr. Speaker, who says, "We take taxpayers dollars and we reward our friends in terms of who

gets the better pay roll in the Province and who does not." He is the person, Mr. Speaker, who got on television last year and said "Well, you know I can work a lot better with my friends, you know I can give them rewards." He exhibits, Mr. Speaker, the very arrogance that is contained in this motion put forward by the Premier himself. He is the very person who shows us the kind of arrogance that we are looking at and the Government House Leader said, "What is the relevance to the question that is now being put?" There is the relevance, the arrogance that is contained in that motion, the hon. gentleman opposite should hang their head in shame, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) who was a Speaker in this House and supposedly-

MR. SIMMS:

I never said a word to you. Stay away from me.

MR. TULK:

Why should I stay away from you?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for Grand Falls, who was a Speaker in this House, not as good as some people who have been there since he was there but, he was a Speaker in this House and he today-

MR. FUREY:

Where did the money come from? The federal, Liberal government.

MR. DAWE:

The money came from the taxpayers of Canada, the same as all our money does.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:

Have you run out of things to say?

MR. TULK:

No. The hon. gentleman for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor), if he wants to heckle someone, should do it in his seat. Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, who was a Speaker of this House.

MR. WARREN:

(Inaudible) no pun involved.

MR. TULK:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask you to tell that hon. gentleman to either be quiet or to leave this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member asked that he be heard in silence. Please continue.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. DAWE:

If I had not been harassed by the member for St. Barbe, I would not responded so quickly. He is complaining that the member for Fogo got the money that should have gone to his district.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The member for Fogo has asked that he be heard in silence, therefore all hon. members must afford him that right.

MR. DAWE:

Thank you Mr. Speaker, I apologize.

MR. TULK:

You should apologize.

MR. FUREY:

(Inaudible) a dark horse.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, they can keep going but we will eventually have order, I hope. I asked them to leave this place, or behave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me come back to the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), the member who was a Speaker in this House and today sits with that same arrogant crowd, attempting to ram things down our throat and ram things through this House.

Mr. Speaker, my time is up but I have to say to the hon. gentlemen opposite that today is another day when they have tried to do what the Premier of this Province tried to do last week; when they tried to subvert again the democratic process from taking place; trying, through using the previous question, a technique that is used very rarely in parliament, as they know, to push through a motion to adjourn this House. They have neither the courage nor the intestinal fortitude to stand on that side of the House and keep debating - the whole thirty-six of them - they have to use that kind of technique to do away with an Opposition of fifteen members.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. gentlemen opposite, I say to the Government House Leader, and to the Premier, that they should hang their heads in shame.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we have sat here in this House again this evening and listened to why we are here; why the members on the Government side are complaining and asking questions about what we are doing here this evening. It is really quite clear why the fisheries critic and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) over here, and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) are here. We are here because of the lack of interest and the lack of this government to do something about the problems that are surrounding this Province. We are here because this government has been doing nothing for the past three or four months only completely waste time; completely mock the people by which they were elected, and the people which are paying taxes, the people who elected those people and expected to get something in return. What are they getting in return? They get government members coming in here who sit down and when you bring up a serious question they find it humorous. They find it humorous when you bring up about some poor lady out there in a low income bracket who cannot get enough income to buy food, or to keep herself warm. They find that very humorous. I find it very disgraceful.

We find that when we say there are no jobs being created, they say, "Oh yes, there is. There was 5,000 jobs created last months, there was 5,000 jobs created the month before." I find that humorous. I find it humorous when I go around the Province and I talk to people in all parts and I am not talking about political

people, I am talking about people in all parts of the Province, they say, "Look, in St. John's you go into the House of Assembly and you sit down and you listen to the jobs that are being created," and they ask me, "where are the jobs because I am not working. I have no income. I cannot even get Social Assistance without getting on my hands and knees and crawling for it and when I do get it there is not enough to survive on.

Let us get back to the jobs. We find that the government is bragging and saying that out there in the Province that people have no reason to complain. Up to the end of 1984, 8,000 people moved into the Province, 12,900 moved out of the Province the majority of which were young people, all of them because there is absolutely nothing left for them to do in this Province.

I have only been here for a past six months and on numerous occasions I have heard all the members from the government side say, "The former Liberal Government did not do anything." Your buddies did not do anything but the former Liberal Government has not been here for the past sixteen or seventeen years. The government over there have been here. You are the people who are responsible for what is happening today. You cannot blame it on the former Liberal Government; you cannot blame it on the Opposition. There is nobody to blame it on. Nobody is going to take the fault only yourselves. You are the people who are not performing, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, we are into this situation. We are not here to prove a political point. We are not here to make gestures.

I can assure the hon. member that I have no problem with my district. I will get elected there the next time, I am sure that you will not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:  
What I fear most is what is going to happen over the next three years, however long you are here, I am not sure how long you can stay there, but there is going to be a lot of serious things happen to the people of this Province. The people are driven to starvation. The hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) shakes his head. I shake my head too.

MR. DAWE:  
No, no. That was not a shake, it was a shrug.

MR. EFFORD:  
Well, a shrug whatever you call it. If you could go and see some individuals -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:  
Is that your idea to shrug people off who have serious problems who are begging you for help when you have absolutely no idea? Why do you not just tell them?

MR. BAIRD:  
You will be all right when you grow up.

MR. EFFORD:  
Why is it you just do not tell them, look, we do not know how. We have come to the point that we just have no knowledge and no concept of what is going on and we are going to step down and let the Opposition go over there because

they know they can do something better.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:  
Do something for reality for a change. Admit your failures. We are here in this Province with the highest rate of unemployment with people to the point that they are so disgusted that they will not even go to Manpower any more to look for a job; they will not even go to register. We have 23 per cent registered, and at least another 20 per cent who will not even take the time to go there because they know there is absolutely nothing there for them. Now, that is an awful situation to be in in this Twentieth Century. We have the highest taxes, we pay the highest price of gasoline, we have the highest poverty level, we have the highest rate of unemployment, we have the highest cost for food, we have the highest neglect that any government could bestow on its people, who can sit down there with his arm under his elbow and blame it on the Opposition, and say we have the worst Opposition.

MR. BAIRD:  
His arm under his elbow!

MR. EFFORD:  
His arm under his chin.

Just imagine when this government today makes fun and says it is the Opposition's fault. Well I wish you will get onto the press and tell your constituents, it is the Opposition's fault that you do not have any jobs. It is the Opposition's fault that you are paying the highest taxes. It is the Opposition's fault that the electricity bills are so high that

they have to turn it off, suffer the cold or do without food. Tell them to get on with the press and tell your people that is what you believe is the problem.

You know, how can this provincial government sit down here and make fun of something that is serious? This is not a joking and laughing matter, this is something that is out there all around you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:  
Fine, you are getting your big fat salary, why care about the next person? The Opposition cares, and this is why this House is going to stay open until the people on that side realize that it is time to stop laughing, that it is time to stop making fun, that it is time to do something about what really is the problem out in our Province today.

MR. FUREY:  
They are playing games with peoples' lives.

MR. EFFORD:  
We have seen a government put an emergency plan in place. The Opposition started something back in July in pointing out what was wrong and how serious the fishery was this year. We started back in July telling about the number of plant workers that had no income, that had no unemployment stamps, and the way the fishery was, and the way it was looking, they were not going to get any. That is some three to four months ago. We went on this week after week, week after week, and we tried to impress on the government, will you do something about it?

Sure, they started to do something

about it. They started to give the idea that they were going to put an emergency plan in place to get those people an income, so that the fishermen and the plant workers who had no stamps or who had only a partial stamps would receive jobs so that they could be qualified to receive unemployment that they could get some sort of an income that they could start their life like normal human beings. Now this was some two or three months ago. We are now a couple of weeks before Christmas, just imagine, after three months an emergency programme is not put in place. I do not know what the definition of an emergency is in Tory terms, but let me read it to you what it means in the Webster Dictionary.

MR. SIMMS:  
It is a nice colour blue book.

MR. EFFORD:  
It is a blue book, but it states what the word 'emergency' means.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Stop making a clown of yourself.

MR. EFFORD:  
'Emergency' means a result -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):  
Order, please!

MR. BAIRD:  
He is provoking, Mr. Speaker. He is provoking.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, 'emergency' means the resulting state -

MR. SIMMS:  
(Inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:

The Minister of Agriculture, is it? over there and the Minister of Forest Resources and Land if you do not realize how serious - just listen for a second -

MR. BAIRD:

You have to table that book now you are reading from it. You have to table that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

We will table you, how is that!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, could I have silence, please!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAIRD:

You will be tabled and gutted.

MR. EFFORD:

It states there very plainly that an emergency means resulting state that calls for an immediate action.

MR. FUREY:

Immediate.

MR. EFFORD:

Immediate action, not prolonged action over three or four months.

MR. BAIRD:

What page is that on?

MR. EFFORD:

This is a strange thing that a group of people who started three months ago to look for emergency money to help people who are in the situation where they have absolutely no income. You shake your head. Well, these are facts, you know they are facts. You know it is a fact that people have no

income; you know people have no money, you know people have no food. I mean, we are in Canada.

When we turn on our T.Vs and see this happening in other parts of the world we shake our heads and say, how in the name of God could this happen? But it is happening right here on our doorsteps, our neighbours are being driven to a situation where they cannot even go to the grocery store any more and pick out some items or certain items whether the price is too high or too low, they are driven to the point where they cannot even visit a grocery store.

Mr. Speaker, this may have been all very well fifteen or twenty years ago when the fishermen and the people all over rural Newfoundland had their own vegetable gardens their own cattle, their own chickens, but not so today. The majority of people in this Province today are depending on income that they expect from the products and from the day's labour that they expect -

MR. DECKER:

And they have a right to expect.

MR. EFFORD:

- and they have a right to expect to get results from a government who have called three elections in six years, just imagine, for a mandate to create jobs.

'Vote for us, the Tories, we will make things easier for you. We will give you jobs.' Three times, an unnecessarily waste of taxpayers' money. Money that they keep telling us -

MR. BAIRD:

Mr. Speaker, this is awful boring.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Now, now, be good now.

MR. EFFORD:

- they have not got. Because when you go to the government today and you ask them for monies for a project, they say, 'we do not have any money. We do not have any money for water and sewerage; we do not have any money for roads; we do not have any money to create permanent jobs; but we have \$40 million to waste on a complex nextdoor.' They have \$40 million to waste on a building, Mr. Speaker, when we have people in the Province hungry. That is all fine, if you have the money, and if you have the means to create jobs. I have no argument if the money is there, but when you go to one of the department's and you say, 'I need something,' they say we do not have it.

It is like today, the phone calls from Manpower went to the Fisheries Committees. 'If you need the money go to your bank.' After three months of expectations, three months of promising, and the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) stands on the floor of this House and says, all the money is in place, all the jobs are in place, then they get a phone call, "You will not get the money for another four to six weeks." That is an emergency in the Tory definition. That is shameful. That is disgraceful.

ALL we are asking, as an Opposition, is for the people of the Province, as taxpayers, is to make some provisions for those people who are genuinely in hunger, doing without heat in their homes, sending their kids to school without lunch money, sending their kids to school not properly dressed. Mr. Speaker, it

is totally disgusting to see thirty-five members of the government be able to sit down in their chairs one after one, and ignore it and make fun. This is no place to play political games this is not a game anymore. You do not need to sit down in your seat and make fun at people who are hungry. This is not the time nor the place to do it. There is a reason for this here this evening and surely goodness you people much realize that this is not fun, that there are people who are actually hungry. Mr. Speaker if they can sit down and have their fun and have their games and try to push the closure of this House because they are probably going down in the polls, when all they have to do is realize that if they do something sensible, the things will go their way. Help the people who are in need, create some jobs, put some pride back into the Newfoundland people because it has certainly been all taken away. When you have a family man who has never been reduced to the situation of going to a Social Service Department and asking for a handout and this December, 1985 they have been reduced to this and when they go over, they have to give a statement of their income for the last ninety days and they say, "My dear lady, I have not worked for the last twelve months, let alone the last ninety days." Then they have to go back and wait for two or three people to sit down behind a desk and make a decision as to whether they are going to give them fifty dollars to go to the supermarket. Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable and the reason the situation is because of the Minister of Employment. It is too bad that you cannot be reduced tomorrow to the situation that the people are in this Province. It

is too bad that you cannot experience it for the next month because it is happening. You may not believe it, you may make fun of it but, the word is getting out of exactly what you are doing.

That is our intention, to expose you for what you really are. We are here tonight to prove a point and we are going to stay here tonight, tomorrow, Sunday, Monday, through Christmas, through January, through February, if we have got to to make you people wake up and realize that it is time and that we have got to do something about it. So you can yawn, you can laugh, you can smile but, the time has to come that you are going to wake up sometime. Someday you are going to wake up. Mr. Speaker, we are today.

MR. HODDER:  
In conclusion.

MR. EFFORD:  
No, I am far from conclusion and I will come back time and time and time again and as long as you keep yawning, then I will have to keep coming back trying to wake you up and put some sense into you.

MR. FUREY:  
It is an example of how the government is.

MR. EFFORD:  
The hon. member over there - Landslide they call him - I have yet and I came to this House some six months ago, to watch you stand on your feet and make one sensible sentence so do not go talking about boring. Mr. Speaker, I give you an example of the situation of the people on fixed incomes. One of my constituents, her husband died just some two or three months ago, she is fifty-five years old and on a Canada Pension income of

\$232 a month. This is a joke. This is what they are laughing at. I went to Social Services and they kindly obliged by giving her another \$79 a month for a total income of \$310 a month, and she is only one example. That is what this lady is expected to live on.

MR. FUREY:  
And this is Canada.

MR. EFFORD:  
\$300 a month, and this is Canada!

MR. FUREY:  
In the Twenty-first Century.

MR. EFFORD:  
The Twenty-first Century with Newfoundland a part of Canada, and we are driving people to this situation of starvation! Members on the other side can sit there and say, 'Those people are not hungry. Those people are warm.' Her light bill for the month was \$275.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
What!

MR. FUREY:  
Shame! That is shameful!

MR. EFFORD:  
Two hundred and seventy-five dollars! Her total income was \$310, and they say, 'She does not need to be hungry, she does not need to be cold. She is getting plenty to live on.'

MR. FUREY:  
What is she supposed to eat?

MR. EFFORD:  
A family of four is receiving an income from Social Services of \$500 a month. The poverty level for a family of four in Canada is \$14,000 a year. They are living \$8,000 a year below the poverty

level. Their hydro bill, even if they go around wearing mittens and two sweaters every day, is going to be at least \$200 or \$250 a month. If they are unfortunate enough to go in arrears for one month, which one lady was this week - she moved to a new apartment and because she was in arrears, she now has to come up with a \$300 security deposit.

MR. FUREY:  
Slow death.

MR. EFFORD:  
- that the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs said he knew nothing about.

MR. DECKER:  
He was not aware!

MR. EFFORD:  
He was not aware!

MR. FLIGHT:  
He approved it.

MR. EFFORD:  
People whose homes are partially heated by electricity, get in arrears through no fault of their own, only through the fault of the income provided them by this government. They cannot get jobs so they are forced to go to Social Services, who hand out a measly \$500 a month. The minister said he was not aware! He is the Minister of Consumer Affairs and he is not aware! I say to the minister that he is not the Minister of Consumer Affairs, he is the minister of corporate affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:  
Because my meeting with Light and Power yesterday morning indicates

to me their profits are not down this year. They told me that they must make a profit, and I said 'Yes, you must make a profit, that is well and good, but look who you are making the profit on, on the backs of the poor people of this Province.' No matter how often Light and Power or Hydro apply for an increase, they get it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:  
It is automatic, rubber-stamped.

MR. EFFORD:  
We have a consumer representative on the Public Utilities Board who is supposed to protect the consumers of this Province. What does he get? - \$25,000 for three or four meetings, plus expenses.

MR. FUREY:  
What an expensive joke!

MR. EFFORD:  
Now, he knows all about having to scrape enough money together to pay his light bill! He is only receiving probably \$500 or \$600 a day on the Royal Commission, plus his private business, plus his income from city council. He is an excellent person to have as a consumer representative on the Public Utilities Board!

MR. FLIGHT:  
Who is he defending, the consumers or Hydro?

MR. EFFORD:  
Yes, that is a good question. Actually, who does he defend? That is the question I would like to ask. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, that while Light and Power rates are being increased and while food prices and the price of clothing are increasing, the income of those people -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Facts?

MR. EFFORD:

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that those people are suffering. Whether you find it serious enough to sit up and pay attention or whether you just put your hand under your chin as all of you seem to have a real problem with, and smile and laugh and say, 'To the devil with the consumer!'— because that is what your relaxed manner is indicating: 'Why should I care about the consumer? I have an income, my family is protected. My children are going to have food and toys for Christmas. My family will be able to afford to put Christmas lights outside the house and have some happiness.' Well, I can tell you, a lot of people in this Province this Christmas will not be happy. Not only that, they are not going to have their bellies full and they will not be able to afford even the tradition of putting up a few Christmas lights. Is that what you laugh at? Is that what you are proud of? Is that the reason the Premier said yesterday, 'I am proud of my ministers?' Well, by God, if he is proud of that, I am glad I am not over there with him! I would never want to be because I have the interest of the people of this Province at heart.

MR. BAIRD:

You will never be over here!

MR. EFFORD:

I would never want to be over there with you. But I assure you if there were an election called tomorrow, or if it were called next week, we would be over there very, very fast and you know it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

We are talking about jobs. We are talking about the creation of jobs. We have a member on the Tory side from Carbonear and down in Carbonear on the 31 December we are going to see fifty-five people out of work. The economy is so bad in the area that The Bay store in the plaza is closing up and fifty-five people have their notices. That is another thing to be proud of! We have a situation out there this year where Ocean Harvesters in Harbour Grace, in Port de Grave and Old Perlican, we have a member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young), a member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid) and we have a member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) who allowed this to happen. They did not once stand on their feet in this House and say, 'I am going to fight to keep these plants open.' The only time they did do anything is when an election was called and when it cost the taxpayers of this Province \$35,000 a vote to get Mr. Young elected in Harbour Grace because he won by 200 votes and there was \$7 million put in that plant.

MR. FUREY:

Is that a Newfie joke?

MR. EFFORD:

That is a fact, Mr. Speaker. That is what they are proud of. Three fish plants closed up and The Bay store in Carbonear closing up with fifty-five people with their notices at Christmas time. That is what they are proud of. They are proud of the high electricity bills. They are proud of the income that the pensioners and the Social Assistance people are receiving. They are proud of that. They are proud of the fact that we have a record of at least 23 per cent unemployment and God

knows how many more. They are proud of that.

They are proud to go out there and see these fishermen get a phone call yesterday from Canada Manpower saying it is going to be another four to six weeks before they get any money. They ask us why we are here tonight, why are we keeping this House of Assembly open? Well, dear heavens above, if we do not take the interest of the consumer, the interest of the people, and the plight of the people at heart, it is certainly not going to be taken by the members opposite. I for one would wish, Mr. Speaker, that they would wake up.

I know when you sit in a position for so long you start to get muddle headed, you cannot stay awake like the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who spends most of his time sleeping, as he is now. We have the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) down there who spends 95 per cent of the time, while the House is open, sleeping. No wonder the situation is like it is today. The Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) with his arm in his mouth trying to keep him from falling backwards.

MR. BAIRD:

When the doctor slapped you on the ass he could not even get a cry out of you when you were a baby.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, will old landslide over there stand to his feet and say something sensible for a change. I will be finished very shortly. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this is not a joke. I know why all the members opposite do not want to be in here this evening, because they are ashamed. The few that are here

probably have no idea of what is going on anyhow, they do not want to know. Most of them know but they are ashamed to come in here and sit down, they find it humorous. You find it humorous do you not? You find it humorous that people are in the situation. If the members on the other side took as much interest in creating jobs and doing something sensible as they are making fun, then this Province would not be in the situation it is today. You have to turn your energies and your ideas toward something sensible for a change. The member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) does not care how much fun you make at him. You do not bother me. The member for Gander does not care how much fun you make at him.

MR. BAKER:

Not at all.

MR. EFFORD:

Do you think that you are doing yourselves a favour by making fun? All you are doing is showing the public just what a complete nuisance you really are.

MR. FUREY:

What a bunch of asses!

MR. BAKER:

Right.

MR. EFFORD:

What a complete nuisance. I would like to see somebody turn their energy in the right direction.

MR. FLIGHT:

Bring in the T.V. cameras.

MR. EFFORD:

Oh, they never will allow the T.V. cameras because that would be suicide. They know that. We know why there are no cameras in here

because if the general population knew what was happening in this House, knew how the members of the government find the situation of this Province humorous they would take up clubs, knives, rocks, anything and rid what is over there and put something there that is a bit useful, because what is happening over there is a total disgrace to any government. I was always taught growing that Tory times were hard times.

MR. FUREY:

You never thought they were this hard, did you?

MR. EFFORD:

But I never thought it was this hard and I never thought the Tories could be so damn foolish.

MR. BAIRD:

Watch your language now.

MR. EFFORD:

I never thought they could be do foolish, because it is absolutely irresponsible, it is absolutely ridiculous when we have a government in power for the next three or four years and the people of this Province only six months into power and they are starving, freezing, and nobody cares. Well God help them, Mr. Speaker, for the next three or four years!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Tonight as I stand to debate the question which was put here tonight we see an example of democracy in action, according to the hon. the Premier. I heard him say over there earlier tonight that it is up to the government anytime to close the House. Is this the democracy I wonder that for thousands of years of people were fighting and dying for to build up our democracy and to build up the Houses of Parliament. Is this what it really comes down to that we hear the hon. the Premier sit there and say that might is right and we as an Opposition have no right to debate the problems that are facing Newfoundland?

We know what the problems are, Mr. Speaker and we have heard the hon. the House Leader and the hon. the Premier say that we have wasted fifteen days debating a Supplementary Supply Bill. Well, we surely spent fifteen days. Unfortunately, we should have spent more until we got the hon. members opposite to at least listen to what we were saying. I am sure we heard a few catch words come from over here this time. My colleague for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) would say that somewhere in the good book, the Bible, there is a phrase that says 'Towards the end of time there will be wars and rumours of wars.' But over there towards the end of their tenure we are hearing of jobs and rumours of jobs. We are wondering really what are the stories? We are hearing great

reports like 5,000 jobs created this month, 30,000 people working over last year and all of that. Yet the statistics comes out and we find that from October to November there are 2,000 more people unemployed, although we have heard the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) and the Premier talk about the jobs that he created in the last month. Everybody over there have made that cry but yet, there are 42,000 Newfoundlanders unemployed and there were 40,000 last month. Now this is only the statistical figure and that is really the people who are registered for unemployment and registered with Manpower. This is not the people who have given up and the people who do not work, cannot get jobs are sick and disheartened, discouraged and are not members of the statistical data that is fed to us every month as we get up.

We have asked questions to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) why there was a delay in the Canada Works. I heard him this morning in debate, "Just wait until February or March and you fellows will be eating your words because we are going to have a lot of people working." Is this just a ploy that they are delaying this Canada Works thing to make the statistics look good in February and March? Is this the way that the people of Newfoundland who are there right now will be treated? I had a call at noon, from a young woman down in Milltown who is living on \$120 a week on unemployment, her husband works with Forestry on one of those part-time jobs and he is laid off. She is making \$124 a week on unemployment and there is herself, her husband, a three-year-old

child and a seven-month-old child. She called and she was crying and the reason for it was that she did not have any food she did not have any milk or cereal in the house. She had gone to welfare and they told her that she really did not fit the criteria. It was a borderline case and he felt sorry for her but because the rules were there, the rules could not be broken. Mr. Speaker, so I took it upon myself to talk to the hon. minister there this afternoon and he said, "It is obviously a case of need. I will phone and ask my Deputy Ministers to phone and tell them to do something about it." Yet when I checked back at five o'clock, the Deputy Minister had not phoned down there so, that is one of the people out there tonight who are victims of the economy that has been put upon the people of Newfoundland by the hon. member opposite. She does not see anything to laugh about or to be joyous about in this season of the year is coming upon us now when we are suppose to be able to rejoice and celebrate. How can you celebrate when her grocery store cut her off because she owes the \$1,400 and an uncaring government is not prepared to issue some sort of temporary relief?

This is to me is some of the travesties put on the people of Newfoundland when we are trying as the members opposite say, to inflict prosperity. If this is the infliction of prosperity, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you it is not the kind that we need. It is a sad, sad thing when you have people phone in the depths of despair and they do not know where to turn.

I will talk about the district that I represent, the district of

Bay d'Espoir. In that end of the district from Milltown to Morrisville, 4,300 people live there, men, women and children, out of that 4,300 people, 170 have full-time jobs. This is an infliction of prosperity that we can do without too, Mr. Speaker. As I said earlier, the only boost to the economy that they get is the Canada Works Programme, call it by any name you wish but, it is still a Canada Works Programme. The training component, the Jobs Strategy, whatever you want to call it, it is still a Canada Works Programme. This is the only thing that those people are existing on down there. Now, we find and we have heard the minister sort of snidely say today, "Wait until February." You tell it to those people down there who are starving, whose unemployment is cut off and they are on some form of Social Assistance. You tell them that prosperity has been inflicted upon them. When we say we wonder why they are delaying this, is it make sure the people are going to be brow beaten to the point that they will be glad to take anything, to reach out their hand and say 'yes, at least something,' to try to beat every spark of life out of them? You take that area of Milltown and that, I suppose, is a little worst as far as unemployment is concerned than the rest of Newfoundland but, we have virtually eighty-five per cent of the people down there unemployed. One hundred per cent of the youth are unemployed, and yet we stand here tonight and the hon. Premier and members opposite are concerned about closing this House. They want to get this House closed so they can go off and, as they said, not bother about the people in Newfoundland, not bother about them. They do not want to hear of

this House opened.

I can assure hon. members that they do want to hear it open. They want some hope. They want to be given a ray of hope. They want to know what really is happening. Why is it these jobs that were promised three times in the last six years, where are the jobs, they are wondering? They are told that they will come sometime down the line, in the future down there somewhere. I would like to be able to believe that hon. gentleman, but obviously I do not think it is there unless there is some action.

We heard the Leader of the Opposition today talk about a little incentive that we had which members opposite missed. He talked about contacting the federal minister in Ottawa concerning the establishment of a sea cadet training base in Newfoundland. This was initiated by the Opposition. This could be a positive thing for Newfoundland. It would employ Newfoundlanders. It would be something that could be put into Newfoundland but yet that idea never came from over there, it came from here.

We hear the hon. the Premier talking about he now is accepting the fact that the federal grants are going to be reduced, and he is prepared to say the federal government does not have to pay off his deficit quickly. He talked about it last year. When we suggested this in the election campaign, he thought it was a very foolish idea, yet we are finding right now that he is around to agreeing with us.

We have so many other things you can talk about, many things that

the people of Newfoundland would like us to debate for them. We can talk about hydro rates and it seems to me that during the election last year we had a group called the NewLab Action Group that were out there. At one time I saw on television the leaders of this group presenting a petition to the hon. Premier with thousands and thousands of names on it. I wonder, he said it would be presented in the House. I do not think it has been presented in the House and I wonder why.

My colleague from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) just talked about consumers appointment to the Public Utilities Board, no doubt a wise choice as far as members opposite were concerned. I watched him on TV a couple of nights ago and he certainly protected them well. He protected them well. As one of my colleagues said under his breath today, 'he has won his war on poverty by getting appointed to the Public Utilities Board,' \$25,000 a year plus the other appointments that he has been given by members opposite, you know where his loyalty lies, Mr. Speaker, not to the consumers in Newfoundland, but to his masters. That is where his loyalties lie, not to the consumers in Newfoundland. He has won his war on poverty. He does not have to worry about it anymore, but the people he is supposed to protect, the people we hear who are out there who have hydro bills that are \$270 and \$300 and \$500 a month, living on \$500 or \$600 a month and have hydro bills of that magnitude to pay, yet they are still expected to feed themselves, and have some of the other amenities of life that we like to think that we are entitled to in this twentieth century in which we

live. Now we find that the man who is going to protect the consumers on the Public Utilities Board is a Tory hack, appointed and paid by them. What do you expect? How much protection is the consumer going to get from this? We have seen this sort of thing. We see Newfoundland Hydro and there have been questions about whether it should be put to public accounting. Should it be audited? We get all of the assurances that it is an excellent company. I am sure the people of Newfoundland would like to be assured that it is and there is no waste and no mismanagement, yet we never get to find out.

Ask the people of the Bay d'Espoir area, Milltown, St. Alban's as to them what is going on with Newfoundland Hydro. They are taking 40 per cent of the hydro for Newfoundland from Bay d'Espoir, where they have the highest unemployment rate in Newfoundland, and yet not a cent put back to pay any taxes toward the operation of that community. Tell that to the people who have to live below poverty.

We heard Statistics Canada say that the poverty rate is somewhere around \$14,000 a year. Anyone in that area that I am talking about right now, the 4,000 people right there in that area, if they ever got to the point that they were earning \$14,000 a year, they would not think they were in poverty. Mr. Speaker, they would think they were on top of the world. They are living right now or exist on \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year from make-work projects. They are not waiting, they are in limbo wondering when there is going to be something come down. Every day I am getting cries. I have a group in St. Alban's, a group that

banned themselves together this year and called themselves, Survival One, a group of men and women between fifty and sixty-five who have no work and no hope of work. And because of the area they live in there is no pension plans for them to fall back on. They must work or go on welfare until they reach sixty-five, old enough to receive their old age pension or Canada Pension. Those people applied for one of those make-work projects and that was put in a situation where the bureaucrats said that there was not a training component in it and there had to be a training component. It is still in limbo and not been approved.

Just imagine, people who have worked and slaved most of their lives. They are in their twilight years and they have to be degraded to this extent that they have to wait for a Canada Works programme to come in, otherwise, they are on Social Assistance. Mr. Speaker, is this justice? Is this the **Brave New World** that the members opposite told us that they were going to lead us into? We have had this charade pulled now for the last fifteen years, we go from one stage to the other. You know, the overheating of the economy was the buzz word about three years ago. We did not want to sign an offshore agreement because we were going to overheat the economy - some overheating, some economy. I wonder.

We find that the words fit the deeds I suppose. So this year in December the buss word is let us close the House. You have been here and you have been debated the Supplementary Supply Bill for fifteen days.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Get out of dodge!

MR. GILBERT:

Yes, get out of dodge, work the dodge and close it. The buss word is to close the House. 'You have heard enough now the people of Newfoundland. We do not want to make you too much aware of this.' The longer we keep this House open, the more is going to come out on how really ineffective members have been in looking after the affairs of Newfoundland.

This to me is the sort of thing that happens in Newfoundland. The management by crisis, I think, it has been referred to sometimes during this session of the House.

We have the programme for the inshore fishery. We, in the Liberal Opposition, started this year and recognized and responded to the fact that there was a crisis in the inshore fishery in Newfoundland. At that time we set up a committee to talk to the fishermen and find out what their problems were. We put it in a report that was tabled in the House and what happened? The situation, after we pointed it out, was in October a feeble attempt by government, the hon. members opposite, to work out an agreement with their buddies in Ottawa. They finally did and now it is all worked out, but the only thing about it is, the projects are approved but, there is no money. The money is there somewhere, we have heard that it is out there in Limbo somewhere. Some sort of an illusionary place out there where you can go, if you get the papers from here to there to there and back, you might get the money.

To trigger this programme, what the people of Newfoundland who

were depending on this to take them off Social Assistance and put them on to Unemployment Insurance had to do was go on a hunger strike. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the people in this Western World, the twentieth century that have to go on a hunger strike to get a job on a temporary basis long enough for them to qualify for unemployment? Can you imagine that in this supposedly Western World that we are living in that Newfoundlanders in this twentieth century have to resort to this sort of action? When they got on a hunger strike, that is when there was response from this government over there. Immediately, "Yes, your project is approved."

They talk very bravely about the people they have put to work and we wonder where and how and why they are doing it. It has to be a crisis. If there is a need and we have demonstrated a need and the people of Newfoundland realize that there is a need, the people that are out there, the hungry ones out there, they know there is a need for this House to be opened until members opposite come up with some positive plans to do something about the economy. The people of Newfoundland are sick of the buzz words, 'overheating the economy; inflicting prosperity; Brian and Brian, hand in hand, will do it.' The people of Newfoundland cannot take much more of this prosperity, they will all have to move away or starve to death. This is the sort of prosperity that has been inflicted on us by members opposite and I think it is about time that we should have this House opened and this is why we are here tonight, to have a chance to bring the cries and pleas of the hungry Newfoundlanders out there to the

members opposite to let them see that there is a problems out there.

They do not seem to recognize it. They can sit there and smile and think it is fun. You ask the lady that I talked about earlier in my discussion, the one that is living on \$120 a week, herself, her husband and two children, who have not got any food in the House tonight, they do not think it is very funny. If members opposite think it is, maybe they should get out and circulate. The thing that I see from this is we have reached the stage where, after fifteen years, they have become arrogant. They have forgotten what it is like to be in mainstream Newfoundland. They rule by divine right. We heard the hon. the Premier tonight say that we can close the House whenever we want to. Democracy shines in Newfoundland, courtesy of the hon. the Premier. This is the sort of thing that happens when you get a government that has outlived its usefulness.

The people of Newfoundland, but for 1,635 votes, made up their mind in April of this year; 1,635 votes would have put some decency on that other side of the House Mr. Speaker; people who were prepared to work for the downtrodden of Newfoundland and for those who are out there hungry tonight. Mr. Speaker, this is the reason why this House should be open. We can talk of all the reasons that you have for closing it and all the ones that the hon. the Premier made about closing it but I would like for him before this hon. House is closed to get up and respond to the unemployment, the hunger that is out there and the make-work projects that are not being pu-

through, that are being hung up so that statistically the Government of Canada will look good in February and March. Is this the way to govern? Is this the way so that the Government of Canada has said that they want those make-work projects or Canada Jobs Strategy or whatever it was, to be run? Those programmes were introduced in September. Mr. Speaker, and here it is the second week in December and they have not been approved. We know why they are not approved and the people of Newfoundland know why they are not approved. They want to make their statistics look good in February and March of this year and say, 'oh, look what have we done in creating jobs.' The same sort of an illusory figures that we get tossed at us across this House every day when this House was open.

We heard the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) stand up and very arrogantly say I have created 5,000 jobs this month.

MR. SIMMONS:  
On paper.

MR. GILBERT:  
On paper. The jobs and rumours of jobs again that we heard about. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, when members opposite are going to deliver? We have heard the rhetoric. This is why, Mr. Speaker, we feel that this House should be open until there is some firm commitment from members opposite as to what is going to happen to the economy of Newfoundland? What is going to happen to the jobless and the hungry? What is going to happen to the people that cannot pay their hydro bills this Winter? You have taken off the fuel adjustment charge that we talked about last year in the election,

it is now taken off. We hope that it will be hid away is what the members opposite are saying. If they do not see it, they might not complain about it. So they have rolled it into the rate and now they are going to put in an 8 per cent increase in rates.

This is the sort of policy that we see emanating from that side, Mr. Speaker. I feel that it is time that if we are going to have this House open, let us debate the real problems in Newfoundland and let us not stand there and listen to, 'we did this and we did that.' Let us look at the situation as it really is, not as we would like for it to be.

You know, there is a problem out there that I am sure the members opposite should be aware of and it is one of hunger, poverty, unemployment, coupled with the fact that we have a government that has been in office for fifteen years who are uncaring and are not concerned about the people of Newfoundland any longer. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this House owes it to the people of Newfoundland to stay open. We were elected by the people of Newfoundland to provide government, either in Opposition or in government.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. GILBERT:  
Yes, both of it is government. The House supplies the Government of Newfoundland, I tell the hon. minister.

MR. SIMMONS:  
They have forgotten that.

MR. GILBERT:  
That is exactly the point, Mr.

Speaker, they have forgotten that the House is the institution which supplies the government of the Province. This is where a lot of our problems are coming from - and the arrogance that I referred to a few minutes ago - it comes from statements like the one by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) there, "We provide the government. We provide the roads in the districts." We have heard the Minister of Transportation say, "We provide the roads in the districts of our friends." This is the form of government that we are getting in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, and this is the reason that Newfoundland is in the mess that it is in today, "We provide the government, we provide the roads."

The whole deal, Mr. Speaker, is that we represent the people of Newfoundland, all of us in this House and they are entitled to a better deal than they are getting from the members opposite. This is why we want this House open. We want to debate the problems of Newfoundland. We do not want to talk about the hypothetical situations.

We were supposed to come here in this House and in November we were going to debate the great Atlantic Accord which was going to provide thousands and thousands of jobs for Newfoundlanders present and yet unborn. Here we are right now, after being opened for a month and a half, very little legislation was presented and it was not the fault of the Opposition that was not presented, I would say, Mr. Speaker. The reason that the legislation was not presented was that the members opposite were not ready to have it presented and did not want to discuss it.

We were quite prepared to discuss the bills if they came up. We would have liked to talk about the conflict of interest, that was one of the ones that we would have really liked to debate. We would have liked to have debated some of the money bills that we did not get and we would have liked to have debated the Atlantic Accord. We got very little legislation passed through this House this time, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that the members opposite did not want it. It was window dressing.

They wanted to open the House to say that they had opened the House but, they did not want to do anything. They have succeeded to this point and yet they try to impose their will now that they are going to close this House, Mr. Speaker. Democracy according to the hon. Premier, "Close this House, we do not want to debate the Province of Newfoundland. Let us close this House." This is where our problem is, as my friend for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) says, "Steamroll democracy." We have had the House opened and we have gone through the sham and the charade and we have been told about the jobs that we have created on paper supposedly. The figures do not back them up when we get them from Statistics Canada and here we are now, 'we can close the House any time we want to. There is no problem, we have the right - the democratic right' as the hon. Premier said, 'to close this House.' Is that the democracy that we have been involved in? If this is democracy, Sir, I can assure you right now, the people of Newfoundland are taking stock of what is going on and they are aware. I am sure that this is why the hon. Premier and the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) are in

such a hurry to close this House. They know what is going on in Newfoundland. They know that we are acquainting the members opposite with what is going on although they are not prepared to respond. It is government by crisis that we get from the other side, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is time that we have a very serious look at the situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, they have not developed a confidence in Your Honour yet for these ticklish ones. Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order 8, which says that, "At eleven of the clock p.m., unless the closure rule (SO 50) be then in operation, the proceedings of any business under consideration shall be interrupted and Mr. Speaker shall adjourn the House without question put, provided that all business not disposed of at the termination of the sitting shall stand over until the next sitting day' - that would be Monday' - when it will be taken up at the same stage where its progress was interrupted."

Mr. Speaker, our submission is that when the clock reaches eleven that Your Honour has an obligation to adjourn the House until this coming Monday. The fact that a motion, Your Honour, has been put and rammed through this House by the majority on that side, Mr. Speaker, cannot change the Standing Orders of this House.

The House of Assembly Act, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is, provides, as the Premier acknowledged earlier this evening, that the Standing Orders can only be changed by a two-thirds vote of the House. To permit, Mr. Speaker, this House to be placed in a position where it sits past eleven o'clock without the closure rule in operation, would be to make a mockery of the rules of this House. What would be the purpose or the point of having a closure rule? The effect, Your Honour if we sit past eleven o'clock, the effect, we submit, is that Your Honour is then saying that the closure rule is no longer necessary, Mr. Speaker. There is no point in having closure. What would be the point? The previous question can be put, debate can be forced through this House, we can be forced to stay here on the first day of your sitting Your Honour they could decide it shall stay open, on the first day of the sitting, they can decide that it must stay open. In a matter of two or three days at the most they can ram the whole works through. I mean what a mockery of the rules of the House to apply that interpretation. Why is closure, Mr. Speaker, provided for in our Standing Orders if that is possible. So I ask Your Honour to rule that, it now having passed eleven, that this House must adjourn until Monday afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, if the hon. gentleman were to make any such argument like that he should have made it this afternoon. Secondly, the motion has been carried, but thirdly - now I am going to give the hon. gentleman a lesson, at least I hope another lesson in interpretation of the Standing Orders of this House.

The reason why the Standing Order says "At eleven of the clock p.m., unless the closure rule (SO 50) be then in operation, the proceedings of any business under consideration shall be interrupted." Now the closure rule provides, in Standing Order 50, that if the closure is in effect you go to two o'clock in the morning. So those two things are the only fixed times, eleven o'clock and two o'clock. Okay, so that is fine.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this House is the master of its own rules. This House refers to its own precedents. This House time and time and time again has received motions to the effect that this House will not rise at eleven o'clock in the night and we have sat, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in times past, before the rules were reformed, with respect to the passage of estimates up to thirty-six and forty hours consecutively in order to get it through.

So if the hon. gentleman wants to go back in antiquity, go back to 1951, Mr. Speaker. These were the rules that were set forth by the hon. gentleman's predecessor, predecessor, predecessor a few times over. This was in the days when the hon. Reg Sparkes was then Speaker of the House and they prepared the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly, which by

the way, Mr. Speaker, came from the old precedents prior to Confederation. I refer to Page 1 which contains a commentary on Standing Orders 1 to 13 relative to the quotation that the hon. gentleman made which, by the way, has not been changed in the reforms of the rules. They are exactly the same. The very first thing on procedure says, "If the House intends to sit later than 11:00 p.m. a motion may be made during the sitting," which was made today, "and without notice having been previously given, which is what the hon. gentleman were complaining about, we did not give notice, "the House do not adjourn at 11:00 o'clock today, and that is exactly what was passed. So, Mr. Speaker, on all counts the hon. gentleman is wrong.

The fact of the matter is that we are the government in this Province and we have brought a motion to this House in accordance with the Standing Orders that the House not rise at 11:00 o'clock. Mr. Speaker, the House does not rise at 11:00. We are on the matter of the previous question and if the hon. gentlemen wish to debate it, that is their prerogative in our democratic assembly. They can debate it in accordance with the rules of the House, but they will debate it until that resolution is finished. All we are doing, and I re-emphasize, Mr. Speaker, is adopting a procedure which must have been adopted at least forty times, in my memory, since 1970 in this House, and I am quite sure many other times as well, to sit after hours, after 11:00 o'clock. The hon. gentleman does not know the rules, Mr. Speaker. Standing Order 8 has 11:00 o'clock and it says unless the closure rule is in

place you sit until 11:00 because the closure rule is the only other rule that takes it to a specific hour, which is 2:00 a.m. in the morning.

Mr. Speaker, we have not used closure. What we have used in this case is a procedure that is well recognized, it has been passed by the House today, that the House not rise at 11:00 o'clock and the commentary - I will give it again, by Speaker Sparkes, a distinguished Speaker still alive, an hon. gentleman who was elected as a Liberal, who researched the Standing Orders and the precedence of this House going back to antiquity, and it says this, "If the House," I assume it is this House, Mr. Speaker; "intends to sit later than 11:00 p.m.," which we are now sitting later than 11:00 p.m.; "a motion may be made during the sitting," Mr. Speaker, I recall during the sitting the motion was made; "and without notice having been previously being given," no notice was given, Mr. Speaker, you know I do not have to give notice; "that the House do not adjourn until 11:00 o'clock today." That motion was placed before this Assembly today, it was duly passed and, Mr. Speaker, we will sit until after 11:00 and we will resolve the question that is now before the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. gentleman that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) knows the rules but he is not trying to tear this House apart, as the hon.

gentleman is trying to do. Mr. Speaker, Standing Order No. 8 is quite clear. It is quite specific. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to read from a little green book. I am surprised that he is not reading something from Aristotle or something like that, it surprises me to no end. It is a well known fact in this House that the Standing Orders of this House are the first authority we go to to govern ourselves and the Standing Orders are quite clear, and that is that at 11:00 o'clock the Speaker leaves the Chair. There are no ifs, ands or buts about that.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of privilege, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, I was not reading from Aristotle, I was reading from Job.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of privilege. The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

It shows his mentality, Mr. Speaker. At eleven o'clock, the Standing Orders are quite clear, the House of Assembly Act is also quite clear, we have to have a two thirds vote to change the Rules of this House. If Your Honour wishes I will read it. "Provided that no such rules shall be altered, amended or appealed except by a vote by two thirds of the members

of such House." and as the hon. gentleman said, that is this House. The fact that the Speaker this morning, Your Honour ruled that the motion was in order does not alter the fact that is it contrary, it does not matter, a majority vote cannot carry, you have to have a two thirds majority and Mr. Speaker, that was not determined this morning whether there was a two thirds majority vote.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this to you, the fact that Your Honour this morning, unlike the hon. gentlemen opposite, Your Honour is a big enough man to stand and say that the Standing Orders of this House are very important, that they govern our conduct and there was a mistake made, if Your Honour needs to do that. I submit, Your Honour that there is no other way for us to react in this House than to say that at eleven o'clock, Your Honour should have left the chair because otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we have 122 Standing Orders, and if the government wants to come in here and put motions, they can put a motion to do away with any Standing Order they wish, at any time and if that is passed, to follow their logic, if they can find some precedents and precedents comes second to our Standing Orders. If they can find some precedents to do that, then can literally tear up the rules of conduct that we govern ourselves by. Now that may be what they would wish to do. That might be the idea that they would wish but, it is in the Speaker's hands. It is not for the Government House Leader to stand and say, "You will debate the previous question and you will not get out until you debate the previous question." That is something for Your Honour to decide and on a matter of

privilege, Mr. Speaker, I have to ask you tonight to withdraw the idea that the motion that was put this morning was in order. It was not in order, Mr. Speaker, because it is contrary to the Standing Rules of this House.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I am presuming that we have stopped the clock at eleven o'clock and we are discussing this topic at the present time.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker, I only get up again in the interest of numerical equity because my colleague has already explained the matter very clearly. As the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side say, this is an amendment, a change to the Standing Orders. It is not an all. It is the use of Standing Order eight. Standing Order eight, as it is in the Standing Orders Edition we now have, the wording is exactly the same as it was in the issue of the Standing Orders on which Mr. Speaker Spark had a commentary and it is very clear. The wording is exactly the same, I will not read it again because that can be checked as a matter of record. The wording is exactly the same and what the commentary is is very clear. Nothing to do with changing the Standing Orders, it is an interpretation of the Standing Order and a commentary on the Standing Order, a commentary on Standing Order eight and what it says is: "if the House intends to

sit later than 11 o'clock p.m.," it does not say that you must amend the House of Assembly Act, but Mr. Speaker Sparks said, "A motion may be made during the sitting and without notice having been previously given 'that the House do not adjourn at eleven o'clock today'." That is exactly the motion made this afternoon and ruled in order by the Speaker. Similar motions were ruled in order by Mr. Speaker Russell, by Mr. Speaker Simms, by his illustrious predecessor, whom I will not name, by Mr. Speaker Clark, by Mr. Speaker Courage, and by Mr. Speaker Sparkes; all of the Speakers since Confederation have made identical rulings as Your Honour made this afternoon. It had nothing to do with amending the Rules of the House but using a rule, which is Standing Order eight. Now, since numerical equity has been observed, I will take my seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend you first for taking the initiative to stop the clock, because we really should not even be here, if we are going to follow Standing Order No. 8. There is no question about that. Now, the two gentlemen on the opposite side quote from Mr. Speaker Sparkes.

If you check our rules, and you cannot take one rule in isolation, our rules - as will show on the title paper - were amended many

times, including July, 1979. There is no commentary in this revised addition. There are no caveats on this particular point whatsoever. If you check the index, there is only provision in terms of eleven o'clock and it is contained in Standing Order 8.

I submit, first of all, in response to the gentleman from St. John's East that the rules have changed since 1951 many, many times. But whether or not they have changed, we are guided by what is between those blue covers. There is no commentary, no caveat, no interpretation, no extension of Standing Order No. 8. So we must read it at face value.

And at face value, Mr. Speaker, it says, "At 11 of the clock p.m., unless the closure rule", etc. It does not say, Mr. Speaker, unless there is another motion to the contrary. It provides only one caveat, only one exception and that is that there be a closure rule in effect. That is the only condition, Mr. Speaker.

Second point:

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the point that was made about the motion that was passed that the House not rise at 11. First of all, Mr. Speaker, it was done over our objections, we argued that it was not in order. We did not at that particular time introduce Standing Order No. 8,

but we did use a number of other arguments. The onus is always on the Chair, when it makes determination as to whether a motion is in order, to take into account all the precedents and the Standing Orders and we would have assumed that Mr. Speaker would have given thought to Standing Order No. 8. We take no responsibility on this side of the House if a government majority rams through a motion which is in contravention of the rules of the House. That does not, in any way, legitimize that particular motion, Mr. Speaker. The operative rule here is Standing Order No. 8, it overrides.

The third point, and on this I conclude: the gentleman for St. John's East is famous for saying and he said it again tonight, 'this House is the master of its rules.' I would be the first to agree with him. He is indeed right, that the House is the master of its rules. And one of its rules, Mr. Speaker, says that if you want to change the rules you have to have a two-thirds majority to do it. So we do not argue at all if the House is the master of the rules, we just submit that if it is going to change those rules, if it is going to exercise mastery over those rules it does so in accordance with the House of Assembly Act, which requires a two-thirds majority.

So, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you in conclusion that that motion today, while it had a majority vote because the government rammed it through for their own particular purposes, it was in contravention of Standing Order No. 8; it was in contravention of The House of Assembly Act.

Mr. Speaker, two wrongs do not make a right. If they want to change Standing Order No. 8, let them give notice up front and bring in the two-thirds majority which, I remind them, they have by the way. There is a way that they can do it. But if they are going to botch the rules, if they are going to remove the last few shreds of democratic endeavour we have in this Assembly, let them at least go through the motions of following the rules, even the most distasteful of dictators follows the semblance of rules in achieving their diabolical ends. If that is what they want to do, Mr. Speaker let them at least fall back on their two-thirds majority. Let them not throw out The House of Assembly Act tonight. I know they want to get out of here and go wherever they are going. I know that they want to close up this House. That is pretty clear and that is their right but, Mr. Speaker they have got to do it without trampling on the House of Assembly Act, I submit to you.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief on this because I think the number of words - and we have heard a lot of verbiage - really denotes the weakness of the case. If you strip away all the verbiage, what the hon. members opposite are saying is that the motion put forward this afternoon and accepted by Your Honour was out of order. In other words, they are questioning Your Honour's ruling of this afternoon. Your Honour ruled the motion was in order, the House voted on it and the motion

was passed and of course, in Your Honour ruling it was in motion, you followed a long line of precedents where exactly the same motion was accepted time and time again down through the years. So the hon. members opposite are themselves out of order now because they are questioning a ruling made by Your Honour this afternoon and they are doing it in a rather back door way. I think that they should be sublimity ruled out of order and we will get on with the business of the House.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Just one brief point, Mr. Speaker. I know Your Honour has heard a lot of debate on this point but, I would just like to make one point. Now, I agree with my colleagues who have pointed out that the rules have changed since the commentary that was placed in this green book was before this House. However, Mr. Speaker, if the green book and if the past practice under the old rules is to be followed, then with all due respect, and I know Your Honour has had to cover a lot of material today - it has been a long day - I would draw Your Honour's attention to page 27 of this green book which explains why we are into this problem we are into right now.

If Your Honour will recall, Your Honour decided that the motion to adjourn was a substantive motion and was debatable. Now, if Your Honour recalls, that motion was made by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) over our

objections while we had a motion on the floor before this House, the motion being that the Income Tax Act be passed and that was being debated. Here is why we are into a position of trying to protect ourselves against of debate on that bill. It was because Your Honour made the ruling that the Government House Leader could make that motion at that time. I draw your attention, Your Honour, to this little green book, the same little green book is being referred to, page 27.

DR. COLLINS:  
I thought you said that was out of date.

MR. BARRY:  
But if it is not, let us apply it fairly to everybody. "Members must distinguish between the motion 'that this House do now adjourn' when offered as a dilatory motion and when offered as a substantive motion. In the latter instance" which Your Honour has decided that it was, "it can only be offered by a member of the government before or between Orders of the Day." So you see why we have our problem Your Honour. We have our problem because of Your Honour's ruling, which I understand. Your Honour is not infallible. Your Honour, by inadvertence, obviously this was not brought to Your Honour's attention at the time of the ruling and that is why we are in this mix-up right now. Had Your Honour had that brought to his attention, there would be no question about closing off debate because the motion could not be put until we had completed debate on the bill but, because, inadvertently, the Government House Leader, knowing the rules, knowing this was there in the green book, he had his little

green book, attempted to pull a fast one on Your Honour and on this House, that is why we are in this conundrum. Now it is there in black and white and green. In a little green book, Mr. Speaker. In the latter instance, that is when it is made as a substantive motion, which Your Honour has said it was being made as, it can only be offered by a member of the Government before or between Orders of the Day, and not during an Order of the Day which we had before this House.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
The hon. gentleman is obviously confused. I mean, here the hon. gentlemen purported to be experts in this little green book that they have seen for the first time. Now this little green book happens to be, Mr. Speaker, the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly which were adopted in May, 1951, it says May 8, 1951. They were not just invented on May 8, 1951. They go back into parliamentary practice before we unfortunately lost our status as a self-governing country and they go back into the British parliamentary practice, Mr. Speaker. But, here it is there, adopted May 8, 1951, now look at the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly, the blue one that we put together in the 1970's. It says adopted May 8, 1951 which refer to this green book, with amendments to and including July 23, 1979, so one is obviously knitted into the other. Now the hon. gentlemen can get up, imagine now the great expert on

everything. He knows everything from Jean Chretien and how to get away the offshore away. Here is the purported leader of the alternative government, who has sat in this House as a Cabinet Minister, who has occupied the position of Deputy Speaker, and this is the first time he has seen the green book.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, you have already resolved this question. You yourself, as well as the illustrious speakers all around that ring us, have already resolved this. It is a matter of the precedents of the House of Assembly and the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, all we are doing is adopting those Standing Orders. We are now seeing the application of democracy in action. The people who are democratically elected to form the government of this Province are trying to get this Assembly in a position where it is relating in a rational way to the needs of the people of the Province of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, I feel that that question might arise and I did do some research on it for an hour before I came back. The time is not going on, it is still eleven o'clock and in view of the submissions from each side I am just going to have one more look at this matter. So I will recess for a few minutes.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! I read on page ten

of this green book the Standing Orders of 1951, under PROCEDURE "If the House intends to sit later than eleven o'clock p.m. a motion may be made during the sitting and without notice having been previously given, 'that the House do not adjourn at 11 o'clock today.'" This was in 1951 under Speaker Sparkes.

There have been numerous rulings to this effect since then. I acknowledge the Opposition's argument that Standing Orders can only be changed by two-third vote as provided by the House of Assembly Act. This section of the act was in force when Speaker Sparkes made his comments and also when subsequent rulings were made. To adjourn the House at eleven o'clock tonight would be to ignore over thirty years of parliamentary practice in our House.

This is not a categorical statement that precedent overrules Standing Orders, but having heard the arguments on the matter, I rule the House does not adjourn at eleven o'clock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
With respect, Your Honour, I want to appeal that ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The motion is that the Speaker's ruling be upheld.

On motion, the Speaker's ruling was upheld.

MR. BARRY:  
Another point of order, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
I notice that Your Honour did not refer to page - I think it was twenty-seven that I referred to in the green book and I would like to ask Your Honour to consider that the motion of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) was brought forward while there was an order of the day being debated; while there was a motion before the House. It was not before Orders of the Day, or between orders, and I would ask Your Honour in light of the established practice that has been set forth in the green book on that aspect, I would ask Your Honour to reconsider and to take a decision. I would submit that the motion of the Leader -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, if I could have silence.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
The Government House Leader's motion is out of order for the reason set out in the green book on page twenty-seven.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, twice today Your Honour has ruled on this. I would

say that the hon. gentleman when he got up and said, "with respect to Your Honour," the only thing that the hon. gentleman has respect for is his own ego, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Your Honour has made a ruling with respect to the previous question. The previous question can really only come up in debate because the way in which it is worded in the Standing Orders and what it is intended is a motion that the question be now put. So how else can it come up, Mr. Speaker, but in debate itself? The hon. gentleman never saw, to his disgrace, this green book before and all of a sudden he is trying to have a crash course in it in a space of two or three minutes. So the hon. gentleman, as I say, it is quite obvious, that the only respect the hon. gentleman has is for his own exulted ego.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is we are addressing the previous question. Your Honour has made a ruling. It is not a question of Your Honour leaving the Chair every time. Your Honour's ruling is to be upheld. The hon. gentleman has had the gall to appeal it on two occasions and he should not be allowed to appeal everything that Your Honour does, otherwise we are going to get complete disruption in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we realize that we are debating the previous question and the previous question, as Your Honour knows, once it has been settled, will then have the effect of bringing to a vote the motion with respect to adjourning until February 6. Therefore, it is the motion, Mr. Speaker, which is out of order, and therefore there is nothing for which the previous question can be put. If Your Honour considers the precedent set forth in the green book on page twenty-seven, the amendment is out of order and, therefore, there is nothing, properly, for which the previous question can be put.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, only five minutes ago Your Honour ruled that the adjournment motion was in order. Earlier this afternoon Your Honour ruled that it was in order. When Your Honour ruled five minutes ago that it was in order, Your Honour pointed out that there was a continuous tradition that such a motion was in order; a continuous tradition going back for thirty years. So only five minutes ago Your Honour, after having taken thirty minutes or so to review all of the authorities, was in a position to say that there was a continuous tradition for thirty years that such a motion was in order and that it was the second time today it had been so ruled. There is absolutely no purpose being served in the same matter coming up again and again when Your Honour, five or six minutes

ago, had ruled on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! One final point, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

A final point, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has missed the point, Your Honour. Your Honour has made the ruling that the motion can be made, but the question now Your Honour is when should the motion be put forward before this House and the point that is raised on page twenty-seven is that the motion can only be put forward when there is not another motion on the floor for debate. That is the point that we are making.

We have no choice but to accept the decision that is now being made, it has been appealed and it is final. Your Honour's ruling stands that that motion can now go forward, however, there is still the question of when should it be properly put and we submit it cannot be properly put when there is another motion, namely debate on the Income Tax Act, before this House.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, if I could reply briefly to that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

With all due respect, I did not understand the point made by the hon. gentleman. He says that the motion of adjournment cannot be properly put after the previous

question, let us say, is carried because -

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is out of order.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

- it is out of order because there is another motion before the House. I submit to Your Honour that there is never more than one motion before the House at any one time. The Address in Reply is before the House and it has been adjourned. There could be three or four debates before the House all being adjourned. The Income Tax Act has been adjourned -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

- by events and by the very fact that we are -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Exactly. There can only be one motion before the House at a time. It is not logically or in anyway possible for the House to have two motions before it at the same time; totally impossible. The income tax motion is not before the House now and it will not be before the House until it is called by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

MR. BARRY:

It was called.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Until it is called again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It is quite clear that there is

only one motion before the House now and that is the previous question. When that is disposed of, there is only one motion before the House and that is the adjournment motion. There is never more than one motion before the House at the same time.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I must rule that there is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, we appeal that ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The motion is that the Speaker's ruling be upheld.

On motion, the Speaker's ruling was upheld.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! I would ask hon. members on both sides to hear the hon. member in silence.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker, there is one good thing to be said for points of order, points of privilege and rulings by the Chair, at least it gets some members on the government benches off their backsides. We have been here since 8 o'clock and except for points of order and so on, not one person on the other side, Mr. Speaker, has got up to defend this

government and its record. The simple reason is there is a record and what there is is indefensible. What we have in this Province, Mr. Speaker - and that is why we are here tonight - is not a government, but a political party that is more interested in its own survival than it is in anything else. Talk about an ego trip, Mr. Speaker. Who has been on an ego trip for at least the last six years in this Province if it has not been the Premier? I challenge anybody on the government benches, Mr. Speaker including the Premier, to stand in his place and tell me and tell this House and the people of this Province what has this so-called government accomplished in the last half a dozen years? Just outline some of the things that have been accomplished in this Province.

Last week, I referred to the fourteen years of talking about an aluminium smelter and the development of the Lower Churchill and all of the jobs that were supposed to come with it. Joe Smallwood promised it in 1971 and this government continued to promise it for fourteen years. We still do not have it, Mr. Speaker. We had a refinery in Come By Chance in 1976 that this government closed.

MR. WINDSOR:  
Is this relevant, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN:  
They tried hard - this is why we are here.

MR. PATTERSON:  
The government did not close it economic conditions closed it.

MR. CALLAN:

The government could have kept it open in the same way it could have kept Corner Brook open or the Baie Verte mines and some of the other things around this Province that was expedient for the government to keep open because it was in a Tory district.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
What is wrong with the Baie Verte mines?

MR. CALLAN:  
What wrong with it?

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Yes.

MR. CALLAN:  
You know exactly what is wrong with it. There have been millions of dollars poured in by the Liberal Government in Ottawa, by the way.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
What?

MR. CALLAN:  
Poured in by the Liberal Government in Ottawa, the millions of dollars that went into Baie Verte to revive it.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
What?

MR. CALLAN:  
\$13 million. Mr. Speaker, was it good money? Was it a good investment? What we have seen to date, Mr. Speaker, stinks. What we have seen to date stinks. If it were worked out, Mr. Speaker, per capita, per employee the amount of money that has been spent to try to keep Baie Verte mines open so that this gentleman from Baie Verte - White Bay can get re-elected on a Tory ticket, if it was worked out, anybody in this Province could see how much

it will cost the taxpayers, not only this Province, but this country, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
And was it worth it?

MR. CALLAN:  
We do not know. It is still closed down for most of the time.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Is it still working?

MR. CALLAN:  
It is still closed down.

MR. TULK:  
It is closed down today, boy.

MR. J. CARTER:  
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:  
We have established in this House, Mr. Speaker, that if a person gets up and gives misleading information to this House, it is incumbent upon any other member from either side to get up and try and set the record straight at the time, just so Hansard is not too confused or confusing.

The point is this that in Baie Verte there is still ore, in Come By Chance there was no oil because Shaheen could not or would not pay for it, and that is the essential difference. Shaheen caused Come By Chance to close down. He would not pay his oil bill. As far as I am aware, he did not pay any of it. He may have paid some, but I am not aware of it. So I think the record should be set straight, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:

Go on and defend Shaheen.

MR. CALLAN:

I do not intend to defend Shaheen. I never did.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, you did.

MR. CALLAN:

As a matter of fact, I never did. And it is not my purpose as a member of this House to defend the Smallwood Government either, because I was not a part of it, neither was anybody on this side of the House, even though the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) talks about people misleading this House. The member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), on practically a daily basis, accuses us, the members of the present Liberal Opposition, of siding with Joey Smallwood and bringing about the giveaways that he talks about. But we were not a part of Joey Smallwood's Government, and nobody here. The Premier was a good supporter of Mr. Smallwood for a long number of years and then he saw a golden opportunity in 1971. He was President of the Liberal Executive in Green Bay and then, for the sake of expediency, like the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and like the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), he decided to change his politics.

MR. WARREN:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

That is what they did, and that is what the Premier did.

MR. WARREN:

You changed your's too.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat, who is standing in the doorway, he is not even in his own place in the House, he knows well that when I was elected in 1975 I was elected as a Liberal.

MR. WARREN:

You were never a Reform Liberal.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

I was elected as a Liberal, Mr. Speaker, and because I believed at that time that there were reforms needed in the Liberal Party and because it was expedient, and then I discovered a year later that the party that I was elected to was not going anywhere, I joined the Liberal Party. All that is history. That is not changing my politics like John Crosbie did.

MR. WARREN:

That is why I left. The party was not going anywhere.

MR. CALLAN:

I thought we went quite far, Mr. Speaker, we went from four members in March up to fifteen on the second day of April. The party that you presently belong to is the one that is not going anywhere. The member for Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer), when he was defending the Speaker's ruling just now, he talked about the adjournment by events, which was a silly argument. The only thing in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that

is adjourned by events is this governments because as far as putting people to work, providing the jobs that the people in this Province are crying out for, the record of this government is uneventful.

MR. J. CARTER:

What about the Accord?

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, practically everytime that I stand in my place to say a few words the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) says, "What about the Accord?" Well, what about the Accord? The legislation was supposed to be brought in here in the middle of November and it looks like now it is going to be on February 6. We were given some notice, earlier today that it is going to be February 6. It is just another example, Mr. Speaker, of putting truth to the big lie that the Premier was presenting to the people of this Province back in March and leading up April 2. The Premier kept saying, Mr. Speaker, put us back in power - among other things, he was asking permission to create jobs, which was a silly bit of nonsense - but he also said, "Put us back in power in this Province because we are the same political strip as our friends in Ottawa and we will have prosperity inflicted upon us," so said the present Prime Minister. Now, Mr. Speaker, what have we seen in the last eight months? What have we seen in the way of prosperity?

We have seen the fishery just as bad as it ever was and not only that, Mr. Speaker, to add insult to injury, a lot of the poor fishermen and plant workers who got two and three and four and five weeks work this summer have

to wait now until after Christmas in order to go to work and make a dollar. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries, the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), if he were over here, like he used to be, well, I do not know how he can live with his conscience. He knows and I heard the Minister of Fisheries on the airways back in early September talking about how they were working with the federal government and having meetings so they could not have it like it used to be under the Liberal government in Ottawa, where programmes got started too late in the Fall; they were talking about having the programmes underway early. What happened, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Fisheries?

He lost that battle, just like he lost the battle over FFTs and the Premier is losing every battle. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) who is sitting with his chin in his hands, what kind of a roads agreement did he get from the Mulroney government in Ottawa? We were led to believe that it was going to be \$500 million and of course, we saw what he got - not even half of that. That is on primary roads. Now, where is the secondary roads agreement, Mr. Speaker? Perhaps the Minister of Transportation will stand in his place and tell us where that is. Why has it not been signed? It is another example.

MR. J. CARTER:

Just give him a chance.

MR. CALLAN:

You are not even in your place. You should be seen and not heard, or both. The motion we are debating is to keep this House open, Mr. Speaker, and let the

government members, the ministers, not put up some of the backbenchers, which is what they were doing all this Fall; putting up some of the weak backbenchers to try and defend their record because they could not. The Cabinet Ministers in the front benches, Mr. Speaker, could not defend this government's actions, especially in the last eight months which was supposed to be the period of prosperity with the two governments of like stripes. Mr. Speaker, I have said it before, but the people in this Province are their own worst enemies. They proved it on April 2 of this year, Mr. Speaker. The majority of the people who voted Tory were foolish enough to believe the Premier when he said, "put us back and we are going to create jobs and things are going to be prosperous and rosy because we have the Tories in Ottawa." Eight months later, Mr. Speaker, we see that nothing can be further from the truth.

The people in the district of Bellevue, Mr. Speaker, did not believe the foolish nonsense, because I pointed out to the people in the district of Bellevue, Mr. Speaker, that such is not the case. And, of course, we saw a few days ago how smart the people are in the Province of Quebec, where they sent ninety-eight or ninety-nine Liberals to power. We saw what happened in Ontario in the Summer. The people in the Province of Ontario said, "well, if we have a Tory Government in Ottawa, the thing for us to do is to change our government in this Province" and after forty-two years they did it. It makes all the sense in the world, Mr. Speaker.

As I pointed out to the people in the district of Bellevue eight months ago, the Premier's arguments were hollow and they did not make any sense. They were not based on the facts of history. I asked the people in the district of Bellevue "is it true what the Premier is saying, that it is better to have a Liberal Government in this Province when we have a Tory Government in Ottawa? Is that true what the Premier is saying?" Then I answered the question. I said, "no, what happens between two levels of government depends on the leaders of these governments."

DR. COLLINS:

You were talking to yourself.

MR. CALLAN:

The Minister of Finance must have been talking to himself quite often, Mr. Speaker, judging from the budgets that he has brought down in recent years, and how much off the mark they have been.

I said if the leaders of these governments are reasonable and fair with each other, then things get done no matter what the political stripe and I gave an example to the people in Bellevue district. I said, Premier Fran Moores had no serious fights with the Liberal Government in Ottawa. And he did not. The only serious fight that Joey Smallwood had was the fight that he had with John Diefenbaker over Term 29, when Mr. Diefenbaker threatened to take it away. It was during the period when we had a Liberal Government in this Province under Joe Smallwood and we had a Tory Government in Ottawa under John Diefenbaker that we obtained funding and got the thirteen trade schools that we have across this Province, Mr. Speaker.

What everybody seems to forget, unless they were reminded, which I did in the district of Bellevue I reminded them that Joe Clark was Prime Minister for nine months in Ottawa when there was a P.C. Government here. What did we have? Did we have prosperity inflicted? Did we have acrimony between the two P.C. Governments? Of course not. The Premier will go down in history as being remembered for his famous quote 'Romeo LeBlanc was a better Fisheries Minister than his colleague, James McGrath', who is out in the cold today. There was a running battle between the Premier and Joe Clark as Prime Minister. We have it now, Mr. Speaker. The only difference is that the Premier is playing it cool but, the people in the Province can see what is happening. The people in Ottawa now are the same people. The Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) brags about the 5,000 jobs for students last Summer. After the Tories got elected in Ottawa in the Fall of 1984, Flora MacDonald, the new Minister of Employment and Immigration, announced that there would be no Summer student programmes, then two or three months later she changed her mind. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because the federal government in Ottawa, although they threatened to do away with the stupid, silly Canada Works Projects, as they referred to them, and the Premier has done it, changed their mind. What do we have today, Mr. Speaker, in this Province and in this country after one year of Toryism in Ottawa and after fourteen years of Toryism in this Province? We have knee-jerk reactions. We have the same, a different name but, the same make-work programmes for the fishermen and fish plant workers

that we got when the Liberals were in Ottawa. Nothing has changed. Last Summer we had the students around this Province doing the same sorts of projects that students were involved in when the Liberals were in Ottawa. Nothing has changed. In two or three weeks or a months times we will have these Jobs Strategy Programmes.

A new title but, as I said to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies last week, because he was kind enough to send me copies of every application that came in from Bellevue district, I looked through them and the same things that the people were doing in Arnold's Cove and Swift Current and Markland and Witbourne and all over the district were doing five years ago under the LIP Programmes, were the same sorts of things that they are going to be doing under a program with a different title and that is all that has changed. Nothing has changed, Mr. Speaker.

We are here tonight because this government is bankrupt of ideas. There is nothing around this Province. You call look around the Province. Perhaps the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) when he stands, which I think he will, will explain to me and to the House why was it that there were a few jobs and a bit of construction on the Trans Canada Highway between Witbourne and Chance Cove or Fair Haven, Bellevue where Johnnie Robinson comes from, who had to get on **Here and Now** to get his wife on a Hospital bed for a heart operation. Yes, he is a good man so why did he go to **Here and Now**? Why did he not come to the Premier after his wife being on a Hospital bed four times in a row

and had to be taken off to let in some emergency? Why did he not go to the Premier? Why did he go to Here and Now? It sounded to me like a paid political announcement. I mean the man did not make sense to me. Whose fault is it that that man's wife had to be placed on the operating table the fourth time before she received her operation? It was the Premier's fault. Of course, the Premier is the man who decides that we do not have enough money in this Province to open up the Hospital beds, it is not the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), it is the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I was asking the Minister of Transportation to explain, there were a few jobs and there was a bit of construction on the Trans Canada Highway which came to a halt two or three weeks ago, why? Was it bundling? Was it mismanagement? I know the answer but, perhaps the minister can tell the answer to everybody here in the House. Why was it that these people, who were gainfully employed, overnight lost their work and the equipment was taken off the highway. Perhaps next Spring it will be back but, the roads should have been reconstructed this Fall and Winter and made ready for pavement perhaps in one years time. Obviously, it is going to have to wait perhaps another year.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here tonight. We have a political party, not a government. I do not see any trappings of government about this crowd, Mr. Speaker. I was saying to the newer members of the Legislature, my colleagues, in the common room or somewhere the other day when they were talking about the members opposite, I said, "If you were here five years

ago, it was very, very difficult being an Opposition member because our numbers were fewer and, of course, their numbers were larger, but over and above that there was a certain confidence. There was a certain confidence about this government and when you stood in your place on the Opposition benches, there was a certain amount of intimidation because you knew that when you asked a question that the minister opposite was going to come back and cut the legs out from underneath you.

But, Mr. Speaker, as my colleague have been remarking to me, and as I have said to them in recent weeks, the guts is gone out of this government, the guts is gone out of the Premier. Why? Because, Mr. Speaker -

MR. DAWE:

There were more of you over there five years ago than there is now.

MR. CALLAN:

I was not even here five years ago actually, but it did not take me long to get back here. But, Mr. Speaker, what is happening today with this government? You know as I pick up a newspaper like The Packet in Clarendville, I read for example a committee presents a strong case for local chronic care service in Clarendville. It looks like they are going to get their chronic care units in Clarendville at the expense of the people in Come By Chance who have the facility there, once their hospital closes. The facility is there. It can be modified at very little expense and a lot cheaper than it is going to take to put a new chronic care unit in Clarendville.

Mr. Speaker, I also see on the

front page of **The Packet**, "Santa Claus is coming to town." Well, Mr. Speaker, Santa Claus is not coming to town in Markland, as I was telling the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) today. There are seventeen fish plant workers there and they cannot get one of these projects. Is Santa Claus coming to Whitbourne? No, Mr. Speaker, Santa Claus, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), the Santa Claus that I am referring to in this House, was supposed to come to town last Spring and here it is almost Christmas and I am sure that Santa Claus will not come to town in Whitbourne this year.

Mr. Speaker, I picked up **The Newfoundland Herald**, it must have been about three weeks ago, and as I thumbed through it I noticed a big picture of the Premier's brother and a message underneath announcing how glad the Premier's brother was about the opening of the Marine Technology Institute. I wonder how much it cost the government to put that picture and that little message across a full page in **The Newfoundland Herald**? As I said, I assumed it was the Premier's brother because the picture is the one you see at airports. It is no more like the Premier of the present day, because he is losing his credibility just as fast as he is losing his hair.

I thumbed through and on the next page, Mr. Speaker, I saw a picture of the Minister of Fisheries, a full page ad, again announcing the

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be

heard in silence?

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please! The hon. member for Bellevue would like to be heard in silence.

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I thumbed through **The Newfoundland Herald**, I saw four pictures of four ministers including the Premier -

MR. BARRY:

No, impossible.

MR. CALLAN:

What were they doing? You would think, Mr. Speaker, there was an election on the go.

MR. DAWE:

Which thumb did you use?

MR. CALLAN:

And the silly nonsense that the Minister of Transportation gets on with. Mr. Speaker, just let me refer to **The Clarenville Packet**, **Tenders to be Called For Paving**, a little article here on the front page. "Ron Dawe, Provincial Minister of Transportation, in conjunction with Morrisey Johnson, M.P. for Bonavista - Trinity - Conception, has announced" - now, what did Morrisey Johnson have to do with the minister deciding to pave a mile and a half or something of road towards Long Beach and Southport and Hodge's Cove.

Mr. Speaker, you can pick up practically every copy of **The Packet** and you will see the Minister of Social Services with some silly story on the front page every week. You would swear that he was a freelance reporter for **The Clarenville Packet**, talking

about these silly programmes, Mr. Speaker, sponsored by the Department of Social Services. What do people do on them? I have seen in my own hometown pregnant or unwed mothers. What are they doing? They are out scrubbing floors and so on. They working on the same sorts of things, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier criticized the former Liberal Government for doing. I read in last week's Packet that there are a bunch out there cleaning up the graveyard in Hodge's Cove and, I think, Long Beach. The same ideas, the same thing that the Premier tore stripes and stripes off the former Liberal Government for doing, not only are the present Tory Government in Ottawa doing it, but this present government took up the same challenge a couple of years ago through the Department of Social Services.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member's time is up.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I want to just have a few words on this motion. It is rather ironic, Mr. Speaker, for the past six weeks we have been sitting in this House on a daily basis -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Almost seven.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, well almost seven, since the 21 October. We have heard the Premier and the House Leader and others criticizing the Opposition for daring to ask questions of public interest, on conflict of interest, and other matters of public interest. They say we have not taken the time or the interest to question the government on the economy and on matters pertaining to the economy. Tonight we are here almost having to fight our way through red tape and silliness points of order raised by the House Leader and others, almost beating our way through a maze of red tape trying to get a chance, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of the House some of the very serious problems facing Newfoundland today. It is paradoxical, Mr. Speaker, to point out that today in Newfoundland we have probably more suffering, more unemployment -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Unemployment levels were down this October compared to October last year.

MR. W. CARTER:

Contrary to what the Premier has said, Mr. Speaker, we have more unemployment, more poverty, more people tonight doing without and facing the prospects of a bleak Christmas.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Five thousand jobs.

MR. W. CARTER:

'We have five thousand jobs,' the Premier says, Mr. Speaker. The Premier knows that is not true. Five thousand jobs maybe on paper but certainly not in the workplace. I tell you now, and I can say this with some authority, there has not been one job created yet under the government's

so-called make-work programme in the district of Twillingate, Mr. Speaker, not one.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, blame it on the member.

MR. W. CARTER:

I have my own ideas, by the way, as to why maybe there are not more jobs provided in Twillingate under this so-called make-work programme.

Today, or maybe it was yesterday, we saw the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) in his place, Mr. Speaker, brazenly saying that they had provided 5,000 jobs.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The member is making his speech, Your Honour has asked for silence, and the Premier comes in - he spends about ten minutes a session in the House, and he spends it harassing the member. He goes on with his nonsense about 5,000 jobs. Statistics Canada figures today show there are 6,000 fewer employed today than there were this time last year. Now, would the Premier permit the member to continue his speech in silence?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am sorry that I interrupted the member for Twillingate. I do not

know if he is making a good speech or not but I just want to tell the Leader of the Opposition - he mentioned in his point of order the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for November, 1985 is 1.4 per cent less than it was in November, 1984 and there were 5,000 jobs created this past week.

MR. BARRY:

Six thousand fewer people working than this time last year.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

There is an old saying that while figures do not lie, liars often figure. I am not suggesting the Premier is a liar either when I make that statement.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Or the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. CARTER:

Or the Leader of the Opposition or anybody else, for that matter. It would be unparliamentary. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, it does not matter what the Premier says or what his minister says about there being 5,000 jobs or less unemployment than a year ago or a month ago. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that today in in this Province of ours, we have more suffering, more people unemployed, more people who are doing without, who are facing the prospect of a bleak Christmas than ever before. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that even in the bleak, dirty 30s, the hungry 30s, there was probably less real suffering.

MR. DAWE:

Come on, you know your history.

MR. W. CARTER:

No. Because back in the 1930s, Mr. Speaker, people had less commitments. They did not have to worry about making a payment on their colour television set or even their black and white. Mr. Speaker, we cannot ignore the facts. If the Premier and his ministers want to use the ostrich psychology, that of burying their heads in the sand and not facing up to the realities of life, that is their business, but I am afraid the Newfoundland people are not doing it. They cannot do it. There are people hungry in my district tonight. I am not taking any joy out of saying this. I get no kick out of standing up here and preaching doom and gloom or reciting tales of misery or tales of woe from my district. I am not a negative person. I think I am a reasonably positive person, but you cannot escape the facts, the facts are there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are there. In my district tonight, Mr. Speaker, there are people, I would suggest to you, who have gone to bed hungry tonight in my district. I suggest that the same situation prevails in a lot of districts in this Province. While this is happening, and while the people of our Province and our districts are sweating it out, are suffering, are doing without, we see a government that seems to be more interested in proving the Opposition is wrong than what they are in proving themselves to be right. We have seen a government that obviously takes joy in winning little political Brownie points. They are more interested in that, Mr. Speaker, than in doing something to help the masses

who tonight are suffering the agony of poverty and unemployment. I say shame on them. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) stands in his place

AN HON. MEMBER:

Are you reading?

MR. W. CARTER:

I am not reading, I have a few notes, I am not reading. The Government House Leader blames the Opposition for wasting the time of the House on Bill 26. He says we took fifteen days debating Bill 26. Well, let me tell the House Leader this, Mr. Speaker, what other vehicle did we have in this session to discuss the problems of the economy in the Province?

As Your Honour knows, we introduced several motions under Standing Order 23 calling for special debates on certain issues. Our leader introduced a motion to discuss, I think, on the unemployment problem. I think other members on this side introduced motions under Standing Order 23 asking that we be given the right to debate these issues in the House. We were denied that right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

We were denied the opportunity. We were denied the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, because Your Honour cited the Standing Orders and said that you are able to debate the issue under the motion before the House, Bill No. 26 which we are now being criticized for keeping in the House too long.

What other bills was the House going to bring in? When the

history of this session is written, and when the experts, the political scientists and so on study the Hansard, it would obviously go down as being the most unproductive session in this House since Confederation - the most unproductive session in this House as far as the government is concerned. They have done nothing. They have done nothing at all. In fact, I have asked people to take a bit of paper and a pencil and to sit down and to write five things that this government has done in the past six or seven years, five constructive things and they cannot do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:

Oh, we have brought in a new flag, of course, we have a new Newfoundland flag now. We have matrimonial laws and we have a few other little housekeeping type of bills gone through but what has this government done? What have we done?

The only tangible evidence, Mr. Speaker, of their being in power is the construction of that \$40 million ivory tower next door. The last thing that we should have done, the very last thing that Newfoundland needs right now, the very last thing that this Province needs, Mr. Chairman, when you have hospital beds being closed and when you have welfare recipients being made do with less. The very last thing that we need in this Province right now, is a new, big and better ivory tower for the public servants. Imagine, a Province where we have so much unemployment and so much misery and where we have the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) and others

announcing the closing of beds in the Hospitals. Mr. Speaker, can I have silence?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have silence while the hon. member for Twillingate is speaking?

MR. W. CARTER:

I would ask them to show me the same courtesy that I show them. I say this again, that the last thing in this Province that we need, indeed can afford now, is this new, big building next door. What a waste of money! What a misguided sense of priorities we have in this Province! When we have Hospital beds, like I said, being closed and emergency wards in the Hospitals.

I can cite a case recently that happened to a member of my family, where undue suffering was imposed on that person because of budget constraints. There was insufficient or at least, an inadequate number of people working on that ward on that particular evening. Yet, we can afford to spend a half of a million dollars renovating the Premier's office, we can afford to spend a very substantial amount of money renovating the office of the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge)

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, come on!

MR. W. CARTER:

Oh, come on is right. We can come on all you like. We can spend all kinds of money renovating and improving the offices of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and other ministers, buying new cars with telephones in them.

MR. SIMMS:

What about the renovations when you were Minister of Fisheries?

MR. W. CARTER:

When I was Minister of Fisheries my office was not that elaborate. I did not waste public money furnishing an office just to do sit in.

Mr. Speaker, the record of this government, Sir, is scandalous. It is nothing to be proud of. We have the spectacle of ministers up trying to defend themselves against things that are indefensible. Ministers will not answer questions. Arrogance has crept in to a point where, I suppose it is almost unheard of before. Public servants, people who were elected by the people to serve the people, have become some arrogant that now they will not even take the time or the effort to stand in their places and give straight answers to straight questions.

Mr. Speaker, the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has deliberately come and took a seat across from me hoping to throw me off but, let me tell him now, that it will take more than my friend, the House Leader, the member for St. John's East, the good corporate lawyer that he is, to throw me off my few remarks.

Mr. Speaker, we have in this Province today, something that we read about in other countries. We read about it in South Africa and in some other banana republics in South America and certain Communist Countries, we have the spectacle of people who, in order to be able to stay alive, must threaten to starve themselves to death. I suppose there is a contradiction there but, that is

the case, Mr. Speaker. That is the situation. We have people who are now threatening to starve themselves to death in order to be able to get enough food to stay alive.

If the Minister of Transportation Mr. Speaker, would only listen and sit there and take that smug arrogant, complacent look off of his face, maybe he would learn something but, by sitting back and throwing nasty little barbs across the House - the same thing can be said for these two gentlemen here in the front seats - that to me is not worthy of members of this House and certainly not worthy of so-called Queen's ministers. We have the spectacle of the Premier trying to defend the Government of Canada with respect to the factory freezer trawlers. We all know what has happened there.

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker. Two Mondays ago, two weeks ago, the other great champion of Newfoundland's rights, that other great fighting Newfoundlander, the hon. John Crosbie, Canada's Minister of Justice and Attorney General, the member for St. John's West, appeared on a VOCM talk show in this Province. The question that was put to him by the moderator, "Mr. Crosbie, what is happening to the factory freezer trawler agreement? Do I take it Sir that you and the Premier of the Province, Mr. Peckford," and I am quoting him now, "have kissed and made up?" Mr. Crosbie, of course said, "Well, there was never anything to make up for. We were always cheek to cheek and jowl to jowl," his typical nonsense. He said, "We are on the same wave length. We have had discussions and we are pretty well agreed on the way it should go." Mr. Crosbie said on this open line

show, "The PC caucus in Ottawa, including the senators from Newfoundland, have been meeting now on a regular basis, working out the details of the conditions that are to be attached to the factory freezer trawler licenses." What would one assume from that statement?

It is an accomplished fact now that the licenses are going to be issued. The question now is not are the licenses going to be issued, but what terms and conditions will be attached to them? You would also conclude from that statement that the Premier and our government and the federal authorities, the ministers, have now buried the hatchet, as it were, and are on the same wave length.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I think that we can allow a certain amount of latitude in debate, but we cannot allow a total, absolute perversion of reality. What the hon. member is saying is that he is in favour of factory freezer trawlers and that this side is also in favour of them. We know that the first part of that is correct because he voted in favour of factory freezer trawlers, but to suggest in any way that this government is in favour of factory freezer trawlers is a total and utter perversion of reality. I am afraid that one has to bring it to the floor of the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is

no point of order.

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you, now that the hon. member has raised the point, that he is deliberately misleading this House. He has been misleading the House as have been other members, as has the Premier, the House Leader, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and others, all of them. When they get up in this House, Mr. Speaker, and deliberately make that statement, that the Opposition party favours factory freezer trawlers -

DR. COLLINS:

You just said it.

MR. W. CARTER:

I said nothing of the kind, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member knows I did not.

DR. COLLINS:

You voted for it.

MR. W. CARTER:

He has misled the House, and I would even say he has deliberately misled the House, and that is what has been going on.

It is the old story, if you say a lie often enough and keep repeating it, eventually everybody will be believe it. That is the theory that this government is working on. The hon. member heard what I said.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition party were the first party in this Province to publicly take a stand against, I repeat, against, factory freezer trawlers. We would not vote for the silly motion, and it was a silly

motion. It was a motion, by the way, with about as much sincerity as the one introduced by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) a few days ago wherein he, and with the blessing of the Government House Leader and the NDP member, with all of the gusto and the sincerity that he could muster - at least what he thought was sincerity and pretend was - tried to introduce a motion in this House calling upon the House to ban a certain toy that, in fact, we knew, but obviously he and his colleagues did not know, is non-existent in this country. Not only does it not exist in Newfoundland, but it does not exist in Canada. I am told that this foolish little doll that he has talked about is not even existing in Canada. I do not know what he wanted to do, if he intended to maybe in his resolution suggest that maybe the Premier, or the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) would make representation to maybe the Minister of External Relations in Ottawa (Ms. Clark), maybe the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Nielsen) to maybe head these little critters off at the pass or at the border. Maybe that was the intent of the motion. But certainly we should have allowed the House Leader and his colleagues to have made a complete fool of themselves and, on reflection, I suppose we probably should have done that and gone along with their silly little asinine scheme. But we could not do that. We did not support that silly resolution, that meaningless resolution and even then, Mr. Speaker, in their typical way of giving the lie to what we did, they then tried to make it appear that by not allowing that silly motion banning this non-existent

toy to be bought by Canadians and Newfoundlanders, they then tried to make it appear that we were anti-Newfoundland; we were anti-Canadian; and that we were very much pro banning the sea hunt. That is the same kind of lie that has been permeating this Chamber, certainly with respect to the factory freezer trawlers.

The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) knows, the Premier knows, the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) knows, the members across the floor know and Your Honour knows and the people of Newfoundland know that we did not support the factory freezer trawler resolution. In fact, quite the opposite, we were the first party to oppose it. Who knows, Mr. Speaker, it will never be known what effect it might have had had the House and the government accepted our amendment, that delegation go to Ottawa and meet with the appropriate ministers. Who knows, maybe that would have worked. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the government did not work, we know that.

I have a sneaking suspicion that that resolution never left the House Leader's Office. I would almost venture to say that that resolution that they passed, this so-called factory freezer trawler resolution, never left the House Leader's Office. That was all part of a charade and because we would not go along with it and allow them to manipulate us, then they started using the old big lie theory, or whatever you call it and tried to blacken us with it.

We look forward with a lot of interest to the Atlantic Accord. I cannot wait, I am just beside myself waiting to see the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and his

colleagues and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and the Premier, try to talk themselves around Term 54. I cannot wait. I am going to be extra careful to take care of myself during the Christmas holiday and make sure that I will be back here on February 6 and to sit in my place and to watch the ministers opposite try to -

MR. SIMMS:

You might be over here.

MR. W. CARTER:

No, I can set the hon. minister's mind at rest. If there is ever any suggestion that I would join that government, I am not saying they would want me, but if there is any suggestion, Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing in this world that I am not going to do, if there is one thing that I am sure of, and that is I would not want to be associated with a bunch of losers and that is what they are, Mr. Speaker. The polls are proving it. The polls that we have had done, the Premier talks about the polls that he has done. He bandied around figures like 54 per cent, but he is not saying, by the way, in whose favour the 54 per cent is. I can tell you now the polls that we have done would certainly indicate that that 54 per cent is not in favour of the government.

The fact of the matter is that this government is going down for the third time. The House Leader knows it, the Premier knows it, and the members opposite know it; they are going down for the third time. It is only a matter of time and they are going to be wiped out. I say now the sooner they are wiped out, the better off Newfoundland will be and the better off Newfoundlanders will

be. In fact, they have outlived their usefulness. They have overstayed their welcome.

DR. COLLINS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

When any member speaks in this House he is suppose to address the Chair. We are witnessing a love-in between two P.Cs, the House Leader on our side and the P.C. in the ranks on the other side, the hon. the member for Twillingate. They are both basically P.Cs. We are having sort of a love-in down there, talking back and forth. I protest, I think the hon. member for Twillingate should address the Chair. I think that he is totally out of order to have this love-in between these two P.Cs down in that end of the Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

With due deference to my friend and colleague, the member for Terra Nova - no offence intended - but I submit that my friend for Twillingate has indeed erred, but that it was an understandable error in that he has come to recognize what all of this on this side of the House recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the real Speaker of this House is the gentleman for St. John's East and he was addressing him.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is definitely a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would not dignify the comments of the Minister of Finance, I would not dignify the comments or its author by even referring to it. If that is the best he can do now that we are having a serious debate on a very serious matter, if that is his contribution, I say God help Newfoundland; God help this Province.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker Marshall, we are going to hang you too before it is all over.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the House Leader is there asking me what I think of widows and orphans? I would prefer to find out what he thinks about them? Because I see no evidence so far in this session that he is even aware that we have widows and orphans. I have seen no evidence of it. I have seen no evidence of any care or concern on the part of the minister or his colleagues that we have widows and orphans.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the spectacle of the minister of corporate and consumer affairs, if that is what he is called now.

I said corporate because it is obvious that I would view him more as a minister for the corporate sector than the consumer sector, defending big business, hiring a person to represent the consumer at \$25,000 a year plus on the Public Utilities Board, who clearly is more interested in protecting the corporate side of it than the consumer side.

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is running out just about in this debate but, let me say this before I take my place. Let me say a few words about the Newfoundland fishing industry.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonaville North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, thank you.

When the hon. Government House Leader was introducing this motion, in his usual verbose, hotty and arrogant manner describe the histrionics and the theatrics performed by he and the Premier a month or so before the House was to open, he tried to suggest to the people of Newfoundland that they were going to come into this House with a full agenda. That was the impression that they tried to create with the people of Newfoundland, so much concern with form and not at all with content to announce to the people that this is the legislation that is going to be discussed and debated.

I know, as one hon. member,

looked forward to that legislation thinking that this was going to be a very productive session. We came here, and as I understand the normal operation, the government introduces the legislation and, working together with the Opposition, they tell us what legislation is going to come on a weekly basis or on a daily basis. While we were debating that Supplementary Supply for fifteen days, we were waiting for the government to tell us what the next legislation was going to be and we never did get it. We got some insignificant little bills, amendments to bills but, nothing of significance. I was waiting, Mr. Speaker, for some very significant legislation.

I was hoping we were going to see some legislation to do something amending the Labour Laws in this Province, particularly since the ILO said that we had some of the most discriminatory legislation in the whole of the western world. I certainly hoping that we were going to see some legislation in this respect but, no, Mr. Speaker, there was no legislation in this respect.

Probably the most significant legislation to come before the House - well it was not significant but, we tried to make it significant and hon. members opposite did not want to make it significant - and this was an amendment to the Worker's Compensation Act where we provided an amendment that would have improved substantially the appeal process. I thought that the minister agreed that it was a reasonable way to go. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) when speaking, thought that it was a reasonable way to go but, I understand this morning that it

was rejected. The only piece of meaningful legislation that would have been achieved in this particular chamber, in this particular session, was turned down. Why was it turned down, Mr. Speaker? Because it came from on this side of the House, that is why it was turned down, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the peculiar thing, and again it needs to be addressed, particularly the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is the person who does this all the time, he is the most delighted man in Newfoundland that the Liberals did not vote for the factory freezer trawler resolution. He is the most delighted man in the world but, he is so perverted that he reads into that that we were for factory freezer trawlers. Now, I ask the gentleman is he going to bring in a new resolution that says something to the effect that when we have an election, the people out there that do not vote are voting for the Opposition, or if they do not vote, they are voting for the government? The convoluted logic, Mr. Speaker! By not voting for something, you are voting for it. The convoluted logic of the man! So when we do not vote for something, they use it any which way they want. We bring in an amendment to a piece of legislation and hon. gentlemen opposite reject it because it came from here.

Mr. Speaker, they are one group of people who should not reject any ideas that come from this side because they are completely bankrupt, they should be looking for them but, Mr. Speaker, that demonstrates the arrogance. I have been looking for the legislation. I have been waiting

for it but, hon. members opposite will not get away with saying that by staying on a bill fifteen days, that we interfered with the passage of legislation in this House. We were waiting for legislation and what came, Mr. Speaker? What was to it?

Where was the meat on the legislation that came before it? I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, there was more meat on a butcher's apron than was on the legislation that was presented in this House. So let us do away with that myth. It is the government that presents legislation in this House, and they presented nothing. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that they want this House to close because if I were the opposite side, I do not think that I would show my face here. When I look at the unemployment that is in this Province; when we look at the economic mess that this Province is in; it is no wonder that they do not want to get faced with solid questioning from this side of the House. No wonder they want to close and go and hide away somewhere but, Mr. Speaker, that is not going to solve the problem either. By closing this House, the problem is not going to go away.

It is rather strange but, hon. members opposite get great satisfaction out of the fact that the unemployment rate went down in the month of November. There was a little fluctuation and do you know what? If this group stays in power, I would not be surprised but the unemployment rate is going to go down by seven or eight points because what is happening in this Province is that the unemployment rate is going down because of the lack of initiative of this government. It is going

down because what is happening is that the participation rate is going down. It went down exactly in this year the same number of points that the unemployment rate went down in November. This year the participation rate in the Labour Force went down by 1.7 per cent, almost 2 per cent. That means that we had less people participating in the Labour Force this year than we had last year less people employed and less people looking for work.

Mr. Speaker, there is no problem to improve the unemployment rate when people give up and the unemployment rate goes up, is that what hon. gentlemen are beating their chest about? Is that what the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) comes in here and talks about 5,000 new jobs? There was not one new job created. What happened was that the participation rate went down.

I realize that hon. gentlemen like to take advantage of a little semantical error. That is the representation of small minds because I would venture to say there is not one over there that knows what the participation rate means. Not one of them! A clear sign of small, narrow, parochial minds. They do not know what the participation rate is. It is a very significant statistic. The participation rate in this Province has declined. The numbers of people actively looking for work and those working this year is at this point in time 5 per cent. Of the total percentage of the labour force in this Province, 50 per cent of them are working or are looking for work. The rest are unemployed. Some have given up looking for work.

If I were among the hon. gentlemen, I would not speak about the unemployment rate in this Province. It stayed for the last three years within 45,000 unemployed, that is where it has been, 45,000 unemployed, that is according to the statistics. I do not argue with the statistics, but as we know, it does not tell all of the truth because we have those workers that give up, the discouraged workers are sick and tired of going to manpower. Do you know what? I have had so many people in my district over the past month or so who do not even bother to register with manpower because they have heard so many derogatory remarks about manpower from their peers and from people around them, they have just give up completely on registering with manpower. I found this out because I wanted people to get jobs on this federal programme, if I can get them there. I asked them whether they have taken the right steps, whether they have registered with manpower. It is useless, an exercise in futility. Why register with Manpower? Well, I point out to them, you have to be referred to them by manpower.

This is the only thing they are doing in Newfoundland today now is making referrals, that is all manpower is doing, making referrals. They could be doing a lot more. They could be hiring people for the offshore if it were not for this ridiculous programme that this government has set up where people looking for work all around Newfoundland and Labrador have to come to St. John's, traipse in here, using the little resources they have to come in here and look for a job, instead of having them to register through manpower. Again, what a punishment we have inflicted on

the people of rural Newfoundland, to force them to come into St. John's to get registered. That is what they have to do, they have to come in here to get registered. Why do they not have them registered with manpower. That will give them something else to do, so these people do not have to come in here in St. John's to get registered or to be constantly looking for jobs. Mr. Speaker, they should be able to register for work through those regional manpower offices throughout Newfoundland and Labrador. It is a tremendous discrimination.

I know people who spend a couple of hundred bucks a month coming in here looking for work on the offshore, and most of them are only getting UIC. It is something that they cannot afford. But we cannot seem to get members opposite to get concern to develop that sensitivity and to have empathy for the workers of this Province, to recognize the financial situation that they are in. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt when you are down you are kept down. These people do not have the resources or the money to come looking for jobs, and here we force them to come to St. John's.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken about this on several occasions. It is only obvious, you do not want to be very bright, you do not want to be very smart, you do not want to be very keen to realize that whenever there is an industry going on that the people who stand the best chance of getting that job or getting these jobs are the people living close to that industry. Government should recognize that and do everything they can to try and equalize the situation, to do everything they can to try and give people living

in Central Newfoundland and Northern Newfoundland and living in Labrador a chance to get jobs with the offshore. But are they doing that, Mr. Speaker? Not at all, they are forcing them to come to St. John's, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

This is the tactic employed by the hon. members opposite, whenever you are getting close to the bone, whenever you are getting close to the truth, they start harassing and heckling to try and get somebody off track.

MR. MARSHALL:

Unnecessary repetition.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, there is no repetition, but if it is repetition -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

- it is repetition that the hon. members opposite do not like. Mr. Speaker, this notion about the discrimination with respect to the offshore, the little opportunity there is right now - there is not much - but hon. members do not want to hear that. That notion is not repetitious, it is the first time that I have raised it in this session. I have raised it before.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order the hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

There is a rule against needless repetition, Mr. Speaker. When you hear the words 'this notion, this notion, this notion, no wonder, no wonder, no wonder is going down because of lack of initiative, it is going down because of a lack of initiative, it is going down because of a lack of initiative by government. I mean the gentleman can condense what he is saying in his half an hour speech in about five seconds. All he is doing he is just repeating phrase over and over again and it is ridiculous.

MR. BAIRD:

It is needless stuff.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is needless and unnecessary tedious and boring and tiresome repetition of the worst order.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I was enjoying it myself.

MR. LUSH:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

When the people of Bonavista North, Sir, elected me to come here, they wanted me to be as repetitious as I could be. I wanted me to make the point over and over again, supposing I repeated them day after day, minute after minute, hour after hour, month after month, that

why they elected me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. PEACH:

Is this better than teaching in school?

MR. LUSH:

I will answer the question, Mr. Speaker. Yes, it is a lot better from the sense that I am operating from a much larger forum. I hope from this forum that I can have influence from a much larger group of people than I could when I was in teaching.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

The beauty about it is if I go, I will come back again when I want, that is more I can say for a lot of others, I will come back again when I want.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to get onto some important matters here. No wonder hon. members want to close down this place, Mr. Speaker, because they are ashamed of their record, an abysmal record and the people of this Province were looking forward to something

in this session, some legislation. And what did we get? Again the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) signing the most ridiculous make-work programme that was ever signed for this Province, the most inequitable work-programme that was ever signed for this Province.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members are going to hear about it. What are they going to be saying next week when they get words back from their constituents, people who got seven weeks work and are not allowed to work on this programme. What are hon. members going to be saying about that? What are hon. members going to say to the thousands of people out there who got seven or eight weeks work and think they are going to finish up on this programme, and cannot get on it?

You know, the strange thing about it is people do not understand it. I have been saying it for months in this House now about the inadequate requirements in that programme for this Province. Nobody seems to be listening, but I can assure you hon. members are going to be listening, because they do not know either. They just accept what the ministers over there sign. They are just like sheep, they accept it. They do not know that there is a requirement in that legislation which discriminates against and militates against thousands of workers in Newfoundland getting employment on the Canada Jobs Strategy programme, but they are going to know it next week and a couple of weeks down the road when they start getting calls from their constituents saying, "why can I not get a job on the programme that is in our

community?" How come I cannot get a job? Look, I have seven stamps, I have had them since August. I only need three more and I cannot get on that programme.

Mr. Speaker, if I were the minister they would get on the programme because I would not accept the programme with that silly requirement on it in Newfoundland today where work is so scarce. It is silly to have that kind of requirement where if a person has more than six weeks work, but less than ten, he or she cannot get on the programme. Now I know the logic, I know the rationalé they have used that if a person has seven weeks, he should be able to find the other three but, we know how difficult that is in rural Newfoundland. It is just as easy to find ten as to find three.

Mr. Speaker, I have been prespiring, trying to get that point across. I have written the Federal Minister on it and I have written the Provincial Minister on it back months ago. What do the minister say? The minister gets up here trying to defend the programme, trying to defend the indefensible. Mr. Speaker, nobody can defend that programme. That Canada Jobs Strategy Programme does not meet the needs of Newfoundland and by suggesting or pushing this idea that there was a training element in it, we frightened people away from applying because they figured they could not develop a programme that was going to train people.

Do you know what one of training requirements said? We must train them for a skill that is needed in the local area. Can you imagine some community in Newfoundland applying for a wharf? Who is

going to build it? Carpenters we have to train them for a skill that is needed in the community. There is not anybody out in rural Newfoundland over twelve years that cannot build a wharf and do not know what to do. We have to train them for a skill that is needed in the community. Mr. Speaker, it was geared to Central Canada, it was geared to the private sector and big business. It was not geared for Town Councils, the Rural Development Associations and the Lions and Kinsmen. So what did we do? We intimidated them, they did not apply, they said, "There is no way that we can train our people here we do not have the kind of infrastructure and much more. How can we come up with a particular skill that is needed in the community? We do not have businesses needing high technology or that kind of thing. All we can do is build wharfs and extensions of town halls and extensions of churches and building playgrounds and that kind of thing."

I tell hon. members if they follow the regulation, there will not be one project granted in rural Newfoundland, if they follow the regulations to the tee. What we have is a farse. Now, the one rule they are going to apply, which seems to me, is the one with people being employed more than six weeks but, less than ten. That is the group of people that are going to be punished. There are thousands of them out there. The irony of it all was that we prescribed the programme for fishermen in exactly the same situation, that is why we prescribed the programme for fishermen who worked but did not get enough insurable weeks.

I know that we pushed them in

doing it, going around the Province this summer but, we erroneously thought that the Canada Development Strategy Programme would look after the rest of the workers and the general work force. We did not think that the hon. members opposite would be stupid enough to sign a programme that discriminated against people out there who were successful enough to get some work and we designed the programme for the fishermen. How do the hon. gentlemen think that is go over down in Nain when he has got some fishermen down there who is going to get employed.

MR. WARREN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had to get up on a point of order because I think that the hon. member for Bonavista North did make some reference to my district so, I would just like to advise the hon. member that today I was advised that there are 229 jobs created in the district of Torngat Mountains by this project between the Federal Government and the Province. It has been accepted and Mr. Speaker, let me assure the hon. member -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Will the hon. member please come to his point of order?

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Bonavista North mentioned my district and asked me what the people of Nain would think about

no working. I would like to advise the hon. member that everybody in Nain is at the present time working.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order. The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to be stupid but, it is another thing to let the world know about it. We know the hon. gentleman has done a good job with that.

Nobody is saying there is going to be no jobs but, the point I am making is how many people are out there who are not going to be able to get jobs on the programme. That is what we are talking about. We are not talking about the people who are going to get jobs, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the people who are going to be ruled out because of that ridiculous requirement.

MR. WARREN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, again the hon. member mentioned about a town in my district Nain and I would like to advise the hon. member that there is nobody in Nain who can qualify.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

The hon. gentleman should know,

Mr. Speaker, or he should remember the old adage that a closed mouth gathers no foot. He should remember that.

Mr. Speaker, everybody must see how touchy there are. The minute we start talking about this programme, the minute we start talking about unemployment, it demonstrates quite clearly why they want to close this House. They have been here now, Mr. Speaker, for the past four or five weeks trying to defend themselves, trying to defend the indefensible, trying to defend this Canada Jobs Strategy Programme that is not geared to the needs of this Province. They have been here not giving out any legislation and trying to blame the Opposition when they are the ones responsible. They have not presented us with any legislation, Mr. Speaker.

I echo the words so eloquently put by my friend the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) when he says that he believes that this particular session, this session that the government wants closed expeditiously, will go down as the most unproductive session that was ever held in the history of this Province, certainly since Confederation. I think those were his words. The most incompetent, the most inefficient, the most ineffective, the most callous, the most insensitive government that this Province has ever seen.

But, Mr. Speaker, they are good in certain ways and do you know what? They have elevated incompetence almost to a form of art. They have got it right down and they do things like announcing this legislation that we were going to deal with and making the people of the Province feel that

things were really going to happen. Things were really going to roll and then they come in here beating their chests because they created 5,000 new jobs and the unemployment rate came down. What really happened, Mr. Speaker, was that the participation rate came down and when the participation rate comes down, the unemployment level goes up. That is what you call lack of initiative by the government. Mr. Speaker, that is what has happened in this particular Province.

Then, Mr. Speaker, they make the big announcement about the mandate to create jobs in the election and they have done absolutely nothing. That is why I say they have elevated incompetence to almost a form of art. But, I think, Mr. Speaker, they are coming to the end of the tether. I think the people of Newfoundland have got their number. I do not believe that they will be able to carry on with their political rhetoric. I do not believe that they will be able to carry on with their political games any longer. The people of Newfoundland have begun to see that this government is not about to produce. Newfoundland people are very kind people. They will give you a chance. They figure that they have given the Premier a chance and once they turn, Mr. Speaker, just look out at what is going to happen. There is no question in my mind why the Premier and why the government and why hon. members opposite want to close this House. There is no question in my mind because they have done nothing and they want to get out of here, they have got no legislation ready, they prepared no legislation and they are just going to go out and hope that the participation rate goes down and

the levels of unemployment goes up. Outside of the House, I can hear the Premier now, getting on the airways of this Province and saying what a great job they are doing with respect to creating jobs because the unemployment rate has gone down and really, Mr. Speaker, what has happened is that people have left the work force, that is all that has happened. I am just wondering what great stuff has passed by here, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like for the Premier to have told us something about free trade in this particular session.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! The hon. member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
By leave! By leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No leave! No leave!

MR. SPEAKER:  
No leave.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:  
A quorum call, Mr. Speaker, please.

### Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

A quorum is now present.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

DR. COLLINS:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, in our Standing Orders 4(b) says, "A member need not remain in the House after giving notice that a quorum is not present." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a right that is given to particular members of the House but, when the quorum was called a little while ago, there was a quorum present and a number of members left the House so as to invalidate the quorum. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that is an abuse of rules of the House. It is alright for a member to leave but, for members en masse to get out to invalidate the quorum of the House, I think it is disgraceful. It is an interference with the action of the House. It is abuse of all the other members of the House and I think that it is a practice that should be deprecated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear! Hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
The Minister of Finance is correct that some people did leave the House. There were eight sitting on this side at the time that the

quorum was called and three on the government side making a total of eleven, which is not a quorum according to the rules.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. I would like to just further say from the glancing around, I did not think that there were fourteen members present.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have had help from the gentleman for Green Bay before and I always appreciated it. I have never said since that I did not appreciate it, either at that time or now. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be useful at about 1:45 in the morning to ask ourselves, what we are doing here. Why are we here tonight?

MR. DAWE:

It has crossed my mind a couple of times as well.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, I would say to the gentleman for St. George's that it has crossed my mind too and I hope when it crossed his mind he came to a conclusion because I have come to a conclusion. I want to put the conclusion to the House for its consideration.

My colleagues before me and others who will follow me have and will address a number of the issues which are the basis for our wanting the House to continue not through this night but, through Monday and some other days until certain matters are dealt with. I want to take perhaps a different tack, I hope complimentary to what they have said and will say, and

just focus in on the issue of why we are here tonight. We are not here particularly by design. We would have preferred to come here on Monday, but that aside, why are we here tonight? I wish the Government House Leader were present. He is probably within the hearing of my voice. I say to him and I say to the Premier and others, that we are here tonight really, at this hour, because of an absence of goodwill among the members.

MR. J. CARTER:

Balderdash!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in silence. The member for St. John's North (J. Carter) has dropped in again. It was always pleasant with him but it was even more pleasant today for awhile without him. I would hope if he is there he will go back to the nap he was having a few moments ago.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that we are here really because of an absence of goodwill among members of this House. Mr. Speaker, the question of when the House was going to close for Christmas is the case in point.

In other chambers, in Queen's Park in Toronto, in Ottawa and elsewhere, there is consultation on these particular matters. In this particular House, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) stands up and as a fait accompli, as a fiat, he decrees that the House shall close on Friday. That, Mr. Speaker, is an example of the absence of goodwill. In any other chamber under our parliamentary system, the courtesy, at the very least, would be to confer with the House

Leadership of the Opposition and to indicate what the government's intentions are insofar as closing the House at a particular point in time. But that is only the straw that breaks the camel's back. That is just the latest in a long string of, not only discourtesies, but just manifestations of an absence of any goodwill here.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen the process and have been part of the process in Ottawa. I have observed it in Queen's Park, in Saskatchewan, in Alberta, in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. I have observed it in Westminster, in Canberra and in Washington and many other members here have observed it in many places.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge anybody in this Chamber to point to another place, another legislature where there is such an ongoing and manifest absence of goodwill. I think sometimes, Mr. Speaker, we forget what brings us here. It is not that we have come into a bear pit because we dislike each others personality. That may or may not be the case. Sometimes in the heat of the moment we get carried away and we hear all kinds of personal remarks made across the House.

I must say, on that subject, I wish my friend for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) were here. He is around somewhere, is he not? He is within hearing of my voice. I heard what I thought was the lowest blow that I have ever heard in my twelve years in politics, the absolutely lowest blow I have ever heard.

The House will be aware, and it is nothing that is secret because I mentioned this point to him before standing, the gentleman for Port

de Grave has a fairly advanced case of diabetes. I actually heard, at least a half dozen times, and I was so incredulous that I went to other members and said, "am I hearing it right? Did I really hear this?" You know, Mr. Speaker, in the last few days it has been heard in this Chamber, and I will not say from what side of the House it came from or who it came from, but the point is that it was said by members towards the member for Port de Grave. There was a reference that he ought to go out and take his needle and that kind of thing. Now, Mr. Speaker, well, it does not matter, that is not the issue.

MR. DAWE:

Why did you mention it if it is not the issue?

MR. SIMMONS:

It is not the issue whether the member for St. John's North (J. Carter) heard it. Perhaps we are about to prove the very point I am making, Mr. Speaker, that there is such a lack of sensitivity here.

It is not that we may have differing views on offshore, factory freezer trawlers or employment strategies, but it is this insensitivity, this lack of good will that pervades every moment that you are here. It is not a very elevating experience, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:

What do we have to do to get you to stop?

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Did you hear that?

MR. SIMMONS:

Now that I hear it, I thank him in a rather backhanded way for saying it, because he proves my point, Mr. Speaker. Here is the gentleman from Port de Grave who has a particular condition, a condition that is his personal reserve, certainly, a condition we would not wish on anybody, but it is his lot in life. What has that got to do with his view on the fishery? Does he get challenged because his view is different? No. He gets challenged because perhaps he has not taken his needle yet.

Mr. Speaker, that is an example of the kind of insensitivity that does nobody in this House any credit.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You are the one who is commenting on it.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I have not said 'you.' And this is the point that the Premier is missing. I have not said 'you' have done it and 'I' am blameless. Of course, I am saying 'we', Mr. Speaker. It may well be too lofty for the Premier. That is a possibility.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, there is no question about it.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not said 'you', I have said 'we'. I think we, as a group, can get on the defensive about this.

MR. J. CARTER:

Would the hon. member sit down and keep quiet?

MR. SIMMONS:

I have in the heat of the moment on one or two occasions said somebody is an idiot. What I mean

to say is what they said was idiotic. I do not believe in this House that anybody is an idiot.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, given the judgment of Newfoundlanders as a whole, they do not elect idiots to come to this Chamber. The law of averages -

MR. WARREN:

What about yourself?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

There you go the member for Torngat Mountains also proves my point.

MR. J. CARTER:

You were only elected by idiots and you represent all the idiots.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, it is an example of how out of touch some of us are that we think that was is gone in the last couple of minutes constitutes some kind of humour. That that is suppose to be witty. It is suppose to be funny. I think it amateur.

Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make I do not ask anybody in this House to agree with me, but I am going to state my view on this. It can be labelled nauseous, it can be labelled pontifical, or it

can be labelled anything you want. If it helps anybody for me to bear my soul and say, yes, I have called a couple of people idiots here and I do not believe they are idiots. I have a respect for every person in this Chamber. I do not agree with all of their views, but I think, as Voltaire said many years before me, I will defend to the death their right to say what they are saying. But how can you defend what they are saying if you do not even give them a chance to say it, as I am not been given much of a chance right now to say what I want to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is a real absence of goodwill here. If we had it, the government process will be served a lot better, the Premier's agenda will be served a lot better and it is his agenda. He leads a government which has the confidence of this House, and it is his agenda that prevails here four days of the week other than the Wednesday afternoon provision for private members. I submit to him and to the House that his agenda would be much better served, the whole process would be much better served, the interest of the people of Newfoundland who sent us here would be much better served, if we just backed off for a moment and realized that we are not really impressing many people.

We may get a few gaffaws, or a few laughs from people around us but, they are our supporters. They are

going to vote for us anyway. We are not really winning any new friends to our side.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we would be all much better served if we all just backed off a bit, go after each other tooth and nails, of course, I will not always agree with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), for example, on issues. I will always reserve the right to tell him what my view is on a particular issue. That does not give me the right to abuse him personally, that does not give anybody the right in this House to abuse somebody else personally and I, Mr. Speaker, for my part, have taken some personal abuse in this House this session but, I have seen a lot of it given to various people on all sides of the chamber.

MR. WARREN:

So am I.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes and so has the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and so have other member but, the fact that a number on both sides have taken it and given it, does not make it right. That is the point I am attempting to make here.

MR. WARREN:

Then why are you still giving it?

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to do in these few minutes is to make an appeal.

MR. WARREN:

Are you apologizing now for all you have done?

MR. SIMMONS:

If you want that, yes. I am submitting, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is a point that needs to be made and made well, that there

is an absence of goodwill here. We can go on beating our brains and beating each other out, but we are not impressing anybody. It is a circus for anybody who comes in here night or day. We have young children up there in the gallery day in, day out and Mr. Speaker, what we project to them is not something that you can be very, very proud of.

Mr. Speaker, that is not a reason to close it. That is not a reason to throw out the baby with the bath water. No, Mr. Speaker. That is just a reason to get some cleaner bath water, that is what it is justification for and it is not a justification for closing, Mr. Speaker, there is another way where a bunch of grown woman and men can find another way.

I sit here and I hear utterance come from grown people and I am really shocked, I have to ask myself if I am awake sometimes. Mr. Speaker, one of the parliamentarians that I came to admire most of all during my five and a half years in Ottawa was the hon. Erik Nielsen. Now, in our caucus, in Ottawa which at that time was a couple of hundred people, there was no man - and I do not think I am telling secrets of the caucus - there was no man that was whose skills raised hackles more quickly than the name of Erik Nielsen.

MR. PATTERSON:

That is why you tore after him.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, that is not the point. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that you could not find very many people who, when you got to them, really hated Erik Nielsen but, he was such a good parliamentarian that they grudgingly admired the way he

went about things. No guy could hit you harder in the House than Erik Nielsen. I tell you, you have not been there, no guy could hit you harder than Erik Nielsen.

MR. WARREN:

You are not comparing yourself to him.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am not but, the point I make is that while Erik Nielsen did and can and will, I believe for some time to come, be able to hit very hard in parliamentary terms, it was always without exception on the issues.

Stanley Noels told a group of us one time that in the number of years that he watched Nielsen in the House, he never seen Nielsen at any time engage in personalities. At no time did he engage in a personality. Mr. Speaker Thomas, the former Speaker of Westminster who retired about a couple of years ago.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Lord.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is right, you know him, you met him. Mr. Speaker, George Thomas told a group of us who had been over there - we had a session with fifteen or twenty Canadian Parliamentarians - we were talking to him about the skill with which he handled the chamber at Westminster with many more member than are here. The point, Mr. Speaker, that I want to make about Mr. Speaker George Thomas, who was Speaker of the House of Commons in England for a number of years until a couple of years ago, was that in this session with the parliamentarians, fifteen or twenty from Canda, including people in the Federal Cabinet at

the moment - Mr. Jake Epp was there, Ray Hnatyshyn was there and a number of other people - one of the gentlemen put to him the question, "how do you manage with so many numbers to maintain such control over the House of Commons? You are in charge at all time." His response, Mr. Speaker, was this: "Without exception, I cut them off as soon as they cross the line between issues and personalities".

Mr. Speaker, without casting any aspersions on the Chair, either the present occupant or, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman for St. John's Centre, or Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Terra Nova, or any past Speakers, I submit that is part of the problem. Not that those Speakers, those occupants of the Chair have wittingly allowed getting into personalities, but that the practice here over the years has grown so that personality matters become okay because we have done it before.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Yes, members are (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, that is what I am saying. I think the gentleman for Waterford - Kenmount is on my wave length on this particular issue.

MR. J. CARTER:

The person speaking now is the worse offender.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend for St. John's North, if he wants to regard this also as a mea culpa, that is fine. I have no difficulty or no pride of place

that would prevent me from apologizing to the member for St. John's North or any other member.

MR. J. CARTER:

Anyone else could make their own point.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I would invite the hon. member for St. John's North to get up and make them. He can make them in one or two ways, by simply standing up and saying ditto and sitting down, which I would much prefer, but if you stand and make them in twenty minutes. Indeed, if he would hold for some time, I will get Hansard to bring me down a copy of my remarks so that he could read them into the record as his.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER:

This is absurd.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, it is not only a pleasant little speech, it is an appeal to the people on the government side and to us on this side to recognize that this particular tactic is getting us nowhere. It is time for us to decide that we should stick with the issues.

MR. J. CARTER:

The issue is that you are a puppet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the tactic has not worked. It is not a very elevating experience and it is the sum total of the reason why we find ourselves here at 2:00 o'clock in the morning. Had there been some goodwill, it might be different. When I say goodwill, let me not be overly general, let me give specific examples. Had, for example, the Government House Leader come to the House Leadership of this side and said, "look, we are contemplating closing for Christmas at a certain day," I am sure that within a day or so we could have worked out some arrangement.

The government line has to be, oh, that crowd over there has nothing to talk about, and our line has to be that you want to shut her down. I understand all of that, we were not born yesterday. But I am sure that when we get away from the press and out of the public eye and behind closed doors, we can find, as men and woman, something that is in the best interest of us all and the best interest of the people who sent us here.

I am sure that on the matter of House closing for Christmas, for example, we could have arrived at a reasonable consensus.

MR. MARSHALL:

If we had a proper leader like the hon. gentleman (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

No, no, here we go again. Now this is, you see -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS:

Sure.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of privilege, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I mean, we would be really privileged if we could have the hon. member over there as leader of the Liberal Party rather than the hon. the jealousy Tory over there. If we had that, everything would be great.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, do you want to rule on the point of privilege?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of privilege. The the hon. the President of the Council was expressing a point of view.

MR. SIMMONS:

I thank the gentleman for St. John's East because he again - I did not orchestrate all of this - but he, like others, illustrates the very point that I am making. If you want to get a speaker off the issue, wade into it for a moment, get away from your chicken or your pizza for a minute and wade in, make a personal slur at the Leader of the Opposition and then walk out of the Chamber again. You see, that will arouse the troops and they will all clap for me.

I say to the gentleman for St. John's East they are all his

supporters anyway, they are all going to vote for him anyway. So who is he impressing?

MR. WARREN:  
Who are you impressing?

MR. SIMMONS:  
I do not care if I am impressing anybody, okay.

MR. J. CARTER:  
You are filling up the time.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
I am not sitting down until I say what I have to say or until the clock runs out on me.

MR. WARREN:  
You are wasting time.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER:  
You have not said anything yet.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Depending on the perspective of the gentleman for Torngat Mountains, I may well be wasting my time. Either by fortune or lack thereof, I am not governed by his perspectives.

MR. WARREN:  
You will not be next time either.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there could be another way; it is the way they do it in Westminster and Ottawa and everywhere else but here. They stick to the issues. Now, insofar as the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is concerned, we pick our leaders, we also pick them well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
We will not, Mr. Speaker, allow the Tories to pick our leaders. If he is concerned, Mr. Speaker, that a man like the gentleman - where are they over there? Not many there tonight - the member for St. George's (Mr. Dawe), the member for Green Bay (Premier Peckford) and a number of others, who in 1979, had Liberal membership cards - including the member for Green Bay and including the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry); if, Mr. Speaker, he went off the beaten track for awhile and wandered over into the Tory camp and then, one day, saw the light and came back, we are not going to turn away a Liberal, an original Liberal. Indeed, that policy, Mr. Speaker, of welcoming Liberals home will assure that one day we will have most of the crowd on that side over here anyway. We will not have the gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins) because he is a Tory and that is to his credit. I would not want to be one, but it is to his credit that he is a Tory.

MR. BAIRD:  
I am one.

MR. SIMMONS:  
No, the gentleman from Humber West will never be a Tory because he has a social conscience. He will never be a Tory. He would like to pretend he is one now so he can move from the third row to the second row and that kind of stuff, and you go on pretending. But he is not a Tory, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I know the hour is growing late but each hon. member has a right to stand in his place and express his views. The hon. member has a number of minutes left and he should be heard in silence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentleman from Pleasantville was not here during the earlier part of my remarks because I stated a couple of concerns that I believe very deeply. I said that I bear no malice towards anybody in this House and he is one of the people I can apply that to. I just want to say to him that I think there is a different way we could do this from the way we are doing it here. I say that with everything that is in me.

MR. DINN:

Why do you not?

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, in my speech tonight I have given notice -

MR. DINN:

And in your caucus today?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, this is not something that the Tories have a monopoly on. Nobody said that. You see how disarmed some of them become, Mr. Speaker, when you are not calling them names. I mean, they do not have familiar ground to fight on, they cannot yell back.

Mr. Speaker, I did not get up to yell.

All of the people in this Chamber know me well enough to know that if I wanted to give a thirty minute screaming speech, I know how to do it. It might not make much sense, but I can scream for thirty minutes if that is what you want me to do. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not particularly believe that is why I was sent here. I believe very firmly that if I am going to achieve anything for the constituency that sent me here and for the electorate at large, to whom I also have a responsibility, I think we have to find a way to harness the talents in this particular Chamber. We do not argue the results of the election either way. We are the Opposition. There is a government on the other side. But, Mr. Speaker, together we provide the governmental process in this Province. There are people in this House who have been around longer than I have and people who have not been around as long.

MR. SIMMS:

And they will probably be around longer.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes and maybe they will be here longer than I have. So, bully, they scored another important point, another Brownie point! But, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to serve the governmental process, I submit to the mature minds here -

MR. SIMMS:

The governmental process here is the Legislature.

MR. SIMMONS:

The Legislature is part of the governmental process. This government cannot govern without

the Legislature. Obviously, it is part of the governmental process. The Opposition is part of the governmental process, there is no question about that. The administration here flows from the Legislature and this Opposition is part of the governmental process. We take decisions on the budget. There is nothing that says that we always vote against the budget. We may well want to vote for a budget or vote for a measure. There is nothing that says that we will vote against everything the government proposes. We are part of the governmental process.

DR. COLLINS:

Are you saying the Opposition is rudderless at the present time?

MR. SIMMONS:

There you go again, Mr. Speaker. That is why he is a Tory I suppose.

Mr. Speaker, I say that if I - when I say I, I mean other people in this House - am going to -

MR. BAIRD:

He must have died and does not know where he is.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

You know, Mr. Speaker, I realize that when I decided to go on this tack that I was taking a very calculated risk. I realize that you need a lot more than a half hour to convince some of the people of my thesis. There are people here I can see, without naming names, on both sides of the House who subscribe to what I am saying. I do not want them to identify themselves. They know inside whether they subscribe or not. But there are others who are not willing to hear or just reject

it outright. Well either it is their problem or their right, as the case may be. I do not care if they subscribe to my view.

I am saying that I, as one member, the member for Fortune - Hermitage, has a responsibility here and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that I can better perform it if most of my time is taken addressing the issues instead of attacking personalities. However witty I may be, however much dirt I may have on a fellow, however much I am able to insult him, no matter how derogatory a term I can think up to call him -

MR. J. CARTER:

We do not believe you for one minute.

MR. DINN:

Is the hon. member proud of what went on here today?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am not proud of what has gone on here today or almost any other day and that is the point I am making to him.

MR. WARREN:

Why is it going on? Ask your leader.

MR. SIMMONS:

No. It is not a question of blaming one person, Mr. Speaker. I submit it is not a question of blaming any one person and you are on the wrong tack if you think the solution to the problem - we have a problem here and -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member has one minute.

MR. SIMMONS:  
May I just -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member has one minute left. He has an opportunity to wind-up.

MR. SIMMONS:  
It is not a matter of blame, but if he wants me to take all the blame, I will take it all. If that solves the problem, I will take all the blame. That is not the issue. The issue is, Mr. Speaker, you can put up brave fronts all you want, you can shout and scream all you want, but have a little chat to yourself in the mirror tomorrow morning, if you want to, and ask yourself, if you had your druthers, if you would rather come here and shout like a bunch of clowns for the next four years or if you would rather deal with some issues. Now, that is what I have suggested to you. If you would like to deal with some issues, perhaps among ourselves we can find some kind of an accommodation. I am not going to say I am going to agree with you on everything. I am saying I will always have the right to attack your ideas, but I do not think I have any right to attack you personally. However, it has got to work both ways, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you very much.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
We just heard the real front bench speak and that is good. The member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) and the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) are my choices for the front bench.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:  
The hon. member has already spoken in this debate. He got up to speak and then he called a quorum. It is on the record.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order. The hon. gentleman used the point of order to express a point of view.

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, thank you for your ruling.

I was just sitting here watching the clock, Mr. Speaker, and it is quarter after two in the morning. I am sure there are thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders who are asleep now. I am sure that thousands of them, Mr. Speaker,

seek the refuge of sleep because I am sure that their waking hours must be pretty horrific. They must be pretty horrific because their waking hours are filled with watching their children go to school, many of them ill clad, many of them without warm meals in their bellies, -

MR. WARREN:

That is not true.

MR. FUREY:

- and many of them going to school frightened because they know that their parents are frightened because there is no money in their households. So I say that at this hour there must be thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders, hopefully, who are getting some peace, and who can seek some peace, in the refuge of sleep. I think that that is a pretty sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, when we are aiming to turn the corner towards the twenty-first century in this great country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, some time ago, two and a half months ago I guess, we heard of a \$9.5 million programme to help fishermen, fish plant workers, and their families, because we knew they were in trouble, Mr. Speaker. This Party, at its own expense, travelled this Island, back and forth, we tried to get to as many places as we could, to listen to the fishermen and to listen to their families.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

And, Mr. Speaker, we knew this tragedy was coming. We knew it was coming in late August and we

came to this Assembly and we tried to tell the government, indeed warn the government, that this tragedy, Mr. Speaker, was coming and it was coming like a Juggernaut. Now we see two and a half months ago, a government announced \$9.5 million, Mr. Speaker, under an emergency programme, and I underline emergency, because that is what it was, that is what they recognized it to be two and a half months ago.

MR. SIMMS:

A very tired speech.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the word 'emergency', "an unforeseen combination of circumstances or the resulting state that calls for immediate action." Just put that in perspective, Mr. Speaker. That is emergency as defined by Webster. Two and a half months ago we had an announcement of \$9.5 million and what do we hear today?

MR. DINN:

The earliest time it has ever happened in the history of Newfoundland.

MR. FUREY:

What do we hear today, Mr. Speaker?

MR. DINN:

It has not happened before.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

What do we hear today, Mr. Speaker? We hear of more hunger strikes and we hear of the threats of hunger strikes, Mr. Speaker. We hear it in my district; we hear it in Bonne Bay in my district; we hear it in the Central Development Association, and that umbrella group which represents seven communities in my district; we hear it further North in my district; and we have heard it all around the Province, a human chain of hunger strikes, Mr. Speaker, because people are desperate. They are hungry, they are frightened and they need help. That is a very serious problem, serious enough to keep this Legislature open, Mr. Speaker, I submit, because the word 'emergency', the record should know, means immediate action. There is a problem and it has to be rectified immediately. Two and a half months ago we heard this government talk about \$9.5 million and now the latest mug's game. The latest game, Mr. Speaker, is announce what you cannot start. Can you imagine? After two and a half months, we will announce it now, but you cannot start it. In other words, we will take the credit, Mr. Speaker, for all these programmes. How many did they name today? Ninety-one!

MR. BAKER:

Five thousand jobs, he said.

MR. FUREY:

Whatever it was. We will take the credit for those inflated statistics and they will look wonderful in headlines, but let us look at the raw truth and the reality of those statistics. What is happening in my district I suspect is a blanket problem. We mentioned it to the Premier and the Premier acknowledged that he would look into it and people on

that side would look into it and that is good. I hope they do look into it right away. What we are seeing is another vicious problem. It is called a contractual problem. It is one thing to announce an approval, Mr. Speaker, and quite another to see a contract coming from, say, the Corner Brook manpower office.

Let us just take one area of my district. A contract has to be sent from the manpower office in Corner Brook -

MR. BAIRD:

That is the same old crap you were talking about yesterday.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is repetitious.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

The hon. the member for Humber West is shouting across again. I know he is a sensitive and good member because he has already spoken up for the Bonne Bay ferry. His heart is in the right place. He knows how crippled that side of the bay is because of that government decision. I appreciate his help. Do not go down onto the low plain when you are on the high plain and it is working well.

Let me just use this example, Mr. Speaker, and I am talking about Bonne Bay and I know that is close to your heart. The Bonne Bay Development Association had a number of applications approved, Mr. Speaker. The manpower officials in Corner Brook tell me they have to put a contract in the mail to them. It could take as long as three days, Mr. Speaker. That contract arrives. They fill it out. They get the Development

Association's approval. It is put back in the mail - another three days, Mr. Speaker. It arrives in Corner Brook where they review the application and, Mr. Speaker, if there is a problem with that application, or if somebody has left a signature off inadvertently, unintentionally, it has to go back through that six-day process again.

Let us assume it is okay after that initial process. Corner Brook to Bonne Bay, Bonne Bay to Corner Brook. Then, Mr. Speaker, it goes from Corner Brook manpower office into St. John's manpower office, and from that central office it is funnelled into what is called the Employment Development Branch. Now they have to scan it. They look it over. They check it out. They add up the numbers. They check for signatures and if there is a problem, Mr. Speaker, it goes back to Corner Brook, back to Bonne Bay, from Bonne Bay to Corner Brook back to St. John's, funnelled through, back to the Employment Development Branch.

Let us assume there is not a problem. The Employment Development Branch looks at it and says, 'Okay, this is fine. Send it over to Supply and Services.' We are really making progress now. Supply and Services will print a cheque in the amount of that particular project and send it to the Employment Development Branch. From the Employment Development Branch, it will go back to manpower at Corner Brook and then to the sponsor. Now that has taken quite a bit of time, Mr. Speaker. Some people would say it is anywhere from two to four weeks.

Now here is the problem that we face and it is a serious problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:

(Inaudible) problems of this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

The Minister responsible for Mines and Energy can yap and shout and try to heckle and put us down as much as he wants, but we are talking about human beings here, Mr. Minister. We are talking about people who are trying to get money into their hands before Christmas. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about families that are hungry.

MR. WINDSOR:

Is this relevant to the motion?

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the President of Treasury Board, do you want to speak to this issue? Are you going to give your maiden speech this session now? As soon as I sit down I cannot wait for you to have something to say.

MR. WINDSOR:

Is this relevant?

MR. FUREY:

Very relevant. Do you think people going hungry is not relevant?

MR. DINN:

What about the people working in Brig Bay?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

That shows, Mr. Speaker, the insensitivity. The insensitivity has become so ingrained! Let me

give you another definition. Arrogance - "a feeling of superiority manifested in an overbearing manner of presumptuous claims."

MR. WINDSOR:

The hon. gentleman should know all about that.

MR. FUREY:

Now there it is personified and exemplified. I only wish the galleries were full tonight with those families who are hungry to watch these clowns in action, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, let us assume that finally after this process that I have identified and outlined and explained to the House, imagine anywhere from two to four to six weeks before there is actual real cash put in the hands of these families. Now is that not sad and sick?

MR. BAKER:

Shame!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

That is not true.

MR. FUREY:

What is the minister saying a contract does not have to be signed now?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

The federal officials are saying it has to be signed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, we must have hit a nerve over there because we have not heard so much from the Minister responsible for Treasury Board since he was demoted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. FUREY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, a wonderful ruling.

Let me carry on, Mr. Speaker. This is one issue I want to raise in terms of the hungry families out there. Let me switch gears for a minute, Mr. Speaker. That is one very serious issue and you saw the reaction, hopefully Hansard will pick up some of those heckles and yells and shouts and the people will know how they feel. It is getting more and more apparent, and this is not a blanket statement because there are some over there whose hearts beat, and we can hear them loudly, but, for the most part, they are a heartless crowd. They have desensitized themselves. They do not mind the dehumanization that is happening across this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Dehumanize people, make them feel less than human.

MR. REID:

Keep going for another ten minutes. Get onto the next Rexograph now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, let me switch gears and let us talk about something else in this House that ought to be addressed. The Minister of Treasury Board shouted about this. He got up on a maiden speech point of order, went into a little tirade and said ask us about unemployment, ask us about unemployment? Well we will ask you about unemployment. Tell us about unemployment. Let us talk about unemployment, 19.2 per cent across this Province. Give me a mandate to create meaningful and full-time jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. FUREY:

If I were you I would send your parliamentary secretary to go rent another bus, because we need that curshade for prosperity, phase two, right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, 19.2 per cent unemployment across this Province. Let us look at the breakdown. The Avalon Peninsula

has 16.8 per cent, can you believe it? Where they have had hundreds of millions of dollars worth of construction, and the Minister of Development has to take a lot of the responsibility, by the way, for these unemployment statistics. It is no good to go darting back and forth to Japan and over to Norway and up to Germany, back and forth everywhere, when back home she is falling apart.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Burin and the South Coast, Mr. Speaker, 17.3 per cent; Central and Northeastern 15.8 per cent; and in my area, Mr. Speaker, the Northern Peninsula, Western Newfoundland it jumped 3 percentage points. Are you proud of this? It is at 21.2 per cent. That is ridiculous. The hon. the member from Torngat Mountains can mock all you want but that is the reality. You must have pockets of unemployment up there as high as 90 per cent.

MR. WARREN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, that is the general -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is a point of order, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have pockets of

unemployment, in fact in Nain 4.5 per cent are unemployed.

MR. HICKEY:

There is no point of order. The hon. member is providing information.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, let me move into a topic that has become very exposed across the Province as well, dealing with unemployment again, and the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) our critic for youth, and who has done a fabulous job as a new member in this House, has really done a wonderful job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. FUREY:

They do not like it over there because he has done a good job presenting the facts as they are and the facts as they are is that 40 per cent of the young people across this Province are unemployed. Now you can sit there and laugh and heckle and do all you want -

MR. WINDSOR:

Is this relevant to the motion to adjourn?

MR. FUREY:

Is the minister relevant? Forty per cent unemployment, Mr. Speaker, among young people between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four. It is 18.3 per cent amongst women. Does the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) know that? Eighteen point three per cent of all women who want to be in the labour force and find work, cannot find work. That is a shocking

statistic.

Let us talk about those young people and I am sure some of the members opposite saw the CBC television programme the last week called On Camera, not when the hon. minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) was on in his little tug of war with the interviewer, not then, the week before, when they dealt with youth.

MR. DINN:

When 'Graham' got (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Could you put the Minister of Zinc in his own seat please?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The point is well taken.

MR. FUREY:

And a lousey Minister of Zinc, you should see his letter, Mr. Speaker, you should see his letter he sent to his counterpart in Ottawa. What a tip toe through the tulips with his buddies in Ottawa. Can you imagine if the Liberals were in Ottawa and they put \$18 million in the Yukon to knock 200 people out of work on the Great Northern Peninsula, he would be hauling the hair out of his head.

Mr. Speaker, let me get back in focus here. Forty per cent of our young people are unemployed and all we get are heckles and jibes and and laughs on that side. On that television programme, Mr. Speaker, do you know what they did? They asked the young people what are your dreams?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:  
Mr. Speaker, this is totally irrelevant to the question.

MR. FUREY:  
Young people's dreams are irrelevant to the question. That is how out of tune they are, see.

MR. WINDSOR:  
The hon. gentleman is being totally irrelevant of the motion.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, young people's dreams are totally irrelevant. The most important resource in our Province who are leaving by the droves, are irrelevant. Is that what you are saying? I cannot wait to hear your speech and have you address youth unemployment buddy.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. HODDER  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:  
Mr. Speaker, my point of order is, after listening to the hon. member's speech, who was executive assistant to Brian Tobin for some three to four years in that area where he talks about great unemployment. He had a great deal of influence on that particular member. I wonder what the member did and what positive -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Sit down!

MR. HODDER:

Instead of getting up and berating the government, while he was in the government under Mr. Trudeau, what did he do to cure the unemployment in the area that he now represents?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
M. L'orateur, je ne suis pas controle par le depute pour Port au Port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage is speaking to the point of order, I take it.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I thought it only a courtesy that I address the member for Port au Port in French because he undertook some time ago to learn the language. I assume that he has. I rose really to speak to the point of order which is this: he answers his only questions really. He raises a very good question on a point of order, a very legitimate one and I would hope the Speaker acting will rule it in order because you see, Mr. Speaker, the question he raises is almost axiomatic. He thought the member for Humber - Port au Port - St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) did so well that he got out and helped him get re-elected a year ago.

MR. HODDER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Port au

Port.

MR. HODDER:

You know there is a circumstance where you work with very little effort. The 400 votes that he got was not by my effort.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order, there is a difference of opinion between several hon. members.

MR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order in regard to the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). The member for Bonavista North is not sitting in his right place now. This is very confusing and it is, indeed, misleading the House because we have always on this side looked upon this part of the Opposition as being the light weight, the immaterial part of the Opposition and this being the heavy weight part of the Opposition. Now, with the hon. member for Bonavista North being in his wrong place, he is confusing the House because he seems to be giving a certain amount of weight to this part of the Opposition. He should go back there where the real weight of the Opposition rests.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would declare that there is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Finance has been standing under his boat's anchor too often.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I was talking about youth unemployment and that is a very critical issue in this Province, when forty per cent of our young people cannot find work and they become frustrated. It is painful for them and their families. I tried to illustrate by talking about the On Camera show, the one prior to the hon. House Leader being bowled over, dealing with youth unemployment. They brought one hundred or one hundred and fifty young people into the studio. I am sure many members saw it and it must have affected everybody who saw it because they asked those young people what their dreams were for the future. One young fellow walked to the microphone and he said -

MR. DINN:

Is this the only speech you have? This is the second time we have heard it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, you talk about light weights! Mr. Speaker, he does not want to hear it because he is a light weight.

MR. DINN:

I have heard it two or three times from you.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, they are going to keep hearing it until forty per cent amongst young people becomes zero per cent. Mr. Speaker, they asked the young people what their dreams were and one young fellow walked up to the microphone and say, "My dream is to have enough money to leave my Province because my Province has become a dreamless land, a land of no dreams." Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, saying that? And the other 150 applauding en masse, in unison.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

They do not want to hear it. Forty per cent, 19,000 young Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four, cannot find work and they look to you for hope and you look back at them hopeless. That is a crime.

MR. WARREN:

Not true! Not true! All lies!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Hon. members are aware that when they are not in their own seats they are not supposed to speak. I am sure the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) would want to retract what he just said.

MR. WARREN:

I withdraw. I am sorry.

MR. SPEAKER:

Thank you.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about one example, and there are thousands across this Province. I am sure hon. members on both sides get letters from young people expressing their despair. Here is one, Mr. Speaker:

"Dear Mr. Furey, I just finished school in June of this year and I starting fishing when I got out of school. I was fishing for six weeks. I went to work at Parsons Pond Seafoods in my community and I worked there for one week. Then the plant closed down and has not opened since."

MR. DINN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

The hon. member does not know it but I know this, that anything he reads in the House he has to table and if he has to table it, then the name of the person goes on the public record and could be printed all over.

MR. BARRY:

Is that what the member wants?

MR. DINN:

I do not think the person who wrote that wants to have that published throughout the Province. Mr. Speaker, I will just caution the hon. member.

MR. TULK:

You want it tabled, do you?

MR. DINN:

No, I do not, but he has to under the rules of the House, he has to.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe speaking to the point of order.

MR. FUREY:

I understand what the minister is saying. I understand that they are very sensitive to this whole problem over there. If he does not want me to quote verbatim, Mr. Speaker, I will summarize it in my own words. Is that what he wants?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

If you read the letter you have to table it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member take his seat.

The point of order raised by the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy with regard to a member tabling what he or she reads is accurate. If the hon. gentleman does not wish to table it, then he should paraphrase it and he should use it in his own words.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, in a word, what happened was this young fellow got

MR. WARREN:

Ah, ha! You would not table it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Is that really what you want? Is that the game you are playing over there?

MR. DINN:

No, I do not want you to. I do not think you should.

MR. FUREY:

I understand. But can you go over and take the batteries out of the Garf doll so that we can cease the Garf barf?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, in a word, here is what I was saying. I appreciate your comment. That is fair ball.

A young fellow got one week's work in a fish plant. The fish plant closed down. He went into a boat and fished for six weeks. He got seven stamps. He needs thirteen stamps, Mr. Speaker. He is seventeen and he is asking me should he go away. That is what he is essentially asking me. Is there any point staying? That is really what he is saying.

What do you say to him? Well, what do you say to him exactly? He is asking, "What is government doing?" Remember now, our job is to oppose, your job is to propose. Now what do you propose for young people? I tried to answer it and I was not partisan. I was saying, 'Here is the Department of Youth. Here is what it offers. Here is the Minister of Career Development and here is what he offers.' But the fact of the matter is that there is not very much hope springing from that

side to the younger generation coming through. Now, is that an honest statement?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. FUREY:

Well, can somebody over there tell me what hope there is for the young people?

MR. DINN:

Ther answer to the hon. gentleman is there was about \$75 million for job creation this year and I do not think the Province can afford anymore.

MR. FUREY:

Seventy-five million dollars?

MR. DINN:

Yes, \$75 million for job creation this year from this Province and the federal government, and that is a lot of money. I do not think we can afford any more.

MR. FUREY:

But, Mr. Minister, come on now. Let us be real. You had \$9.5 million for a so-called emergency. We defined 'emergency'.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

We still have not seen any money, that was two and a half months ago. So if we are using that as a precedent, what do the young people hope for?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

Would the hon. minister take his seat? The hon. member has approximately one minute left.

MR. FUREY:

In conclusion, the unemployment problem across this Province is savage, it is painful.

MR. WINDSOR:

It is terrible.

MR. FUREY:

That is right, it is terrible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Let me quote the Minister who is responsible for Treasury Board, he says, it is terrible. I said at the beginning of my little talk, Mr. Speaker, that tonight across this Province there are thousands of Newfoundlanders asleep, home in their beds. But I also said, Mr. Speaker, that they are asleep because they are taking refuge from the nightmare of their waking hours, because, Mr. Speaker, they have no money, they have no projects, and it is painful and horrific. While the Minister of Finance can joke and laugh, and let the record know that he laughed at those young people.

DR. COLLINS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, some of the people asleep in this Province are taking refuge from the hon. member's speech. My hon. colleague for

Exploits will back me up.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order.

The hon. member for St. Barbe, would he try to wind it up, please?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member is attempting to wind up his speech, please.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion we want this Legislature open because there are some terrible and horrendous problems out there in the real world. It is easy for ministers over there to go hear, hear, and shout and bawl because they have nice comfortable salaries, Mr. Speaker. Their money is secure. They are fine. But for the young people of this Province and those people who desperately, direly need those make-work projects - and they are not the real answer either, Mr. Speaker - we are staying open until their needs are met, because we cannot stand idly by and turn a blind eye, as this government has collectively, to that very sad problem.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I would have raised it during the member's speech, but there had already been enough

interruptions. I want to quote a couple of citations to you and then state my point of order. In Beauchesne, paragraph 55, on page 20, it provides; "That the privilege of freedom of speech is both the least questioned and the most fundamental right of the Member etc." Mr. Speaker, in our Standing Orders 11 (c) it says, "When a member is speaking, no member shall pass between him and the Chair, nor interrupt him, except to raise a point of order."

Mr. Speaker, I submit that nobody should have inflicted on the gentleman for St. Barbe what was inflicted on him, least of all a new member in this Chamber. He should have the right to be heard. There was a deliberate attempt, Mr. Speaker, a concerted attempt to see that he did not maintain his train of thought. He had some points he wanted to make. I think he made them admirably well under the circumstances. The circumstances were absolutely impossible.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, with all due respect, Sir, that the Chair, not only the present occupant of the Chair, but the other two occupants, the Chair has lost control of this House. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Chair ought to contemplate doing what the Chair does in every other jurisdiction. When members refuse to obey the Chair, and it is not for lack of trying by the Chair tonight, the Chair has been absolutely admirable in its interventions, but if you have a gentleman, such as the gentleman for Torngat Mountains, for example, who persists in interjecting every five, ten, or twenty seconds, what can the Chair do? The Chair can do what a number of Speakers, whom I could

name, have done in Ottawa and Westminster. The Chair announces to the House that the Chair has lost control and therefore leaving the Chair. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is an option that ought to be looked at pretty soon.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):  
Order, please!

The point made by the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) in terms of the basis for a member being heard in silence is accurate and is contained in the Standing Orders. However, I would point out that, as the hon. member said, the Chair kept calling order repeatedly.

It is two-way street here because the hon member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey), while making his speech, could have demanded his rights and immediately upon saying, 'I wish to be heard in silence,' would have, and each and every time he said that, the Chair would have reacted even more vigorously than, in fact, it did. It would seem to me, at least, my ruling on this matter would be, I do not discount a number of points that the hon. member has raised. However, it has been a freewheeling debate. It is in the morning hours and it seems to me that there was flexibility shown on both sides. I would declare that the point of order, while well taken, based on the points raised, I do not believe there is anything that we can do on the matter right now.

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

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

MR. FUREY:  
I just want clarification. Did I understand the Speaker correctly that I am supposed to ask the Chair for protection if I feel that I am not being protected? Is that what you are saying?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member certainly has the right, as any hon. member has the right when he or she is speaking, if he or she is interrupted, to insist on their rights by asking for the protection of the Chair and insisting that they be heard in silence. The Speaker or the Chairman will certainly enforce the rule and see to it that the hon. member has his right.

The other point that should be made is that when an hon. member, who is in an exchange across the House, does not request that his rights be protected, the Chair very often assumes that the hon. member is quite comfortable with the exchange and the interjections. There is a bit of give and take on both sides, including the Chair maybe, in terms of interruptions.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Stephenville.

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

There are a number of reasons why this House should stay open. I first want to commend the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) for an excellent speech and for bringing out the problems of youth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I ask for silence, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I commend my colleague for St. Barbe for an excellent speech talking about the problems of youth on this Island. I do not think that we can talk about it enough.

I am going to make, as I think we often try to do in the Opposition, some constructive suggestions on youth unemployment and how to solve some of the problems. We are here for a purpose and the purpose is to try and solve the major problems of this Island, that being probably the worse one that we have to deal with right now.

I attended a conference over in Stephenville a couple of weeks ago on youth and there was a presentation made there by a representative from Ontario who dealt with a lot of research on youth employment strategies. He presented a document which he researched called Encouraging Self-employment, Some Organizational Models From The U.K.. It talks about developing employment opportunities in rural areas. Newfoundland, being a rural area, made me quite interested in the proposals that were brought forward.

MR. WINDSOR:

Is this relevant Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I must say they were very good. I enjoyed the presentation made by that person and I had a chance to speak with him on the proposals. They deal with the problems of youth unemployment and they try to attack the problem. One of the things that was brought up was a young enterprise system where you would provide monies, funding or advice, etc., for young people getting into business. There were a number of other ones, mini companies - I will table this in the House for all to see. Our entire caucus, as a matter of fact, have had a look at it and are developing some constructive suggestions which I think are needed.

One programme called "Head Start in Business," is a project to help young people set up in business. It runs one-day workshops which are information and awareness sessions and so on and it goes on down the line. It contains very good, constructive stuff to help us get at that wicked problem we have out there today. It goes on. It gives more programmes that do not cost a lot of money. It just talks about using the resources that you have available. That is probably one of the biggest problems that we have here in Canada, using our resources with the proper priorities and using them in the proper manner. I do not think they have been used very well, especially here in Newfoundland

When you look at the unemployment rate of youth, thirty-five, forty, twenty-eight, twenty-five, it goes

up and down, but it is always high. We have to really sit down and try to figure out how we are going to solve the problem. We should be talking about constructive suggestions on how to solve that problem. I have not seen a great deal come from the other side.

I attended a conference when a Senate Committee came down here this past Summer on June 6, when it came to Newfoundland. They came here to hear the views of people who wanted to try to solve or attempt to solve the youth unemployment problem on this Island, which has gotten way out of hand. The Committee was quite good, but there was no representation made by the provincial government to this Committee. They were not there to present any alternatives.

The Government of Nova Scotia presented a brief in which they outlined some proposals they had. One of the things that they outlined and what they had done and created was a Youth Initiative Office established with the mandate to deal with youth and particularly to address these three questions: it has direction to co-ordinate the youth activities in the Province and to develop a comprehensive career counselling service for all youth. Now, I think that is excellent and that is, I believe, a Progressive Conservative Government in Nova Scotia.

MR. J. CARTER:

You tabled that, did you?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Oh, definitely, no problem at all. As a matter of fact, to educate the present administration I will table everything I have

here because there is a lot of education needed to tackle this problem.

MR. WINDSOR:

Is this relevant?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

It was done just across the Gulf, on the other side. They felt their unemployment rate for youth of about 14 or 15 per cent was way too high and they figured, 'Well, we are going to have to try to attack it,' and they did this. It has been working not badly at all, from what we can see. It is an initiative to try to solve the problem.

Initiative: I do not know if the present administration knows the meaning of the word. I have a hard time trying to figure that out. This is an initiative taken by them over there in Nova Scotia to try to tackle the problem.

Manitoba has a youth unemployment problem of something like 12 or 13 per cent. They have attacked the problem - that is the word they use, 'attack' the problem - by setting up a Young Entrepreneurs Business Programme. They pumped some money into it, not a great deal, but just enough to see if it would work, to see if the young people would take it and go with it. They have taken it and they have gone with it. As a matter of fact, from what I have been hearing, it is a resounding success, but, again, the word is 'initiative'. They have taken the initiative to try to solve the problem.

MR. SIMMS:

Is that a federal programme?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

No, it is a provincial programme

with \$400,000 in provincial money.

MR. SIMMS:

Is there a federal programme similar to that for young entrepreneurs?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I think there was for the Summer. This one here is a programme that goes year around and it helps set up permanent jobs.

MR. SIMMS:

Nova Scotia?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

No, this one is in Manitoba. This is a separate one. I am just giving you some outline of it. It is a very good programme. As a matter of fact it was in the Globe And Mail just a couple of weeks ago and it was an initiative taken or attack what they thought positive for the major problem they have up there.

We have a problem down here that is double that and we have not seen any initiatives like that whatsoever. We have not seen it whatsoever. I do not know if we are ever going to see it. I have to say that the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) made some excellent points to that, pointing out the other side and what they have not done. I am going to do the same thing because we have to keep doing that to keep pushing to get things done. The role of the Opposition is to give constructive suggestions and these are some constructive suggestions. I will ask the administration to take these suggestions and to go with them because this is a gigantic problem that we have here. This is nothing that we should be fooling around with. This is something that we should all try to sit down and co-operate on and

try to do something about.

When we talk about relevance or why we are here, I think this is probably the best reason in the world to be here. As my colleague for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) so ably stated, it is time that we finally sit down and do something about it. I described some initiatives that have been done across Canada to tackle the problem. I would like to see the Provincial government here take some of these things and look them over, read them over, discard them if they are no good or whatever but, take the initiative, take it up and look at; take it home and read it over a cup of coffee and do something with it and say you are doing something with it. People out there need to hear that it is being looked at because the spirit out there is a hopeless spirit. It is time that they had a little bit more hope there. We cannot wait five or ten years down the road because there will not be anything left in five or ten years. It is time that we tackled that problem. Like I said, the role of the Opposition is to be constructive. This Summer -

MR. FUREY:

Protect us from the Port au Port Puppet.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I ask for protection from the hon. member for Port au Port who I have a great deal of respect for.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Stephenville would like to have silence, please. That applies to all members, silence for the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that very, very wise ruling. A very nice ruling I must say.

Co-operation and consultation, now that is a couple of beauts. I have heard those words and I looked them up in the dictionary but I do not believe Webster's because they give me the wrong answers. I mean, co-operation and consultation means you are suppose to get along and talk to each other, suggest things to each other, work together and then try to solve the problem.

Well, we have a Provincial government and a Federal government that are supposed to be doing that. We were told that a lot of our problems would be solved. At least, I was hoping that we would see an attempt at the problems being solved but, I think that is gone out the window. We are probably gone back further than we ever have been. I just wonder when this co-operation and consultation is going to arise or when it is going to come about or at what date or what time in the future, so that people can at least put a smile on their face and figure out when the results are going to arrive because they have not arisen yet and I do not see in the near future when they are going to arise.

We have the Federal government just announcing federal cutbacks. They are probably going to nail us to the wall down here and we hardly hear or see any representation being made to address that problem. It is very difficult to comprehend because if we are going to deal with the youth unemployment problem down here and they are going to nail us to the in education monies and so on, we are going backwards instead

of forwards. With the Provincial government supposedly not in the position to try to tackle the youth unemployment problem, as they admit -

MR. DINN:  
Would you permit a question?

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Oh yes, sure. I would permit a question.

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

MR. DINN:  
Did the hon. member know that on a per capita basis that this government, along with the federal government, has put nearly \$70 million in job creation. A lot of which has been spent for youth employment and that that is more than many of the richer Provinces in Canada, like Alberta and Ontario on a per capita basis. Did the hon. member know that?

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
I thank the hon. minister for the question. The hon. member for Stephenville knows that but, you spent \$70 million and the unemployment rate is probably after going up in youth unemployment. It just like pouring money into a hole and there is a hole in the bottom where it just keeps flowing out and nothing happens. If you are going to spend the money, I would ask him to spend it wisely instead of throwing it out the window.

MR. DINN:  
Is it not being spent wisely?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

There is no where else in Canada that has even close to the unemployment rate here. You say you spent a ton of money yet there was a report came out just there last week showing that the Summer programme had the lowest amount of everything across the border for Newfoundland students. It is too bad this is not Question Period! But, that \$70 million, if it were spent wisely and put in the right places, it might help solve the problem.

MR. DINN:

Would you agree with it being spent on the fishermen of the Province?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Oh, I totally agree with it being spent for the fishermen of this Province but, they cannot even get a hold of the money to spend it. As my colleague for St. Barbe so ably said pointed out, you can announce the programmes all you want but, when they do not have the money in their hands it is a different story altogether. I mean, the first time in years, I cannot remember, I have not heard of a hunger strike in Newfoundland in twenty years. If these programmes and everything are working so fine, I would love to know why these people are calling in here and saying, 'we are on a hunger strike because we cannot get our jobs or we cannot get our money that was suppose to be there.' This is suppose to be emergency funding.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Hear, hear, and ho, ho, ho - Santa Claus is not coming to town at Christmas for a lot of people.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Santa got to go!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Santa got to go. He is not going to be around this Winter I tell you for some people.

We went around, and I must say, I participated in this wonderful Opposition Caucus Committee that went around on the fishery this Summer.

MR. DINN:

I read that report.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

You read that report.

MR. DINN:

There was nothing in it.

MR. TULK:

You cannot read.

MR. DINN:

You were for factory freezer trawlers.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I ask for protection from this hon. minister.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please! The hon. the member for Stephenville would like to be heard in silence. So could we have order, please?

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that wise ruling.

We went around this Summer and we were getting calls from everywhere telling us about the disaster in the inshore fishery. We went to some really small places I have not been before. It was a real

good experience for myself, I must say, to discover a lot of places in Newfoundland that I have not been to. But it was not a nice discovery, Mr. Speaker, because these places and these people were suffering. This was about July/August, and we came out with the report. I must say, my colleagues who were on that committee did a wonderful job; an excellent job and they presented in a concise manner - they did not fool around - these are the problems and some suggested recommendations that were given to us by the fishermen of this Province. We brought it in and we made the point very ably, I must say. I think we got a letdown there because we did not make it ably enough. This is December 6, and we still have not got this emergency programme or the money for it, wherever it is suppose to be or wherever it is. Nobody knows what they are up to.

MR. FUREY:

Stay where you are too until I come to where you are at.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes. It is amazing. That was over three and a half or four months ago. They knew the problem was coming. They could have had all the bureaucratic wrangling all out of the way. They could have had it all set up and announced it and they could have gotten all the praise in the world and they could have gotten out of the hot water. This is organization for you. I mean, you could have gotten out of the hot water. You could have gotten all the praise in the world. We went out and did all of our running around this Summer, in all of these places. You could have gotten all the credit. We did not have to do that, by the way, but you could have done an

excellent job, everybody in Newfoundland would have said, 'now, that government knows what they are doing out there and they are going to help us and they have helped us and they have shown that they are going to help us.'

But why are the hunger strikes on the go? I mean, they are saying one thing and then the people are telling us a different thing.

MR. WARREN:

Are you going to tell the people?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I ask for silence from those wicket comments from the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Once again, could we have silence while the hon. member for Stephenville is speaking, please?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I like youth, by the way, Mr. Speaker. I am one, as a matter of fact, I enjoy being one, and when I get up here and see the lack of policy and initiatives that have been taken to try to solve the youth unemployment of this Province, I mean, I get applauded. I know people, I have a ton of friends, who have left this Province or who have tried to stick it out and tried to do something with it and are finding it very difficult to do. They have turned to the provincial government for some type of hope or assistance and it is not there. The opportunities have not been created.

MR. WARREN:

Would the hon. member permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes, I will permit a question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

I was just wondering if the hon. member knew anything about those four young people earlier tonight who came into the building?

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains has been injecting all night from everybody's seat except his own; getting up on these silly points of order; interrupting what is a very serious situation, as is being outlined by our youth critic on this side. I would ask Your Honour to provide some protection for the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) so that he can get on with the debate and express his opinions freely in this democratic parliament.

MR. MARSHALL:

On that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman raises a question that has been around this House tonight for quite a period of time and that is the fact that there were four detainees. Now, the hon. gentleman asked a question as to whether or not -

MR. BARRY:

You will get an answer to it.

MR. TULK:

Do you want an answer?

MR. MARSHALL:

That is what I would like to do, I would like to get an answer from the hon. gentleman as to what his role was with respect to that.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. There very four young children from the Pleasantville Boys Home, Mr. Speaker, that came up to this House. We had not intention of raising this in this House.

MR. MARSHALL:

You raised it.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker, you raised it! Now, Mr. Speaker, let us deal with it and tell all about it.

MR. WARREN:

How did they get here?

MR. BARRY:

They were four of eighteen children that tried to break out of that place to come up here to voice their concerns about the cruel conditions under which they are still living tonight. Mr. Speaker, they came to the ground floor of this building and they asked -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

How? How?

MR. BARRY:

They walked, Mr. Speaker!

MR. WARREN:

Did they? Did they walk? They never walked, that is not true!

MR. BARRY:

They walked, Mr. Speaker. They walked with no winter clothing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

They never walked.

DR. COLLINS:

Do you want members to believe that?

MR. BARRY:

They came into the ground floor and one of them being a young boy from Stephenville, asked the Security Guard to call the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward). The member for Stephenville went down, Mr. Speaker, and brought them up to the fifth floor office of the Opposition. He came up here immediately and informed me that there were four young boys who had broken out of the Boy's Home because of the negligence of the staff. They are not in control, Mr. Speaker, of that home yet tonight. Mr. Speaker, immediately upon being informed by the member for Stephenville that those young men were there, I informed the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) and I informed the Constabulary member who is here in front of this House.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this. We now have another despicable example of how members opposite will use anything, including the young people of this Province, for their own ends.

MR. WINDSOR:

Who brought it up? The member for Stephenville brought it up.

MR. BARRY:

The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) brought it up.

MR. WINDSOR:

But the member for Stephenville brought the boys up.

MR. TULK:

What would you do with them? Throw them out on the street? Is that what you would do?

MR. BARRY:

In response to a call by the Security Guard on the ground floor, Mr. Speaker, the member for Stephenville went down, upon being informed that he was wanted. He found out, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. BAIRD:

What are you bawling about?

MR. BARRY:

- when he got them up to the fifth floor, that these young men had broken out of the Pleasantville Boys Home and came up here for consultation as to the proper course of action, and immediately, we notified the minister responsible and the Constabulary member who then called for a car to bring these young boys back.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does that say about the state of the Pleasantville Boys Home where you have eighteen young men trying to break out and four of them managing to get up to this House of Assembly to express their concern?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we decided we would not raise that in this House and we now have the Government House Leader insisting upon an explanation. I have never seen such a despicable exercise of

exploitation of children because that is what the Government House Leader is engaged in.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. EFFORD:

Guaranteed you put your mouth into it this time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have silence while the hon. member for Stephenville is debating.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, since the hon. member has raised this - my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Now that the Government House Leader has raised this, maybe the Minister of Social Services would, by leave, explain, Mr. Speaker, why there are eighteen young men trying to break out to complain about the conditions under which they are living and why four of them did manage to break out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MR. BARRY:

Explain! Explain!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order. The hon. gentleman for Stephenville, I

understand, is in the debate. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is continually showing his lack of emotional control in this House as he has indicated with respect to this point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Could we have order please while the hon. the member for Stephenville is debating?

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I do not even know if I should address this right here with these people across the way, but just to make a point. Last night I got a call. One of those four happens to be from my constituency. As a matter of fact, the night when the Speaker was having a party, I get a call because of this report that came out. This parent, whom I had been working with for over two months, who has expressed a lot of concern to me about that place up there - for two months I have been working, two months - and I have contacted a ton of officials and in my own constructive manner just asked questions here and there trying to find out how the system operates, etc.

MR. BAIRD:

Did you go and ask the minister?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I got a call from her two nights

ago, after this report came out, and she was crying and she was in a state. She was trying to get in touch with the Premier, because she wanted to get her son out of the place.

Tonight, I am sitting here in the House of Assembly and I get a call from downstairs. I went downstairs and I see four kids down there with just shirts on, freezing to death, and they want to talk to the member for Stephenville, the only reason being that -

MR. WINDSOR:

Why did they come here? Tell us why they came here.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I do not know why they came here.

MR. TULK:

Do not be so slimy.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I do not know how they got here. The thing is they got here. I went downstairs as requested and I said - well, I did not know what to do at first, as you would be, because you are shocked. So I went -

MR. J. CARTER:

Think fast.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I will not talk fast. I will take my time on this one, hon. member, because this is ridiculous. I am going to take my sweet time, as a matter of fact.

I notified the guard - the guard knew right off the bat - and I notified the penitentiary fellow here who watches the place and automatically brought them up to a safe place, put them aside, went up and notified the Leader and he

went through all the proper channels and so on and so forth. We had somebody with us all the time to make sure that there was no harassment or anything like that.

Do you know what they said? They came up here tonight because they wanted to speak to somebody about some of their concerns. They knew they had to go back, but they just wanted to say hello and see if somebody would listen. That is the only thing. They were very mature, very nice and so on and so forth. I am not going to, from the slurs that have come across from the other side, I am not going to sit here and take that. I did nothing, Sir, but listen to those kids, who are going through wicked hardships. That is all I did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

If the member for Torngat (Mr. Waarren) wanted to know, he could have come and asked me. We notified the minister etc. But, no, it is absolutely ridiculous. That is the end of it. If you want to ask me more questions, go right ahead. I will be here the whole night.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had intended to say quite a number of things but the last particular exchange has really shocked me. I thought that the situation was such that nothing would be said publicly about it, that nothing would be done publicly in the House, and that the situation would be handled by the appropriate officials and that is all there would be to it.

I would like to do some follow up myself. I am sure the member for Stephenville will do some follow up on the situation, from the point of view of one of the young boys being from his riding and he has had contact with the parents quite often over the last couple of months.

I was really shocked to hear the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) do what he did, supported by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

MR. WARREN:  
I asked a question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:  
As usual the member for Torngat Mountains runs off at the mouth before he thinks! He is not capable of thinking. He has been shooting off his mouth here all night.

MR. TULK:  
Now he has dragged four children into this.

MR. WARREN:  
I asked a question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:  
The member for Torngat Mountains has not got the sense to ask a proper question in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, it is a shocking exhibition. I do not know what happens from here.

MR. WARREN:  
I just asked (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:  
That is okay, Mr. Speaker, you do not -

MR. FUREY:  
Let him explain what happened. Give him leave.

MR. BARRY:  
Let him explain what happened.

MR. TULK:  
We will give you leave to explain what happened.

MR. WARREN:  
Ask your leader what happened.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:  
Does the member want to explain what happened?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Gander has the floor.

MR. BAKER:

I will give leave for a couple of minutes for the member for Torngat Mountains to explain and to give us the benefit of his wide knowledge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. BARRY:

Let him explain what happened.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, if I speak he will give up his time.

MR. TULK:

No, we gave you leave to explain.

MR. BAKER:

No, no. By leave. I gave you leave.

MR. FUREY:

Coward!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

There is an example. There is the example -

MR. WINDSOR:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

The gentleman took his seat. He

obviously forfeits his right to speak.

MR. BAKER:

And you should take your seat.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, there is an example of the kind of game that that particular individual is playing here tonight.

MR. WARREN:

We know what happened boys.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

When given the opportunity to explain himself, he had to play his little game and say, it will come out of the hon. member's time. Now he is playing a little time game is what he is playing here. Mr. Speaker, I do not care if he does interrupt. I do not need your protection from such lightweights as that. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I should get in any deeper into this situation because I do not want to drag out things that have not yet come out.

I am sorry that the Government House Leader (Mr. Masrhall) and the members opposite are trying to close this particular session of the House or adjourn the session until February 6. There are a number of items on the Order Paper that I was looking forward to debating and wanted to take part in.

There are a number of items that I did not get a chance to contribute

to, including the one we are in the middle of, Mr. Speaker, the debate to amend the Income Tax Act. Because, Mr. Speaker, even though, this is largely cosmetic and, even though, the amendment to the Income Tax Act is simply to follow in the steps of the federal government, for a province that has the highest taxation in the whole country, the highest sales tax, the highest every kind of tax in the whole country, I think it was an important point to debate.

Also the bill that was to come after that, Mr. Speaker, An Act To Amend The Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973. Now there, Mr. Speaker, is a beautiful piece of business.

MR. WINDSOR:  
Surely he is not relevant.

MR. BAKER:  
The minister is not relevant.

An Act To Amend The Conflict Of Interest Act, 1973, which I have a copy of here somewhere, Mr. Speaker, amongst my papers. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a fine thing to do, to amend this Act. I wanted to speak to this particular piece of legislation because it seems to me after what has happened in this House in the last month and a half, that really there is no need to amend legislation in here or there is no point to amending the legislation. There may be a need but, there certainly is no point. The reason that I see no point is that, apparently, the Premier and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) can simply ignore provisions of this act. I do not intend to repeat the previous part of my speech for the members opposite. If they do not want to listen then, perhaps they can go

somewhere else.

I would like to point out—

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

MR. EFFORD:  
Oh, sit down, you are making a fool of yourself! Sit down for God's sake!

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

MR. HODDER:  
Mr. Speaker, very simply, I thought this was a motion to adjourn the House and not one where you can talk about the Income Tax Act, and not to talk about all those things that the members have brought up. This is not a free-wheeling debate. This is a specific debate and the member is not adhering to that.

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

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

MR. BAKER:  
I recognize the interjection of the parliamentary expert opposite. I was pointing out, Mr. Speaker, as you well recognize, the fact that I would like to see the House remain open because I would like to get into this type of legislation. I submit there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, there is no point of order. It seems to me it has been pretty free-wheeling since the debate started. The rule of relevancy certainly could have been called to question a

number of times before but, I believe hon. members will agree, that if we were going to follow the rigid rule of relevancy, then that might have been said in the beginning. We might have followed it. It seems to me that the hon. member for Gander is using this particular issue and will bring it to a conclusion which will be in order. That is my interpretation.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a good ruling.

Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out that this particular Act seems to be changed at will anyway, and no pun intended. On two occasions, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) particularly, indicated that he did not follow Section 14 of the regulations dealing with conflict of interest of ministers, which indicates that he shall notify the Premier in writing on any matter in respect to which he has disqualified himself from acting, not before the fact, Mr. Speaker, because everybody has to make a declaration before the fact but, after he has disqualified himself, then he is suppose to report in writing. It has been indicated on several occasions in this House, and the record will show, that the minister and the Premier have indicated that this particular guideline is not followed.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that not following this guideline is an offense in itself and in fact there are a number of matters which regards to conflict of interest guidelines that certainly need to be debated.

There are several other items, Mr. Speaker, that I would really like to debate if the House stays open

and if the session continues beyond the next day or week or whatever. The reason I would like to see this House stay open are bills like, for instance, An Act To Provide For Payment Of Financial Assistance For Students Attending Post-secondary Educational Institutions. If the House does not deal with this bill, then I think it would be a shame. If the government, for instance, is serious about environmental protection, then I would think that it would be only too glad to get along to Bill 45, An Act To Amend The Department of Environment Act. This is a very important piece of legislation that really, Mr. Speaker, should be dealt with before the House closes, especially since the indication is that when we come back, at some future date, we will be dealing with the Atlantic Accord. The legislation, by the way, we have not seen yet and we hope that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) gives us copies well in advance.

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of bills yet to come relating to Municipal Affairs and with the situation regarding municipalities in this Province today, we certainly need a debate on Municipal Affairs. We certainly need to get into the fact that there are a lot of municipalities in this Province that are on the edge of bankruptcy, if not bankrupt at this time, for a variety of reasons. We need to discuss that.

Mr. Speaker, the overriding point that needs to be debated is jobs.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I cannot hear you. Speak up.

MR. BAKER:

I should repeat that for the hon. member. The overriding issue that needs to be debated is the issue of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I dare say that if somebody took the trouble to go back through statements made, particularly by the Premier and by some other ministers in government, if one were to go back over the last year or so and total up the number of new jobs that the Premier claims to have created in this Province, we would wonder why we are not importing labour, Mr. Speaker, from all over the world. He has created enough jobs to put every Newfoundlander to work, plus half of the unemployed in Canada if you were to total it up.

Every month we hear, 'We have created 5,000 new jobs. This month we have created another 5,000 or 6,000 new jobs.' We continually hear the litany from the Premier. Now, surely goodness, he is telling us the truth! But one would wonder, Mr. Speaker, when there are still 42,000 people unemployed in the Province, what version of the truth the Premier tells us. I say again that the facts he is telling us have to be true in some context. The key to that, Mr. Speaker, is 'the context' in which these figures are used.

For instance, is it that if, in community A there are 600 jobs lost and, at the same time, in community B there are 100 extra jobs created? The Premier would interpret that as creating 100 new jobs, conveniently forgetting the jobs that disappeared by the wayside. Is this what is happening? Certainly, it must be something like that.

Here tonight we heard the Premier

mention 5,000 new jobs. In actual fact, what the Premier was talking about, I would like to remind the House, is that there were 5,000 people who hopefully at some point in the next short while will get six or eight or ten weeks of work. There he is talking about 5,000 new jobs. Mr. Speaker, if you go through the year like this, with all the press releases that have been put out, and add up the number of new jobs, it will be absolutely astounding. As I said earlier, one would wonder where all of these unemployed are coming from. One would wonder whether they are just simply too lazy to go out and get a job with all the new jobs that have been created. In actual fact, the type of jobs that the Premier referred tonight are not the type of jobs that he was talking about a couple of years ago. You are talking about two different things, Mr. Speaker.

A year and a half ago, the Premier tramped from one end of this country to the other and members of his caucus, ministers, party workers, whatever and the gospel that was being preached then, Mr. Speaker, was that these make-work things are not jobs! That is not jobs! What we call jobs are permanent, full-time jobs. That is what we call jobs. I have heard it time, after time, after time. We do not call these make-work jobs jobs, that is simply another way of giving somebody welfare. How many times did I hear that? How the tune changes, Mr. Speaker.

Now, all of a sudden, this morning, the Premier says, "5,000 new jobs." All of a sudden he is talking about these very temporary jobs. By the way these people are not working yet, they will get to work sometime over the next month

or so, and all of a sudden these now are the jobs.

MR. REID:

If the federal Liberals had not given away all of our fish, we might have had a hell of a lot more jobs.

MR. FUREY:

Well, what are you doing about it?

AN HON. MEMBER:

We are trying to change that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

The Tories have been in control in Newfoundland for the last fourteen years. When are we going to stop blaming everything on somebody else? Instead of taking action, instead of trying to create jobs, Mr. Speaker, members opposite will simply shout, scream, and howl and do nothing.

MR. REID:

You can do all the bawling you like.

MR. BARRY:

It is time to put the corks back.

MR. REID:

Another Baker ran down in Trinity Bay one time. Do you remember your brother?

MR. BAKER:

Do you know where it is?

MR. REID:

Do you know what? Do you know what he left behind?  
I will tell you what he left behind.

MR. WINDSOR:

Is the hon. gentleman relevant?

MR. REID:

(Inaudible).

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I think the comments of the hon. member opposite are indictative of the kind of initiative and get up and go that we find in all members opposite; an example of the kind of initiative and get up and go and gumption and so on that is going to make this Province work; that is going to put this Province back to work; that is going to create 40,000 new jobs in just a very short time.

That is the kind of attitude that assures that nothing positive is ever done in this Province. All we have been getting is smear, smear and more smear, slime oozing across, that is all we have gotten.

The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) tries to make a little joke and says, 'sludge', standing up in the doorway saying, 'sludge'. What a contribution to this debate and what a contribution to job creation in this country. It is absolutely amazing what goes on, Mr. Speaker. The 40,000 new jobs, Mr. Speaker, were not created. As a matter of fact, we are developing a generation in this Province that has been described as being lost and forgotten.

The Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) gets up and makes his pronouncements to, you know, about how healthy the state of exploration is and how healthy the mining industry is in the Province. We get an awful lot of these statements, Mr. Speaker, that are purely cosmetic. Apparently it is in vogue now to get up and say everything is fine,

everything is rosy, everything is glossy and everybody is happy. You cannot tell the people of this Province right now they are happy. You cannot tell them that everything is okay by simply getting up and making a Ministerial Statement. That is not the way to solve the problem.

You certainly cannot do it by throwing the kind of slurs across the floor that we saw tonight that made me lose my temper. We cannot do it that way either. You have to be serious about this business of job creation. I was going to say that the 40,000 jobs were not created. We have created instead a lost and forgotten generation.

People in this Province for the last seven or eight years, ten years maybe, have existed on nothing but the odd works projects or nothing. An awful lot of them have never gotten on one of those works project or they have existed on Social Assistance. It is becoming that this is the only kind of life that they know, the only kind of life that they have experienced. Mr. Speaker, that is sad.

Hopefully, sometime down the road we will have the situation where we will have close to full employment in this Province but, in the meantime, that generation has lost all these years. I would like to point something else out, Mr. Speaker, that ties in with this idea of job creation.

The lack of attention or the lack of direct action by the government to protect the inshore fishery is going to create another whole mass of people who are going to sacrificed. A whole new generation, the older generation primarily are going to be

sacrificed unless, somehow we can protect and develop the inshore.

It is not enough to protect, we have to develop our inshore fishery to the extent that we can provide employment for our people and somehow that has got to be done. It is easy for you to say, "there are 20,000 people out there and we cannot put them to work in the fishery as it exists now." Well, if that is so, then we have to take that fishery and change it so that we can put these people to work. There are countries in this world that have developed their inshore fisheries and produced good quality fish and had all of the jobs on shore. It is possible but, I do not see any effort on the part of this government to do that, as a matter of fact, to the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I see what I suspect is an attempt to do away with the inshore fishery and to substitute something else and say to heck with all those 20,000 people who depend on it.

This is not a decision that was announced but, a decision that is being made through government action, and this kind of decision, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of decision that is going to lead to even more unemployment in the Province.

I would like to mention another very specific example, Mr. Speaker, of a Tory who is trying to cost us jobs in this Province. I speak of the attempt by John Crosbie, a close friend of members opposite, buddies, cheek to cheek, jewel to jewel. We know all about that. A friend of members opposite is trying to get international status for St. John's airport. I am not going to discuss the merits of that, Mr. Speaker. I do not intend to

because it would take too long.

However, I will point out one thing.

MR. WINDSOR:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. WINDSOR:

Clearly a motion such as this must be relevant as the Speaker must be relevant to the point of order. What Mr. Crosbie is doing in relation to international status for St. John's is clearly irrelevant to the motion to adjourn. I would Your Honour to rule the hon. member out of order.

MR. BAKER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

I would point out to the hon. member that there is a place in the Order Paper for me to debate this type of issue and to explain it. My point simply is that I do not want to adjourn. One of the reasons I do not want to adjourn is because I would like an opportunity to explain the situation to members opposite, as the member for St. John's North has asked me to do on one occasion.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The motion is to adjourn. Speak to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I can only repeat what I said

before, that there has been a fair amount of latitude allowed in this debate, and it is somewhat late now to call into question the rule of relevancy unless the hon. member strays too far. It seems to me that he is winding up his speech anyway, I believe he has about three minutes left. There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now then, about the loss of jobs, Mr. Speaker, and money, a recent report, and I do not agree with all of it, says that if the Air Canada flights alone were moved from Gander to St. John's, just that, and there was no other effect on Gander because of that - and that is the part I do not agree with - it would mean a loss to Gander of \$1.3 million a year, but a gain for St. John's of only \$225,000 a year. So here you have a loss of over \$1 million in our provincial economy by that move.

The report also points out that it would mean a loss of thirty-eight jobs in Gander, whereas thirteen would be gained in St. John's, for a loss of twenty-five jobs. Now this is just a small example of the kind of thinking that is the cause of our unemployment problem.

I would like to finish off, Mr. Speaker, by referring to something else that I would like to debate - I have already mentioned a number of them - and there is a place left on the Order Paper for it, and that is some of the comments of members opposite concerning problems. The fisheries problem was handled by members opposite by saying there is no problem in this minister's district and there is

no problem in that minister's district and so on, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has a minute left.

MR. BAKER:

There is no problem in this minister's district, or that one's or that one's. If you people have problems it is because you are not doing your job. What a stupid attitude! What a shallow explanation! In actual fact what they are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we are in control but we will not do anything for you, we will do it all for ourselves. That is a shameful admission in this House, Mr. Speaker. They are the government of all of the people. I realize that you do some things for your friends and so on, but at the same time to get up and publicly boast about it is just a little bit too much, Mr. Speaker, and that has been done a number of times in this House recently.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I ask the hon. member to wind up.

MR. BAKER:

I will wind up, Mr. Speaker.

So the main point -

MR. J. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have been watching the sweep hand on that clock. Your Honour said he had a minute

left. He has now talked for a minute and ten seconds, and I think he should sit down.

MR. BAKER:

The Speaker asked me to wind up and I promised I would.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. I have asked the hon. member to wind up his remarks.

MR. BAKER:

The main point, Mr. Speaker, is that by adjourning we are losing the opportunity to debate and losing the opportunity to make sure that that government does what it said it was going to do, and that is to create jobs.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have listened to the enlightened debate. I want the Speaker to know that the few points that I will try to make will be germane to the debate. They will be relevant. In 1979, Mr. Speaker, the Premier said to Newfoundland, "One day the sun will shine and have-not will be no more."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, that was said in 1979 and I believe after six years of debate that this House should not

close until the sun shines on all sectors of Newfoundland. I want to be known as the first member who stood in this House and said that the Premier is not totally wrong. The sun has indeed shone on certain sectors of this Province and this country. The sun is shining on National Sea, the sun is shining on Nova Scotia, and the sun is shining on New Brunswick as a result, Mr. Speaker, of the FFT decision, as a result of the conniving of our federal members and as a result of our Tory buddies in Ottawa pulling the rug out from under the Premier. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the sun is shining on Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, P.E.I. and FFT, but the sun is not shining, Mr. Speaker, on the occupants of the Whitbourne Boys' Home. The sun is not shining, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) will know, on some of the former occupants of the Children's Home on Water Street. The sun is not shining on those people or on the people who care about them. The sun, Mr. Speaker -

MR. REID:

Were you ever out to the boys home in Whitbourne?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Look, I would think that that member is probably a graduate from the Boys' Home in Whitbourne.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I know the morning is getting early or the night is getting late, but for one hon. member to accuse another hon. member of being a graduate of the Whitbourne Boys' Home, or any other home or whatever, is to cast aspersions upon the character of another member of the House, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is on a high flight and all the rest of it, but that is not a very kind way to refer to another hon. member of the House. I am sure that the member for Windsor - Buchans, in his decency, in the way he has conducted his own life over the last ten or fifteen or twenty years, the decency with which he has conducted himself in this House over the last four or five years, I am sure he wants to get up - I am not going to stand in my place because I know he is rushing to get up - to apologize to the hon. member.

MR. REID:

Mr. Speaker, he is going to have to get up and apologize.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The member for Windsor - Buchans was on his feet giving a very good speech. The member for Windsor - Buchans was on his feet talking about issues, not personalities, Mr. Speaker, but the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid) has been interrupting the member for Windsor - Buchans and shaking his fist at him and getting up and threatening him. Now, Mr. Speaker, let the member for

Trinity - Bay de Verde observe the rules of this House and act like an adult, and let other members, including the Premier, act the same way.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I said earlier that the Chair has provided a great deal of leniency in terms of interruption. I have also said that hon. members can have silence, if they so wish, by simply asking the Chair and the Chair will do its best to grant their requests. The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans did not make such a request, although the Chair attempted to call order on a number of occasions. I am sure that the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans would like to change what he said and retract that statement. It seems to me, if it does not breach the parliamentary rule, it is unbecoming from an hon. member of the House to make such a reference in relation another hon. member. I will ask the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I have had in my lifetime some people close to me spend time in the Witbourne Boys' Home, I withdraw the remark and if I have offended the member I apologize.

Mr. Speaker, as the Premier said, the sun will shine. The sun is shining on Newfoundland Hydro and the sun is shining on Newfoundland Light and Power because he has a PUB down there that is dancing to his tune. Mr. Speaker, he has a consumers' advocate on that Board who is out to defend and protect Newfoundland Light and Newfoundland Power, one of his political buddies, Mr. Speaker,

who gets \$25,000 a year, along with some other salaries, to make sure that the New Lab group is stepped on and ground into the dirt and ignored, and in so doing the consumers of this Province are ignored. But, Mr. Speaker, the sun is shining on the Premier's ministers who junket around the world, like the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) who junkets to the Far East and all around this world and accomplishes nothing. The sun is indeed shining on that sector of Newfoundland. The sun is indeed shining, Mr. Speaker, on Cabot Martin. The sun is shining \$150 worth an hour of Newfoundland sunshine on Cabot Martin. Mr. Speaker, one could argue that Cabot Martin will indeed make \$312,000 this year. But, I guarantee you, while he may not make \$312,000, he will certainly make \$150,000, and that is three times what he was earning when he was working twenty-four hours a day for the Premier. That, Mr. Speaker, is the best example, or the worst, however you read it, of political patronage that was ever known in this Province. A man we had for \$62,000 a year and we are now going to pay \$150,000 a year in consulting fees. There is your patronage, Mr. Speaker! The sun is also shining, Mr. Speaker, on Messrs. Goudie, MacLennan, Osmond and Andrews, the defeated Tory candidates in this Province, as a result of our Mr. Clean Premier, the man who told us, 'One day the sun will shine and have-not will be no more. When the people heard that message they thought he meant that the sun would shine on everyone, that he was going to usher in a new period of economic expansiveness. They did not realize that what he meant was that the sun would shine on the people he selected to have the sun

shine on, Mr. Speaker. The sun is not shining on Buchans, Mr. Speaker. For fifty years, Mr. Speaker, the Buchans mine operated non-stop, but now it has closed and 500 or 600 men are laid off. Because of that Premier's actions, Mr. Speaker, the sun is not shining. That great Premier was going to guarantee economic development and expansion for all of Newfoundland, the very man who, when Abitibi-Price wanted to completed a road that would give them access to wood stands, give them access to the West Coast and leave a glimmer of light at the end of the tunnel, told Abitibi-Price, "Do not complete the road," the man who wrote a letter to Mr. Grimlin stating, "Do not complete the road," when Mr. Grimlin had said, "The viability of the Labrador Linerboard mill might be at stake. We have to have that road." Well, he is going to have that road. The member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) need not hop up, Mr. Speaker, because the road is going ahead now, but it is not going along the route the Buchans - Burgeo Road was intended to, and it is not going to provide any economic stimulus to the Central Newfoundland area, to Buchans, and provide some hope for a future. No, Mr. Speaker, the sun is not shining on the welfare recipients in the district of Port au Port, Mr. Speaker. Let the member go to Port au Port and tell the people the sun that the Premier was talking about in 1979 is shining on them today, after I have heard him so often stand in his House and tell this House that his district had the highest level of unemployment in Newfoundland - it was so, it still is so, and it will continue to be so as long as we get the kind of policies from that Premier that we have been

getting.

MR. HODDER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know why I was singled out as a member here, but I would like to inform the member that, due to my representations and what not -

MR. FLIGHT:

That is no point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is not a point of order.

MR. HODDER:

- in the next two years I would suggest that the unemployment rate in Port au Port will be much, much lower.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

What is your target?

MR. HODDER:

My target is zero, yes, that is right.

MR. FLIGHT:

This is an abuse, Mr. Speaker.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

You have four years to get to zero.

MR. HODDER:

That is my target, zero. My representation of Port au Port will not be to take advantage of disaster or take advantage of the people I represent, but to do positive things for the people I represent.

MR. FLIGHT:

That is an abuse of my privileges, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier was probably not aware of it at the time, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, he recognized two members sitting on this side of the House when it would be very easy to make the sun shine on. He found out how easy it was to make the sun shine on those two members, Mr. Speaker, and he made it shine. It was easy to make the sun shine on those two members. And we all know how the sun shone, so that is another segment of society that the sun is shining on, because the Premier intended to make the sun shine.

The sun, Mr. Speaker, is shining on former Premier Lougheed, \$10,000 worth of sunshine per trip, per weekend, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Lougheed is going to enjoy the Newfoundland sun as a result of the largess of the Newfoundland Premier. But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you the sun is not shining on the 12,000 Newfoundlanders who are leaving this Province every year as a result of the economic chaos that that Premier has brought on this Province. It did not shine on the cultural groups, Mr. Speaker. The sun, Mr. Speaker, is not shining on the people of this Province who are denied hospitalization because there are no beds available. The sun is not shining on those people. The sun is not shining on the people from the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde's district who are sitting out there waiting to be hospitalized and cannot get in because there are no beds as a

result of the cutbacks.

The sun is not shining, Mr. Speaker, on the senior citizens' home in Lewisporte, in North Haven Manor where the board brought in a self-imposed freeze on beds when there are now empty beds in that North Haven Manor with a backlog in excess of 100 senior citizens who need chronic care. The sun is not shining on that 130 Newfoundlanders who cannot get into North Haven because the North Haven Manor had to impose a freeze as a result of the actions taken by this government.

MR. WARREN:

What about Torngat Mountains?

MR. FLIGHT:

Insofar as Torngat Mountains is concerned, Mr. Speaker, the sun can never shine there while that member is there casting his cloud.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I know a few people from Torngat Mountains and I can tell that member that they would see him as the most despicable object that ever walked in their midst if they could have witnessed what that member did tonight, a despicable, reprehensible act, Mr. Speaker, that I have never seen the like of in this House. And he did not have, Mr. Speaker, the courage or the dignity to stand up and apologize after the error of his ways was pointed out. He took a good tongue-lashing though from the Minister of Social Services and that is not the last one he is going to take before this is over because the Minister of Social Services may pay the price in this House as a result of the actions of that member.

MR. WARREN:

I have a feeling your leader is going to pay the price before it is all over.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member is making accusations and innuendos against the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains which are totally unsubstantiated because, as we know, the four children, as they were referred to, will be subject to a police investigation. There will be about statements taken from them. The truth will come out exactly what happened. It may be totally different from what the hon. member has said. So I think the hon. member should withhold any statements until the actual truth comes out taken by professional people which will become part of an official record. Then we will know exactly what happened. Until that time I would suggest the hon. member withhold any innuendos or any spurious accusations that he might make against the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. But I would ask the hon. member to speak to the motion.

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the sun is not shining on the employees of the

Newfoundland railway in Newfoundland today. The sun is not shining the way the Newfoundland railway workers thought it was going to shine when the Premier and his entourage boarded the Newfie Bullet here in St. John's to go across the Province saying, "We are going to fight. Now we are going to save the railway. We are getting involved." The sun is not shining, Mr. Speaker, on the employees of that railway who know their jobs are in jeopardy and know she is coming down and coming down with the conniving of that Premier, the man who was going to save the Newfoundland railway.

The sun is not shining, Mr. Speaker, on the population of the whole Come By Chance area who believed that one day the sun would indeed shine and they would be employed in an industry refining their oil. The sun is not shining, Mr. Speaker, with the knowledge that again, with the conniving of that Premier and his Cabinet, that the oil refinery is in jeopardy and might be sold for scrap. Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous it gets. The hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is now taking pride, as we all have, in announcing two finds within the past month, both equal, I suppose, in capacity to Hibernia. Now, Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous it is the more oil we find the less chances we have for refining it here.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy and the Premier are going to have to bring a lot of reassurances to the people of the Come By Chance area, and all of Newfoundland, before the sun starts to shine for those people. Mr. Speaker, the sun is not shining for the labour movement in this Province under this Premier.

The Premier with the connivance of his Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), brought the labour movement in this Province to its knees.

MR. BLANCHARD:

To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour, on a point of order.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans should get well informed before he starts making statements about what the labour movement is all about in this Province right now. Mr. Speaker, he is using metaphors about the sun shining. He is trying to find out when the cloud cover is going to break in Buchans. And he is going to find out what is going to happen to the good people of Buchans-

MR. FLIGHT:

That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BLANCHARD:

-as a result of what is going on? He does not know, so he has been asking me questions. He is getting up now and reflecting on labour in the Province. It is about time he get informed, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the sun is not shining either for all the people in Newfoundland and Labrador who needs housing from housing from Newfoundland and Labrador Housing under that particular minister, Mr. Speaker. The sun is not shining for the seventy or eighty people of Windsor, living in desperate conditions, who have had applications on file for six years. The sun is not shining for these people. The sun is shining, Mr. Speaker, for the committee that he appointed and pays per diem to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, on a point of order.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, methinks the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans is misleading the House of Assembly and misleading the people of Newfoundland when he talks about the amount of housing provided by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing on behalf of the people of the Province, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, which is more per capita than any province in this country, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member should beware, because only this week the hon. member got up in this House and berated one of the only hopes that the people of Windsor - Buchans has with respect to development in this Province when he berated the only company that is exploring in Windsor - Buchans,

which is BP Selco. He got up and said in this House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I would ask the hon. minister to state his point of order.

MR. DINN:

I am getting to the point of order, Mr. Speaker. The point of order is that the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans, who is here to represent the people of Windsor - Buchans, is not representing them, Mr. Speaker, and should be castigated by this House because he should be representing them.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I can deal with that minister some other time, but I want to tell this House that the sun is not shining on employees who worked at Ocean Harverters but are now laid off as a result of the Premier's disastrous approach to the fisheries in this Province. I will guarantee you the Premier did not intend for the sun to shine on those 1,200 constituents, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, apparently the hon.

the member for Windsor - Buchans is going right around to each minister and criticizing them. Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. gentleman that the people of Harbour Grace will have their fish plant open again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG:

And the sun will shine on Harbour Grace again, Mr. Speaker, no worry about that.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, there will be plenty of time to deal with that minister. I tell you that the sun is not shining for a lot of people in Grand Falls, Mr. Speaker, because they are aware of the connivance of their member, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), in going along with the Federal Forestry Center going to Corner Brook. Mr. Speaker, if you wonder why he only had a forty-one vote majority, that may be a major factor. The sun is not shining on that element of the population of Newfoundland and, Mr. Speaker, the sun is not shining on the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird).

MR. YOUNG:

You did not want the office space you rent in Buchans going out on public tender.

MR. FLIGHT:

If I wanted to, Mr. Speaker, I could raise a point of order now about what the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) just said. I know what he said and Hansard will

probably show what he said. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, the sun is not shining on the member for Humber West's constituency which is obviously not going to get a forestry center. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, Mr. Speaker, wasted his time. He wanted to be the great minister, resting on his big majority, saying, "I can afford to be big and I can afford to go to Corner Brook." And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the sun is not shining on the people whom the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) is responsible for in this Province. The sun is not shining on young students who are leaving the university in droves because they cannot afford to stay in, Mr. Speaker. The sun is not shining, Mr. Speaker, on the students who are coming out of that university owing \$10,000 or \$20,000 a year because the minister allowed the university to jack up tuition fees and he went along with the reduction of student aid. Nor is the sun shining, Mr. Speaker, on thousands of fishermen in this Province while he is sitting on his hands and not helping to get work for them. The sun is not shining on the people who were forced to go on hunger strikes, Mr. Speaker. The sun is not shining on the member's Provincial constituency where people were brought to the embarrassing, disgraceful act of having to stage hunger strikes to get that minister, Mr. Speaker, to get off his hands and work.

MR. DINN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans should not be allowed to put on the record of this House the fact that there is a problem with the student population of Newfoundland. There are more students registered this year than any year in the history of Newfoundland and the Student Aid Programme in Newfoundland is the best Student Aid Programme of any Province in Canada, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the sun is not shining on the people whom the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) told in a very callous way, 'If you are not represented by my friends, do not expect any road repairs or any pavement.' The sun is not shining on those people, either, Mr. Speaker. Nor is the sun shining on that large section of the population of this Province which is the constituency of the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell). It was a joke here tonight, we were calling him the Minister of CC. We have the Minister of SS and we have the Minister of CC. I guarantee you that that minister's constituency is seeing no sun as a result of the action he has taken on their behalf. He is the minister of Newfound hydro, the minister of Newfoundland Light, the minister of any corporation you can name, Mr. Speaker, but he sure is not the Minister of Consumer Affairs, he is sure not the protector of the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I have a statistic here that I would say every minister has to share some

responsibility for, and surely the sun is not shining on this constituency. Up to the end of 1984, Mr. Speaker, 8000 people moved into this Province, as a result of all the sun that the Premier caused to shine. But as a result of the sun that he did not cause to shine, the lack of sun as a result of his disgraceful approach to governing this Province, 12,900 moved out, a net loss to this Province that every minister over there will have to take responsibility for. 'One day the sun will shine and have-not will be no more.' What a joke!

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there is another group of people in this Province the sun is not shining on, and that is the provincial constituency of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). Mr. Speaker, the sun is not shining on his own constituents in Seal Cove. The sun is not shining on a community like Millertown where he intercepts every grant and has the community in bankruptcy. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you something else; the sun is not shining on the various miners and mining communities in this Province who are the constituents of that minister standing in the door, yapping, Mr. Speaker. He is not talking to the brewery workers.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

DR. COLLINS:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here listening to all this. The

hon. member opposite mentioned almost every minister in the administration and he ignored me completely. Now, I object to this discrimination. I was sitting here anxiously waiting for my name to come up and I can only assume that the hon. member was talking of moonshine and not sunshine.

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

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

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

MR. FLIGHT:  
I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) I am concerned and sorry that I did not include him, but I can tell you he has a constituency— every person in this Province forced to pay 12 per cent SSA, the sun is not shining on that constituency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, consultation and co-operation is what we have heard from members opposite from the Premier down, and I must say with respect to some of them it is way down, Mr. Speaker. Let us look at the approach that the Government of Canada takes with respect to

communicating with this Province and the rest of the country. Why is it that they have been able to get away so far in some parts of the country - not in Newfoundland but in some parts of the country - why is it the Government of Canada has been able with this notion that there is a new era of consultation and co-operation? I would like to draw the attention of members, because I am sure some members are not aware of this, to a Government of Canada strategy paper leaked a few weeks ago. Mr. Speaker, what it set out was a dirty tricks campaign to counteract opposition to Government of Canada policies. Let us read the basic theme of that paper, Mr. Speaker, and I will not have to table this because it is already accepted to be part of the record of this House since it is from the Hansard of the federal Parliament, Mr. Speaker. Here it is. This is the strategy now that it is recommended that the federal Cabinet should follow:

'The strategy should rely less on educating the general public than on getting across the message that the trade initiative is a good idea.' In other words, a selling job. Let me repeat that. This has to do with the strategy on free trade, Mr. Speaker, but it is key to all the federal government communication strategies. This is right from Mr. Mulroney's Cabinet document that was leaked to the federal Parliament.

MR. DINN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, can we find credibility in the Leader of the Opposition who voted for factory freezer trawlers in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I should mention, Mr. Speaker, that at the appropriate time we will release the letter that we received from the acting federal Fisheries Minister which confirms our opposition as having been duly noted by the minister and says, Mr. Speaker, that our advise, the opposition that we provided, was considered. I think basically the tenor of the letter was that he succumbed to the behind the scenes urgings of members opposite, that it was the lack of any representation on the part of the Premier until months had passed that permitted him to go ahead and make his decision to give serious consideration to the National Sea application. That was why factory freezer trawlers will sail out of Nova Scotia, Mr. Speaker, because the Premier of this Province, instead of carrying on a battle in Ottawa, was issuing press releases and telexes down here and he did not have the courage to bring an all-party committee of this House up to Ottawa to carry on the battle where it should have been fought.

Let me get back, Mr. Speaker, to the theme here. This is the federal strategy for communicating. The strategy should rely less on educating the general public than on getting across the message that the free

trade initiative is a good idea. In other words, the strategy is a selling job, Mr. Speaker. Now that is the essence of what has gone on with all of this discussion about consultation and co-operation, a selling job. Down here, Mr. Speaker, it is known as a snow job also.

Mr. Speaker, little wonder that members opposite have been mouthing the same phrase, 'Consultation and co-operation,' because they are part of the same conspiracy, a selling job, a snow job.

MR. WINDSOR:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board on a point of order.

MR. WINDSOR:

Obviously in a debate such as this the hon. gentleman must be relevant and he is being absolutely and totally irrelevant. Mr. Speaker, I would submit not only is he not being relevant but he has a responsibility to the people who elected him to this House to be intelligent, or at least be semi-intelligent, and he has been neither relevant nor intelligent and I ask Your Honour to rule him out of order.

MR. BARRY:

Just briefly to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is marvellous to see some life in the President of Treasury Board, the first sign of

it since his demotion. When the Premier found out, Mr. Speaker, that the minister was telling his campaign contributors during the last election that he was going to be the next Leader of the Tory Party, the Premier immediately gave him the old yank out of the Development portfolio and stuffed him into Treasury Board, the minister opposite has been sulking ever since. You talk about a big sook, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Is that enough on that point of order?

MR. SPEAKER:

I want to rule on that point of order now.

MR. WINDSOR:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

The hon. the gentleman should know what it is like to get turfed out of Development. Not only did he get turfed out of Development, he got such a sook that he ran away from Cabinet, he could not handle it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could just briefly comment on that very relevant point that was raised, Mr. Speaker, at one time I had the pleasure of being Development Minister, and that was the period that the Premier keeps referring

back to when 40,000 jobs were created. That was when it was, Mr. Speaker.

Now, because of the pressures of Energy, Mr. Speaker, and other commitments, I decided that I had to do justice by working full-time on Energy, so I decided I would have to ask the Premier to permit me to relinquish the Development portfolio. At that point in time, as the job charts will show, the graph goes like this, Mr. Speaker, in terms of jobs created after that point in time.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Mines.

MR. DINN:  
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition may be misleading the House on this. I happen to know, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition left under duress, he was under too much pressure, he could not take the pressure. Baie Verte was closing down, Mr. Speaker, and all the other things were happening, and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition could not take the pressure and as a result, Mr. Speaker, that is why he had to go. It was not, Mr. Speaker, the great rise in job creation.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
On that point, the minister is all mixed up in his dates. Mr. Speaker, I had left the Development portfolio close to a year before that point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
I will allow one more submission.

MR. WINDSOR:  
The hon. gentleman is totally incorrect. The hon. gentleman and I held a meeting in Toronto with the principals of Advocate Mines, then we went to Montreal and attended an international hockey game, and the next day he resigned.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! I think it is time we dealt with this point of order. There is no point of order, but a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, the former Development Minister has forgotten that when we were in Toronto, he was then the Development Minister and I was the Mines Minister, Mr. Speaker, and that is the point that I was making for the Minister of Mines and Energy. And by the way it should be noted, I guess, that when I left the Cabinet, when my stomach could take no more, it took three of them to replace me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! I am having difficulty hearing the hon. member.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition joined the Liberal Party my stomach could not take it either so I left and came over here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:  
To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To the point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I welcome the intervention by the gentleman for Torngat Mountain, a man who has now added to his list of reasons for crossing over. I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, that the member now has finally exonerated himself by levelling with this House, that the real reason he went over there was on a matter of some high principle having to do with the state of his stomach rather than the state of his pocketbook, which was the reason he told us earlier, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! There is no point of order, but a difference of opinion among three hon. members.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn) and the Minister of Development (Mr.

Barrett) who have been -

MR. WINDSOR:  
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is not permitted to malign the Minister of Development who is not here in the House to defend himself.

MR. BARRY:  
What have you been feeding him in there?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
What was sprinkled on the pizza? Mr. Speaker, could we have the inspectors who went in and found that rancid tuna go into the Common Room and find out what has gone rancid in there this evening because obviously members opposite have gotten into something, Mr. Speaker? The heckle and the gibe routine -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Tuna juice.

MR. BARRY:  
Tuna juice, is it?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I would have to say to the Leader of the Opposition, for the first time tonight, that the rule of relevancy would now certainly apply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, that is one of the

first rulings tonight that I have to agree with. Maybe this is what is happening, we may be getting a Speaker out of this. We may be seeing a Speaker in the making. There may be another hanging up there pretty soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
Now, we have seen the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Development jump up regularly when other members are speaking. Perhaps they would be -

MR. BAIRD:  
The Minister of Development is not here, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:  
The hon. gentleman is continuing to malign the Minister of Development who is not present.

MR. BARRY:  
I am sorry. The former Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
- the putative leadership candidate of the Tory Party, I should mention, until he was turfed out of Development. Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps these gentlemen would rise on their own

time and give us the benefit of their collective wisdom which would, I am sure, take thirty or forty seconds. It has been a long night but for for these two members to give us their collective wisdom, their full and complete encyclopedic collective wisdom, we could spare the thirty or forty seconds that that would take in the course of this debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I could just get back to the matter of jobs and to why this House should be kept open, we have seen the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn) get up and talk about how well mining is going. We have seen the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) get up and talk about how well job creation has been going. We have seen the Minister of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) get up and say how well labour relations are going now with government employees, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINDSOR:  
Sit down and I will tell you all about it.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
I will be sitting down in about forty-five or fifty minutes. Mr. Speaker, perhaps they could tell us where the 6,000 jobs went between November of last year and November of this year. There are 6,000 fewer people working.

MR. WINDSOR:  
I will tell you about the 15,000 people who have signed agreements.

MR. BARRY:  
It does not matter how many have signed agreements, it does not matter, Mr. Speaker, how much mineral exploration has increased,

because there are only 173,000 people working now and this time last year there were 179,000. Now it does not matter how much you adjust seasonally. It does not matter how much you fool around with what the Premier calls 'lies, lies and damn statistics.' Perhaps some members opposite could carry back to the Premier the correct quote, which is, "Lies, damn lies and statistics," as I know the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) has tried to point out to the Premier on a number of occasions, which is why he may not make it to the leadership of his party either. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that 6,000 jobs fewer can exist if members opposite were doing their jobs. Six thousand jobs have been lost in this Province. That is the bottom line.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Why did you not protect the 400 jobs in Baie Verte?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

Why did they laugh you out of your seat on the Burin Peninsula?

MR. BARRY:

I could run in Pleasantville, because that will be a safe Liberal seat.

MR. DINN:

Tell us why you ran away from Bowater?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I plead for your protection because my voice is going from the shouting. I plead for your protection, particularly with respect to the sook.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Maybe a brief recess until members compose themselves would be in order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

When a member asks for protection, when a member asks to be heard in silence the Chair has to see to it that that is granted.

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition challenged me in Pleasantville. I say this to the hon. Leader of the Opposition: If he will resign tomorrow, I will resign and take him on any day of the week in Pleasantville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

I hold that challenge out to the Leader of the Opposition or any member opposite, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order?

MR. BARRY:

I have a suggestion here: Let us have them all resign, Mr.

Speaker. Come on! We are ready!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. DINN:  
On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Would the hon. minister take his seat? I have to rule on the other point of order.

There is no point of order. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. I ask hon. members to restrain themselves so that we can get through this.

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

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

MR. DINN:  
The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Pleasantville was challenged by the Leader of the Opposition and I accept the challenge. If the hon. Leader will resign, I will and take him on any day of the week, Mr. Speaker, within the next twenty-one days.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
What has he been fed? Mr. Speaker, he had a bad mushroom, obviously, during dinner.

Mr. Speaker, when one is elephant hunting, Mr. Speaker, one is not sidetracked by gophers. Now that point has been made time after time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Would hon. members take their seats?

Order, please! I would like to rule on that last point of order. There is no point of order. I suggest to both hon. gentlemen that they settle this outside of the Chamber.

MR. DINN:  
He has not got the guts, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I do not mean physically.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:  
Name the nuisance!

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

MR. BARRY:  
I have to confess I do not have much left because I lost most of it listening to what was spewed out here this evening.

MR. WINDSOR:  
Look! Another Rexogram telling him what to say next.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could get back to the 6000 missing jobs, where have all the jobs gone?

MR. WINDSOR:

The hon. gentleman deserted the jobs at the Marystown Shipyard and the jobs at Baie Verte.

MR. BARRY:

Protection please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman requests silence.

MR. BARRY:

Where have those 6000 jobs gone, Mr. Speaker? We know that a lot of them went to friends of members opposite but that did not increase the net total because most of them were job transfers. Instead of job creation, members opposite are spending most of their time on job transfers, transferring jobs from individuals, Mr. Speaker, entitled to receive them, if they were advertised, to transferring jobs on the buddy system. One of the favorite techniques, of course, of transferring jobs to a buddy is this designation of temporary employees.

MR. BAIRD:

You are only a temporary leader and you will get transferred, too.

MR. BARRY:

We were interested in the response, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), responsible for the Public Service Commission, when asked how many temporary employees were employed by government and he refused to answer. He said, "That is not the responsibility of the Public Service Commission." He

evaded the question on a technicality and refused to give the answer. Now, Mr. Speaker, I issue this question to all ministers opposite: Have the courage to get up and tell us how your job transfer schemes are going - not job creation, but your job transfer schemes - and let us know how many temporary jobs have been created in your departments in this past year. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we had those figures, which members have not been given in this House, we would see where the energies of members opposite have been channeled and directed over the past several years, not in job creation but in job transfers, taking jobs away from the ordinary individual on the street who would like to apply to a properly advertised position. That opportunity is not given because temporary employment is the rule of the day in the departments. Permanent positions, Mr. Speaker, are being filled by employees who are designated as temporary. This, Mr. Speaker, is a cancer that is gnawing at the bowels of this administration and it is going to see this administration crumble over the next several years, this rot that has set in.

MR. DINN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister for Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

A point of order on the basis of repetition. The last Leader of the Opposition said exactly the same as this Leader is saying now. I challenged him in Pleasantville, he ran in Bonavista North and

lost. I say that the hon. Leader of the Opposition will not challenge me in Pleasantville but will run in Mount Scio - Bell Island and he will lose, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, he has got to be kicked out. Somebody has got to carry him home, get him out of here because he is making a fool of himself.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I noticed the Sergeant-at-Arms is starting to limber up a little. The Sergeant-at-Arms is doing his limbering exercises and he may be needed in a moment. Mr. Speaker, I think what might be happening here is that the Minister of Mines and Energy may have been given a little flick by the Premier and told to shape up or he may have to ship out, and that may be why, Mr. Speaker, we see this energetic effort on the part of the minister to interrupt debate this evening. Now we have not heard very much from the minister when it is the turn of somebody opposite to get up and speak. We have not heard a sound, Mr. Speaker, from the minister or other members opposite, and that is very curious, Mr. Speaker. Is this a deliberate tactic not only to bring about closure but to even bring about closure on the closure debate by shouting down the Opposition during the closure debate? Is that the technique? That is plan D, is it?

MR. DAWE:

I would just like to point out that there are less temporary jobs and more permanent jobs in the Department of Transportation than there has ever been in the history of the department.

MR. BARRY:  
Maybe the minister, one of these years, will give us an answer on that Bay L'Argent job that he undertook to give in the last Session.

MR. DAWE:  
Hundred and hundreds of less temporary positions and hundreds and hundreds of more permanent positions.

MR. BARRY:  
Maybe he will give an answer to that question that he undertook to answer in the last Session of the House, Mr. Speaker, which has not yet been answered.

MR. DAWE:  
If the hon. member had been in the Legislature more in the last session he would have gotten the answer because it was given.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one curious aspect to this free trade debate. If I could just get off the topic for a minute, we have not yet heard how the Premier of this Province, the champion of local preference, will explain the local preference policies to Ronald Reagan. Can you picture Ronald Reagan being told, "Well, now, Mr. Reagan, you are going to have to break down your barriers"-

MR. DAWE:  
Ronald Reagan understands affirmative action.

MR. WINDSOR:

What has the hon. gentleman got against local preference?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has asked to be heard in silence.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to find out is have members opposite scrapped the concept of local preference? Has that been wiped out?

MR. WINDSOR:

Certainly not. It would have been scrapped if the hon. gentleman had his way.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Then I am going to be delighted, Mr. Speaker, when I finish my remarks, to hear -

MR. WINDSOR:

He would scrap it altogether.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I think we should throw him out now. I think that is about it. We should toss him out now.

MR. WINDSOR:

I think you should flick out the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WINDSOR:

He is being totally irrelevant.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Members opposite should get up and explain how local preference can be squared with the concept of free trade.

MR. DINN:

Sit down and we will explain it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I will be delighted to have the minister or somebody on that side of the House debate when I finish. We will be delighted to see the minister arise and give an explanation for that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

Tell us what your position is on local preference. Are you for or against it?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy has slunk off into his hole again. Where is he? He has crawled off into his burrow again. Where is the Minister of Mines and Energy? I want him, Mr. Speaker. I miss him. Mr. Speaker, where is the Minister of Mines and Energy?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I ask hon. members, again, to

allow the Leader of the Opposition to be heard in silence.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition requested my presence and I am here. I hope he takes up my challenge in Pleasantville.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I ask the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy to allow the Leader of the Opposition to be heard in silence.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

In response to the quart of disorder, Mr. Speaker, he alleges he is here, but that is clearly not the case, so there is no point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

That hon. member of all hon. members in this House who spent ten days in the Ministry of Mines, I have outdone him by 100 times, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the first day the member for Fortune-Hermitage spent sat there he did more than the Minister of Mines and Energy has ever done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, is there any control?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know has the minister yet stopped allocating housing units on the basis of political preference? Is the minister still allocating housing units in this Province on the basis of partisan political consideration? If the minister is not so doing when did he stop the practice? Because there is a long, long line of people seeking access to the various housing units of the Housing Corporation. We get many letters and we write the Housing Corporation.

MR. DINN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is making an allegation here through the back door which he has not got the courage to make through the front door. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition has any proof, I want him to lay that proof on the Table of the House and if that proof can be justified I will resign my post

as Minister of Housing. He has not got any proof of that allegation, Mr. Speaker, and has not got the courage to make it outside the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

I was about to rule on that very matter before the hon. minister rose. The hon. Leader of the Opposition certainly has been given all kinds of flexibility with regard to relevancy. However, he was asking a question as if it were in Question Period, obviously eliciting a response. That is what seems to disrupt the House, so I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to continue his speech.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest things that I have seen is the way morale in the Department of Mines has deteriorated since the current minister has moved in. It is sad to see the way in which those very good people I gathered around me—

MR. DAWE:

You should hear how they talk about the hon. gentleman opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

He is getting out. He cannot take it.

MR. DINN:

Me!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Will the hon. minister take his seat. The hon. Minister of Mines

and Energy is well aware, I am sure, of the rule that he is not supposed to speak unless he is in his place. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, he has slunk off again to lick his wounds. He has gone to lick his wounds. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy inherited a wonderful department. Over several years, I gathered together the cream of the geological crop, Mr. Speaker, in that department and we had a fighting force with the highest of morale. Mr. Speaker, I meet with my former staff and they come to me and they are almost in tears.

MR. TULK:

He has slunk back in again!

MR. DINN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Everyday, Mr. Speaker, I meet with my staff in the Department of Mines and Energy, and they can not understand why the former, former, former Minister of Mines and Energy held his office in the Confederation Building, away from them. They cannot understand why he would not associate with them, Mr. Speaker. He was too high on his pedestal. They cannot understand why he would not associate with them and they were totally disappointed in him as minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. minister will take his seat or leave the Chamber?

MR. TULK:

He has left again!

MR. SPEAKER:

The Leader of the Opposition and the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, as I indicated before, should settle some things outside of the House. They obviously have differences of opinion on a number of matters. I do not wish to rule that the Leader of the Opposition does not have flexibility because he does, as everybody else has had tonight, but I ask him in the interest of expediency find another area to debate in the time remaining.

MR. SIMMONS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, with respect, I do not believe we can blame this charade on the member who has the floor at the time. He surely has flexibility. If he is not being relevant then of course, it is the prerogative of the Chair to draw this to his attention. It is understood that what a member says may well provoke a certain reaction in other people, but that does not give them license to disrupt the House. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, you only have two options: Either name the member for Pleasantville, or vacate the Chair on the grounds that the House will not obey the instructions of the Chair, has degenerated into disorder and, therefore, should just cease meeting at this particular point in time.

MR. SPEAKER:

I appreciate the advise of the

hon. member. However, I suggest that both hon. members, in the interest of expediency, find another area of debate just so that we can get on with the business of the House. I will keep the hon. member's advise in mind. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I assume the Minister of Mines and Energy has gone out to have his diaper changed, but I am not sure.

Mr. Speaker, if I could get serious in the few minutes left in my speech, one of the saddest things we have seen over the past twenty-four hours is that way in which arrogance has reached an all-time high in this Province, the way in which members opposite, with a savage desire to escape the heat that has been focused on them in this Session, have been willing to tear up all the rules of the House in order to get out of Dodge as fast as possible. That is the motto of members opposite, "Get out of Dodge". The heat is on, Mr. Speaker, and they are prepared to threaten the essence of this legislative process because, Mr. Speaker, we all know that just about the only lever, the only bargaining power, the only negotiating strength, when it all comes down to the final push, that the Opposition used to be given in this legislature, and is still given in other legislatures of the British Commonwealth, is the right of the Opposition to have the time to debate the issues that they wish to debate. What we have seen over the last twenty-four hours is the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and members on that side of the House prepared to subvert the legislative process, subvert

the democratic process because the polls have shown them it is slipping away and the polls have told them that every day they stay in the House, Mr. Speaker, it slides just a little bit further. They do not realize that it is all over anyway, they may as well stay here and take their lumps, that the wheels are off that tiny little Blue Machine. Mr. Speaker, members opposite are eager to get out from under the glare of public scrutiny that they have been put under in this session of the House. They are so anxious to get out!

Mr. Speaker, that administration, is like a sewer pipe that is starting to rust and its contents are starting to ooze out through the rust holes, Mr. Speaker. This session of the House has consisted of members opposite trying to put their fingers in the holes of the pipe, but when they plug one hole it oozes out through another area, Mr. Speaker. Now, I guess the best example was the one we saw here tonight, raised by the Government House Leader, where the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), until the House closes was hoping to have us believe that everything was under control at the Boys' Home in Pleasantville. Now we have seen how correct that is, Mr. Speaker. We saw how much under control the Children's Home at Pleasantville is by that little visit that we had here this evening. Now, Mr. Speaker, every minister and every portfolio is going through the same process, trying to keep the lid on until the House closes, trying to keep their fingers in the rust holes to keep it from escaping, to keep it from hitting the fan until this House closes.

MR. DAWE:

Is this the Newfoundland section of Drama 250? You are doing a good job on the arm movement, by the way.

MR. BARRY:

I thank the Minister of Transportation.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DAWE:

You look more like a sewer pipe leading up to a seption tank.

MR. BARRY:

The minister should know, he spends a lot of time in them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, then we have the arrogance of a Premier who comes in here and says, "Well, all we have to do is decide the House is going to close down today. We have a majority and we can close her down. Rules be damned!"

MR. SIMMONS:

We will decree it.

MR. BARRY:

We will decree it. What does it matter that there is a British Parliamentary system. What does it matter that by custom and tradition the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, is entitled to delay, where delay is considered necessary, and if they delay too long the public knows this and will criticize and will treat the Opposition as they should be treated if they act irresponsibility. But no, that is not what members opposite are prepared to wait for. They are not prepared to wait for public

opinion. They have decided they are leaving the House, Mr. Speaker, because the polls have shown that the matters raised in this House during this past session have caused one continuous slide. We know the Premier has polls taken on an ongoing basis, and it is an updated poll, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing is the Premier of the Province coming into this House and saying, yes, I am going to close it down. It does not matter what the customs and practices, what the traditions, what the Standing Orders are, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be closed down. We are not going to bother with closure, Mr. Speaker, we are going to close her without closure. That is what the Premier said. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is an arrogant and dictatorial approach to this House, an approach, which has seen democracy in this Province brought to an all-time low in the last twenty-four hours. The opportunity for debate on jobs, on the fishing industry, on regional development, on unemployment insurance, on reduced sales tax, on the crucial issues of this Province today, has been stifled and cut off, the guillotine has been brought down.

Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough, but it is not finished yet because the Premier and members opposite will rue the day they decided on this tactic. It will come back to haunt them, Mr. Speaker, because the people of this Province are fairminded. God help us! Is this what 5,000 years of civilization has brought us to, Mr. Speaker? This is what it is all about. This is what the World Wars were fought for, Mr. Speaker. Was this what tens of

thousands of lives were laid down for, so the Premier of this Province could come in and say, we are going to close her down now, we are getting too much flak, we are slipping in the polls, every day we stay in the House we lose more votes? Mr. Speaker, "We have to get out of Dodge," that is their motto. Mr. Speaker, members from St. George's to Bonavista, from Grand Bank to Torngat Mountains are going to have to explain that in the next election. The next election is not too far off because a leadership change is in the making over there, Mr. Speaker. We know a leadership change has been under way for some time now, but it does not matter. We know some members opposite have been urging Mr. Crosbie to come back. "Bring John home for good," that is their motto.

We know that there is another faction lining up behind the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, and we know that there is another faction that is lined up behind the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), and we know that there is another faction that used to be lined up behind the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) but he has since fallen upon hard times politically because of his demotion.

MR. POWER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not often bother to rise on points of order,

especially when the Leader of the Opposition is making such a wonderful speech relevant to the things that are happening in Newfoundland, but when he talks about leadership in the political process, I just want to tell him something about the Party he leads and how precarious his position is as Leader. The other day, when some of his members were talking about leaders and leadership changes and what we might need over here, I just made a little note of what happened. Smallwood lost an election in 1972.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

That is not a point of order.

MR. POWER:  
Mr. Speaker, I will gladly outline my point of order. When the Leader of the Opposition is spending a fair amount of time talking about leadership reviews on this side of the House, he should check his Party background. Smallwood, to Roberts, to Rowe, to Jamieson, to Sterling, to Neary, to Barry - they all get one election and when they lose they are out. That is all the Leader of the Opposition has, one more chance.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, in such a competitive environment, I can only say that I am very honoured to have risen to the top.

MR. DAWE:  
It is not only cream that rises to the top, as you know from septic tanks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
I know the minister the minister have spent a lot of time down there studying that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. POWER:  
The point is there is not a leadership problem over here.

MR. FLIGHT:  
There is, 'Charlie', and you are it.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I think we may have found the leading contender. You know, it is he who doth protest the most. 'Methinks he doth protest too much,' Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:  
He even puts the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) in his place!

MR. BARRY:  
You 'Charles' has a lean and a hungry look!

The reason, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing such a sad display, such disregard for the rules of this House, such disregard for the traditions of our Legislature and our parliamentary custom is, Mr. Speaker, because there is this great fermentation going on over there. The leadership is bubbling, because the message has gone out that the current leader is finished, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier has had his last shot, that the people have spoken as of the last election. It is all over. Mr. Speaker, we have all had members opposite come to us on this side of the House and say that in private.

We would not break confidences by naming names, but every member here has had members opposite come and acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that it is all over unless there is a change of leadership.

MR. WARREN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WARREN:

The Leader of the Opposition made an accusation earlier, saying that I was considering running for the leadership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I just cannot hear the hon. member.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said earlier that I was aspiring to the leadership of this party. Mr. Speaker, he was wrong, but I tell him I would be only to glad to take it on if he will kindly donate some of the \$750,000 that he got out of the Ocean Ranger disaster.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mount Scio tonight, in his usual -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Is this a new point of order?

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I rule there is no point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, do you not want to hear a submission?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Then I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A new point of order?

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition tonight, in his usual display of fairness, has identified a number of leadership candidates but, even though it is late in the morning, he would never be as loose in his logic or his thought process as to suggest that the gentleman from Torngat ought to be a leadership candidate of any party. I want to object, also, that he did not include the gentleman for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn). I would think he would make a good leadership candidate given the way he handles those housing decisions, as we heard tonight already.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, there is no point of order.

MR. DINN:

There is none. I understand that. The hon. member has made a fool of himself every time he got up.

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

MR. YOUNG:  
The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. TULK:  
No, his time is not up.

MR. YOUNG:  
Indeed it is.

MR. BARRY:  
The Speaker handles this House.

MR. YOUNG:  
I looked at the clock.

MR. BARRY:  
Oh, questioning the Speaker's  
ruling now. Why did you not  
question a few of the earlier ones?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have  
seen is a total breakdown of the  
democratic process of this  
Province, an assault upon the  
traditions of this House such as  
has rarely been seen. Mr.  
Speaker, the Standing Orders have  
been raped and pillaged here this  
evening. They have been ravaged,  
Mr. Speaker, shredded, played on  
by uncaring, unthinking,  
opportunistic individuals who want  
to get out of Dodge because their  
feeling the heat. Well, let them  
know, Mr. Speaker, they can run  
but they cannot hide.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker, I listened to one  
hour of speech making by the  
Leader of the Opposition, the  
putative Premier of this Province,  
a guy who says he is going to be  
the Premier of this Province.  
This is what he says he is going  
to be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker, how can you put faith  
in a loser? How can anybody put  
faith in a loser? In 1972 he  
started his political career,  
Burin - Placentia West, a winner.  
In 1975, a loser, Mr. Speaker,  
down. They got to know him, Mr.  
Speaker, that is what happened.  
They got to know the Leader of the  
Opposition. A couple of years and  
they got their chance, down the  
drain, loser. Pat Canning, the  
former member for Burin -  
Placentia West went down and took  
on the hon. member in 1975. Down  
the drain, Mr. Speaker!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I know the debate tonight was  
rather fairly loosely or widely  
ranging, but the hon. minister is  
not confining himself in any way  
to this motion. I would ask him to  
speak to the motion.

MR. DINN:  
Mr. Speaker. I will confine myself  
to the motion. There is no problem  
to confine myself to the motion  
that we are discussing here

today. What is the motion? The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) would like to know, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would like to know because, although they talked about everything, neither one of them spoke on the motion, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition did speak for an hour and he spoke, Mr. Speaker, on everything except the motion, Mr. Speaker. I intend to speak on the motion.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition spoke about challenging me in Pleasantville, but he wilted, he went away from that, Mr. Speaker. I understand that I am not allowed to speak on that, Mr. Speaker. That is not allowed because that is not what the motion is all about, Mr. Speaker. I want to get to the motion. The Leader of the Opposition challenged me in Pleasantville, Mr. Speaker, then walked away from it. He chickened out. He did not have the intestinal fortitude to take me on in Pleasantville, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

What is the motion, 'Jerry'?

MR. DINN:

I am trying to get to the motion, Mr. Speaker, but I am addressing those things that the Leader of the Opposition addressed. What is the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Tell us! Tell us!

MR. DINN:

The adjournment motion was there, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. the House Leader put the previous question. And I can speak on that, Mr. Speaker, until the cows come home. The Minister of Rural,

Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) came in with the cows but he is here, Mr. Speaker. But the Leader of the Opposition did not speak on that, Mr. Speaker. That is what I cannot understand. For an hour the Leader of the Opposition spoke about everything else. Here is, Mr. Speaker, a man, a deposed Tory, a guy who walked across because he could not take the pressure of government, goes over there and wants to from the government. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland will not accept that. We know that, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Newfoundland knows that.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

There is too much talk about free trade for 5:00 o'clock in the morning.

MR. DINN:

Yes, free trade at 5:00 o'clock in the morning. The only reporter we have in the House is up there asleep and the Leader of the Opposition is talking about free trade.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition who did not address himself to the motion, ran for the leadership of this Party in 1979 and was a loser, Mr. Speaker. He was a loser. He could not take that. He was made Minister of Development. Well, Mr. Speaker, he could not take the pressure there so he was made Minister of Mines and Energy. Well, the Baie Verte mine was closing down, there was the St. Lawrence problem, and he could not take the pressure, so he gets out of the Cabinet. If they do not do

it my way, Mr. Speaker, they are not going to do it at all.

MR. TULK:

Get to the motion 'Jerry'. What is the motion?

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I speak through you to the House and to the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

The Leader of the Opposition did not want Development, he did not want to create jobs. I know that. There are a lot of people in Newfoundland who do not know it, but I know it. He did not want Mines and Energy, Mr. Speaker. What did he want? He wanted Justice, Mr. Speaker. I know that, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition knows that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

Tell the truth when you get up.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would just like to point out to the minister that is the same thing the people of Newfoundland want right now, justice.

MR. DINN:

That is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. Minister of Mines and

Energy.

MR. DINN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has not made a point since he came into the House, and that is not a point of order and not a point. Mr. Speaker, he said, 'When I was Minister of Mines and Energy I created jobs and I got a group of geologists around me.' Well, the geologists over in the department, Mr. Speaker, did not even know the hon. member because he would not condescend to have his office at the Mines Department. He had his office here in the building and they had to come over and genuflect and say, 'Can I have a meeting, Mr. Minister?' When he was Minister of Mines and Energy he did not condescend to lower himself to go over and meet with the people in the Mines Department. I speak to them every day and he knows that. Mr. Speaker, that is another sign of a loser, he cannot face his people. You have to walk in and face your people.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, we are clearly witnessing one of the best speeches this minister has ever made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

I am going to take the Hansard and mail it out to every constituent I

have. Mr. Speaker, in that vein I am here trying to hear the speech, but the gentleman for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid) and the gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) are constantly interrupting my friend. I would ask the Chair to keep some silence here so that I can hear the speech. I want to hear every word he is saying. He needs protection, he is a friend of mine, so would you please, Mr. Speaker, ask these fellows to restrain themselves so we can hear what he is saying?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition spent one hour putting the reporter up in the gallery to sleep and he is now awake.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition talks about factions in Newfoundland, that is what he talked about, factions.

MR. LUSH:

Factions?

MR. DINN:

For the benefit of the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), f-a-c-t-i-o-n-s. Well I will tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition about a faction in Newfoundland.

MR. FLIGHT:

What?

MR. DINN:

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) does not understand faction. There is a faction in Newfoundland in

Pleasantville. The Leader of the Opposition challenged me in Pleasantville and then he wilted away like he always does. Whenever some pressure comes on the Leader of the Opposition, he wilts away. It does not matter whether it is in Burin-Placentia West or wherever, after two or three years he wilts away into oblivion - zero, a loser. Whether it is leadership, when he loses he wilts away. We tried to build him up, Mr. Speaker, we gave him the Ministry of Development, we gave him the Ministry of Mines and Energy, but, no, he could not take the pressure, he wilted away. Now that is what happens. I tell the hon. members opposite through you, Mr. Speaker, because we are supposed to speak through the Speaker in this House, that the hon. former Minister of Mines and Energy, who when Minister of Mines and Energy and did not condescend to mix with his people in Mines and Energy, Mr. Speaker, that he did not last very long, he could not take the pressure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why are we adjourning the House? Why is there a motion to adjourn? Why is there a motion to put the previous question, Mr. Speaker? I will tell you why. Because, Mr. Speaker, before we came into this House the hon. the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) laid out all the legislation for hon. members, but they did not want to talk about that. Do you know what they talked about for fifteen days in this House? What we spent before April 1 of last year. That is what they talked about for fifteen days in this House, not about what is going on now, not about what will happen in the future, but what happened last April. Mr. Speaker, that is what the Liberal Party is all about. They are at

least six months behind where we are.

Mr. Speaker, you know what they have been doing? They have been attacking the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) because there are \$70 million put into job creation this year. Now, Mr. Speaker, \$70 million put into job creation this year is a record. It is more than any other province per capita in this country has put into job creation.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Can we afford it though?

MR. DINN:

I do not know if we can afford it. I really do not. I do not know if the people of Newfoundland can afford that, we are really laying the taxes on them, but \$70 million put towards job creation this year is a record. What did they do over there? What did the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) do during this sitting? He got up, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you what he did. The member for Port de Grave got up in this House and misled the House and the people of this Province, talking about foolishness.

MR. EFFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

There he goes. Now I am going to prove that the hon. member is foolish.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy or the Minister of

Housing, whatever he is supposed to be, better make sure of what he is saying there. He will have to inform this House exactly how the member for Port de Grave misled the House or withdraw that statement.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave got up in this House and he put out a challenge to me, Mr. Speaker. Unlike the hon. member, if I put out a challenge to any member opposite who cannot answer it, I will answer the hon. member. To the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) this week he raised the matter of a person's light and power bill. I think it was seven or eight or nine months in arrears. Mr. Speaker, we have the proof here and the hon. member knows we have the proof here. He was told by Light and Power before he raised the question, Mr. Speaker. He knows. The Minister of Consumer Affairs knows. We all know now. So he misled the House. Mr. Speaker, that is proof enough. I will lay it on the Table if the hon. member wants me to.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. There is no point of order.

MR. DINN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us deal with the motion. What is the motion. The motion is to adjourn. The

motion is to put the previous question.

MR. EFFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

You have just been ruled out of order. Sit down and stop making a fool of yourself.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, for a person who accuses somebody else of making a fool of himself, he is doing quite a job himself. The government members over there are holding their heads in shame. The minister said that he was going to table where I misled the House and I ask him now to table it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

No problem, Mr. Speaker. Before I am finished that will be tabled. There is no problem there at all. I have that proof.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

There is no point of order. The hon. member is making a fool of himself. He stands up on a point of order that is no point of order. That means he is making a fool of himself. You have to read the rules. There is a little blue book here that states the rules of the House. The hon. member should

read it. He is a rookie in the House, I know, but he should read that.

What I was on was what the hon. members opposite did the past sitting of the House. What did they do? What did they vote on? They voted for factory freezer trawlers. Now the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), in his own mind, knows that that is a foolish move to make. The hon. member for Twillingate can laugh it off. He can say to the people outside this House, "Well, look, I am against factory freezer trawlers," but, really, casting that vote was a stupid move. The hon. member has to agree that it was a stupid move to vote for factory freezer trawlers in this House. But that is what the Liberal Opposition did. That is stupid! We spent fifteen days in this House talking about foolishness and then when we had a vote where hon. members opposite could make a mark for themselves, they voted for factory freezer trawlers. All the people across Canada, even the NDP, know what they did was wrong. The member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) is talking to the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) and he is saying what I am saying is right, he made a stupid move. Does the hon. member know why he made a stupid move? Because he sat in caucus with a stupid leader, that is what happened. We had a motion, you got sucked in, and he told you to vote the way you voted and you voted that way. That is stunned! There is a cure for cancer, but there is no cure for stunned. The Leader of the Opposition took you in to your little caucus and he said, "Now, we have got to vote against this motion." You all got sucked in and you came out and voted for

factory freezer trawlers. I mean, really, the people are there are looking at you. Look, the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) cannot believe what he did, he is laughing at it now. The hon. Leader of the Opposition sucked you in, you voted for factory freezer trawlers, and all the people across Canada know what you did and they think that you are stunned, I think you are stunned, the people of Newfoundland think that you are stunned, and there is no cure for it. See, if you can be that easily led then there is no cure. Some cancers can be cured but stunned cannot, and that is where the Liberal Party is, in that wilderness because it is stunned. It is not slow to learn, it is just straight stunned! Now, Mr. Speaker, what are you led by? That is what we have got to examine. What is the Liberal Party led by? They are led by a guy who ran in 1972 and lost in 1975, he got in on the Premier's coattails, Mr. Speaker, that is what he did in 1979, and then could not take the pressure of not that bad a portfolio. I mean, I do it, Mr. Speaker, on a regular basis, but he could not take the pressure of Department of Mines and Energy and wilted. I take Mines and Energy and Housing as a matter of course. The hon. Leader of the Opposition had one problem in Baie Verte and it just dropped him to the ground.

MR. WINDSOR:

He ran away. I came out to help him but then I had to drive his out of it -

MR. DINN:

You tried to, but you could not save him. The hon. member could not be saved. I know what the hon. member for St. Barbe is laughing about. Je knows that the

next leader is Brian Tobin.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and 'Energy', in quotation marks and Housing is making a very good speech, it is the best speech that he has made in a long time, but I wonder if he could explain to the House and to us why it is that he is only half a Minister of Energy and why they have taken Newfoundland Hydro and the Petroleum Directorate away from him? Is it that the Premier believes that he cannot handle it? I wonder if he would explain that to us.

MR. DINN:

That is not a problem, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. DINN:

The whole Province knows that! The hon. member for Fogo never made a point of order in his life that stood up! Mr. Speaker, the whole Province know it. Now, why am I only Minister of Mines and Housing? Because the Ministry of Housing is the fourth biggest budget in this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Why are you not in Hydro?

MR. DINN:

And why am I Minister of Mines? Because, Mr. Speaker, I am going to produce dolomite in Labrador, limestone on the Port au Port Peninsula, and gold at Chetwynd, Mr. Speaker, and Sop's Arm.

MR. TULK:

What a minister!

MR. DINN:

I do not have time for everything. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to the main point of this motion, which hon. members opposite are trying to put me off. The main point of this motion is the hon. the Leader of the Opposition spoke for one hour, I have a couple of minutes left, but why did the hon. the Leader of the Opposition speak about nothing? Because he has nothing to talk about. The Leader of the Opposition led his lemmings into this House this year and said, 'Vote for factory freezer trawlers.' All hands rushed in and voted for it, and the people of Newfoundland said, 'They are for factory freezer trawlers, so are they for Newfoundland? What kind of a stupid bunch are they! We are not going to vote for them any more.'

MR. POWER:

The Globe And Mail pointed that out.

MR. DINN:

The Globe And Mail, even an NDP member from Western Canada knew that was stupid, let alone the people of Newfoundland. What else did they do, Mr. Speaker? For fifteen days they spoke about money we spent last April.

MR. TULK:

If you want leave 'Jerry', you have it. You are making a great

speech.

MR. DINN:

I know that. I can outdo everybody over there any day of the week. And I am only a stickboy on this team, Mr. Speaker. I admit it. The Leader of the Opposition never made it as a stickboy, Mr. Speaker, fifteen days debating nothing. The Leader of the Opposition put out one challenge in this House since it opened this session. What was the challenge? The challenge was to take me on in Pleasantville. He has not got the intestinal - what I was going to say might be unparliamentary - fortitude. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has not the intestinal fortitude to take me on in Pleasantville. I will give him ninety days to decide. Let him do his polls, Mr. Speaker, and I give him ninety days to decide if he can take me on in Pleasantville.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And we will not call a by-election in his district of Mount Scio.

MR. DINN:

Look! I have just got word from the Premier that we will not call a by-election in Mount Scio so that when he losses in Pleasantville he can run back to Mount Scio, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is it. The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans is here now. Do you know what the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) contributed to Buchans since he got elected? Well, I will tell you what it is, Mr. Speaker. BP-Selco, really the only great hope that Buchans has, do you know what the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans said about BP-Selco? One of the only hope that Buchans has -

MR. FLIGHT:

This is better than Rocky 10.

MR. DINN:

Go ahead! Break the rules of the House. Do not get up on a point of order because you cannot win one.

MR. FLIGHT:

Give usa blow by blow, 'Jerry'.

MR. DINN:

I only have a few minutes left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MR. DINN:

Do you know what he said about BP-Selco?

MR. SIMMS:

What did he say?

MR. DINN:

He said, 'They whipped everybody out of Buchans.' Four people. Just for the hon. member's information, next year BP-Selco will have a field office in Buchans. We know because we talked to them.

MR. FLIGHT:

Where is your survival gear, Rambo?

MR. DINN:

Look, will you shut up. Do you want to know about what is going on in Buchans? BP-Selco will set up an office in Buchans next year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

They will have a field office, several geologists and an exploration team, trying to find new minerals so that Buchans will survive. What has the hon. member done about it? He got up and

attacked BP-Selco. I have been spending the past year trying to get these mining companies in here to explore and develop, and what did he do? He got up and attacked one of the best possibilities there is for Buchans!

MR. SIMMONS:

He should resign.

MR. DINN:

He should. And I tell the hon. member, he will not take the challenge as well as I took the challenge from the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. He will not resign as quickly as I said I would when the Leader of the Opposition put his challenge out. When is the Leader going out and Brian Tobin coming back?

MR. FUREY:

They are working on it.

MR. DINN:

'Furey' knows. The Leader of the Opposition does not know, but 'Furey' knows.

Mr. Speaker, I could speak for another hour and a half or two hours but members opposite have some time left and I want to hear one constructive proposal put forward by any Opposition member. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will go home and have a good Christmas, and enjoy, because I can say there are sixteen Newfoundlanders in this Province who, amongst them, have been able to come up with one constructive proposal for this government. They have not yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, on that remark, I will have to reach and try to pick up the sword, I suppose, to this challenge. I realize it is going to be extremely difficult because here, Mr. Speaker, is the prime argument in favour of the television cameras in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Would to goodness that the people of Newfoundland could have seen that tonight, Mr. Speaker. They would have revolted! They would have marched on Confederation Building tomorrow morning, Mr. Speaker! We would have had a revolution on our hands! There would not have been much security, there would not have been much complacency in the minds of anyone connected with mining or housing or anything else that that portfolio takes into consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if anyone else noticed it or not, but there is clearly something wrong with hon. members tonight. I have heard all kinds of suggestions being made as to what is wrong with the hon. ministers here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I can shed some light on what is wrong with them. I believe I know what the problem is, Mr. Speaker. The answer, I think, came to me when my friend from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) was giving his speech. He was talking about the sun shining. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that having watched the actions of ministers in this hon. House tonight, they are suffering

from sunstroke or the effect of the moon shining upon them, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that there is one disappointed Premier in Canada tonight. There is one Premier in Newfoundland tonight, Mr. Speaker, who, if only he had his time back, would have gone along with the suggestion from this Opposition to close down this hon. House at 11:00 p.m. Every minute that we have gone beyond eleven o'clock we have seen the noose drawn tighter and tighter. We deliberately gave members opposite enough rope to hang themselves. If the press is not totally blind, Mr. Speaker, they saw what we were doing. The hon. minister walked into our trap, wrapped the rope around his neck and we gave him enough rope to hang himself. That is all we had to do.

It is basically now, Mr. Speaker, a waiting game. It is just a matter of sitting by for a few more years, two or three years, give them enough rope and we will not even get the chance to be voted in. We will not be able to brag about that. You are going to see a party voted out. They are going to be voted out, Mr. Speaker. We are going to be the ones to inherit because we are the government in waiting but we are not going to be able to take full credit for it because the people will become so vicious, so fed up, so disgusted that they will throw this crowd out, Mr. Speaker. The day will come, I would predict, when the Tories in this Province will be a party that will be akin to the dinosaur. Only the

paleontologists will ever - Pierre de Chardin was one of them - be able to study what once was the Tory Party since they will be thrown so far out, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this House tonight is full of symbolism. The lateness of the hour or the earliness of the hour, however you mind to put it, has produced across the floor a group of tired, weary, yawning, run down hon. members; hon. members who are tongue-tied; hon. member who are left with not a word in their cheek. All they can do is throw a few heckles across the floor.

MR. SIMMS:

You will eat those words.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I hope I get the chance to eat those words. I hope so, Mr. Speaker. I hope that there is someone else over there who is not so hobnailed by the hon. Premier that he is not afraid to get up and speak. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that there is someone else who is not so hobnailed that is he afraid to get up and express his mind like the Minister for Energy just did. Oh, the embarrassment! I could see the Chairman of the Council, the embarrassment that he was going through was pitiful. My heart when out to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

When I am challenged in this House

to produce information - the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) made an allegation earlier this week - I would like to table in this House the information that I said that I would table, Mr. Speaker. I do not have any opportunity only right now through a point of order. We do not, Mr. Speaker, as a party agree with tabling anybody's name, but we know who the hon. member was referring to and right here, Mr. Speaker, indicates to the hon. member, just for his information, the information that the hon. member talked about earlier this week - which was totally inaccurate - I table it for the members of the House of Assembly, unlike the Leader of the Opposition who will not live up to his challenges.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. minister took the opportunity to table a document.

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

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The symbolism that I am leading up to, Mr. Speaker, is just as we have a group of tired, worn out, haggard, run down hon. gentlemen, we have a tired, weary, worn out government, bereft of ideas.

I have been in this hon. House six - seven months. I have not heard one original idea. I have not even heard an original joke. I wish to goodness they could come up with an original joke once in a while to break the monotony in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker. I have not even heard an original joke, let alone an original idea.

MR. WINDSOR:

The hon. gentleman should listen to himself if he wants a good joke.

MR. DECKER:

I have seen arrogance though, Mr. Speaker. I have seen arrogance displayed in this Assembly such as has never before been seen in the history of this Province.

MR. SIMMS:

You have only been here six months. How do you know?

MR. DECKER:

I have been in this world for forty-four years and I have not been unaware of the existence of this Assembly. I have been aware that this Assembly was here and never before have I seen a party in power act like a steam engine gone berserk and rose over tradition which goes back to the Magna Carta whereby the traditions of democracy are swept aside so that in a dictatorial manner we have the party in power saying, 'We will close this House! Caesar will rule by decree and let no man in the realm try to tell Caesar how to rule! Caesar will rule by decree!'

What we are witnessing is closing ceremonies, It is moping up. The end has come. Tired members in a tired government, an impatient electorate just waiting to try to make right some of the wrongs that have been made in the past few years.

The party in power is anxious to adjourn this House. The Opposition do not want to adjourn this House because there are still many problems which have to be addressed and in the last few minutes of my debate, Mr. Speaker, I will look at a few problems that we do want to discuss. We want to

discuss, Mr. Speaker, before this motion to adjourn is carried, federal/provincial relations.

Federal/provincial relations, Mr. Speaker, have never been in a worse condition before than they are in at this very minute. Federal/provincial relations have never been worse, Mr. Speaker. Let me explain myself. We have just come through many years of Ottawa bashing where Don Quixote goes out on his horse and tries to slay windmills; where he tries to create enemies; where he creates allusions; he wants someone to attack, someone to fight and it was appropriate for the last number of years, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier would take on Ottawa. It was convenient.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, it was right.

MR. DECKER:

It was convenient because we had Ottawa with a Liberal government -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, no.

MR. DECKER:

- but now, Mr. Speaker, we have entered upon a new era, we have entered upon a new blissful era.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is where you are wrong.

MR. DECKER:

What we have now is a Prime Minister who is not afraid to inflict prosperity upon Newfoundland and we have a Premier who is willing to accept anything that the Prime Minister will try to inflict upon Newfoundland. That is why federal/provincial relations are in such a terrible state today. Federal/provincial relations are in such a terrible

state because we now longer have a watch dog.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Do you want to call a vote?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

No, it is not going to matter.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not want to get up and give a speech in a context like this.

MR. DECKER:

No, I cannot either.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

What I am saying is that the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle has some time left in his speech. There is an incident that has happened in the precincts of the House. I for one, do not want to get up and give a speech in this context and we have all said our pieces. If the member for the Strait of Belle Isle wants to say a few more words, then we can call for a vote and call it a day.

MR. FUREY:

Let us take a recess.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, I would go further than that. I would say the member has not got much time left so it is not a good time to keep debating these matters. I am just trying to be fair that is all. I mean everybody has been talking about not being petty ever since eight o'clock yesterday evening, so let us not be petty. I will not speak at all. Let us bring it to a vote and say good bye to it.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, can I suggest that we take a ten minute recess while this matter gets resolved?

MR. TULK:

That is the Speaker's purogative.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I just might say, there is a medical emergency outside in the common rule but, we also have to do the business of the House and do it properly.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, I am prepared on my part to have no more to say on the matter and nobody on this side will have anything to say on the matter. We will just clue up.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out and this is the time to do it, the Premier does not have to debate because he moved the motion and has spoken in the debate, Mr. Speaker, so what the Premier says is irrelevant. So what we are saying is, can we recess for five or ten minutes? Is that going to change anything all that significantly?

MR. SPEAKER:

We will take a five minute recess.

### Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Calculating the time that we recessed, the hon. member has until 6:32. The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I was saying in my speech that we were against the House adjourning because we felt there were some matters that should be discussed. I was suggesting that we would like to discuss federal/provincial relations, among other things, which we feel have come to an all time low. The reason that it has come to an all time low is because when we had opposite governments - a Liberal government in Ottawa and a Tory government in Newfoundland - the Premier was continually attacking Ottawa. Newfoundlanders could be assured, Mr. Speaker, that this mad dog approach was not doing much for Newfoundland in the sense that we were probably losing out on a lot of money, a lot of contracts and secondary roads agreements, grants for our railway and so on. Even though that was the case - that as a province we were losing out - we knew that we were not being sold out by Ottawa because we knew that the Premier was a watchdog for us. But what we see now is a different form of government.

We have two Tory governments and there is evidence that we could well be sold out with the factory freezer trawlers as a case in point where we saw the Premier and his members go into the charade of pretending that they were going to kick up a big fuss, but there was nothing more to it than just a bit of hot air. It was just an excuse to pretend or to make it look to the people of Newfoundland as if they were doing something. We feel that if this House were not adjourning, we could devote another few days to that. Mind you, we took fifteen days. Maybe we should have taken longer. The problem is still not solved, Mr. Speaker, and we would like to have

had more time to devote to federal - provincial relations and all the implications and all the connotations that occur because of the total breakdown in federal/provincial relations.

We would like, Mr. Speaker, to have had the opportunity to discuss Clause 54 because Clause 54 is going to come back to haunt generations of Newfoundlanders yet unborn. There are Newfoundlanders yet to be born who are going to be doomed to poverty, who are going to be forced to live in a Province which is going to be a have not Province forever and eternity because of Clause 54, Mr. Speaker. Clause 54 essentially states that the oil on the Grand Banks - and there is lots of it there, let no member be mistaken - there is lots of it there and I am glad there is lots of it there. All Newfoundlanders are glad, Mr. Speaker. No particular party has a monopoly on having put that oil there. It is ours by right, Mr. Speaker - but Clause 54, again this Tory government in Ottawa and a Tory government in Newfoundland made it definite that Newfoundlanders will not benefit from this offshore oil.

Here is what will happen, Mr. Speaker. Tankers will go out to the oil wells on the Grand Bank. The oil will be pumped into the tankers and will never come ashore. It will be carried away to the United States, Canada, to be refined in Quebec, to be refined in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. This world will not go on long enough, Mr. Speaker, unless Clause 54 is changed and we, in this party, are going to make it our business to dig in our heels, to dig in our feet and stand up for Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders, those who are now

living and those who are yet to be born. We are going to stand up for Newfoundlanders and we are going to try to our utmost, Mr. Speaker, to have that vicious clause changed and knocked out of the Atlantic discord - excuse me, the Atlantic Accord. Clause 54 must be changed.

I believe that our harping upon this particular clause has brought it to the Premier's attention and he is aware and the Premier is concerned about how history will preceive him. I would submit, Your Honour, that at this time the Premier is concerned. He knows he is on the eve of fading away into oblivion like all other past Premiers who have let down their native land. He knows he is on the way out and he does not want to be remembered as the Premier who gave away the last single solitary chance that Newfoundland ever had of becoming a have province in the Dominion of Canada. The Premier knows, the Premier does not want to be remembered as the Premier who presided over the ultimate sellout, the ultimate kick in the guts for Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. Mr. Speaker, this is why we are going through this game, this is why we are trying to keep this House open, but the majority is steam-rolling over us. The arrogant majority is using their numbers to force us into the ground, Mr. Speaker. We are not given the opportunity to discuss Clause 54, to discuss federal/provincial relations.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to have had the opportunity to discuss the conflict of interest legislation, because conflict of interest potentially is raging in the party opposite. The party is ripe with conflict of interest. If I were a

minister in that Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, God forbid that that should happen, but if I were a minister in that Cabinet, I would have to ask why it is that there is a hierarchy of ministers. I would have to say what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander.

MR. LUSH:

No, is sauce for the Gander, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

MR. DECKER:

But in this case it is not, because some hon. members are exempt from the conflict of interest legislation, while others are not. I can see there a possibility, Mr. Speaker, of division within the Tory Party. I can see minister getting up in the corner and whispering saying, 'why is it, if you and I did this, you and I were trying on and breaking the conflict of interest legislation, what would happen?' We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, would like to have had more time, we would like to have seen that conflict of interest legislation brought forth, so that we could have spent a few days discussing it.

Mr. Speaker, we would liked to have had discussed federal/provincial relations; we would have liked to discussed Clause 54; we would have liked to discuss conflict of interest. Mr. Speaker, gasoline in this Province is over \$3.00 a gallon. The most expensive, I suppose, I have to check my facts -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

A litre, a litre!

MR. DECKER:

By coincidence I heard an

editorial on radio this morning, I believe the Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands might have heard it as well, and the commentator was pointing out that the price of gasoline was rising, but at the same time we went to metric conversion and people were no longer able to realize what was happening to the price of gasoline.

I remember years ago when gasoline was sold by the gallon. I had a service station, Mr. Speaker, at that time, up in the Strait of Belle Isle. There was no way in this world that we could get an extra cent on gasoline. The government would be shouting out, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, not this minister, Mr. Speaker, because obviously he is more interested in the corporate affairs than he is consumer affairs. But the Minister of Consumer Affairs and that administration, which was a Tory Administration, by the way, were shouting out, wondering why the extra cent or the extra two cents were put on a gallon. Then gasoline started to go up and it is still known, Mr. Speaker, that the real cost you pay at the pumps is taxes. It is not the cost of the gasoline, we all know that. This Province has put a vicious tax on gasoline, Mr. Speaker. We would liked to have had the opportunity to have discussed the price of gasoline in this Province. Mr. Speaker, we could have gone on and on. If we had our way, and if we were doing justice to our constituents, and if we were given the opportunity to discuss everything which needs to be discussed and needs to be dealt with in this Province, it would be appropriate that this House would be open fifty-two weeks a year.

There are so many problems -

MR. POWER:

Problems do not get solved in here, boy.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, there is clearly a disregard for the House of Assembly when a minister of the Crown would suggest that problems do not get solved in this hon. House. I am aghast, I am amazed that a minister of the Crown would sit in this place and have the audacity, the daftness, be foolish enough, be disrespectful enough and be arrogant enough to say that this House is irrelevant. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, it is a blatant disregard for tradition, it is a blatant disregard for the British parliamentary system, which we have inherited.

What we are saying is that this House should have been given the opportunity to discuss federal/provincial relations, Clause 54, conflict of interest, three-dollars-a-gallon gasoline, electricity rates, we do not have a secondary roads agreement.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Is the House ready for the question.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I have to say a few words on this motion to adjourn. Mr. Speaker, having asked you at least fifty times tonight if hon. gentlemen opposite were relevant, I can assure you I shall stay relevant throughout my remarks, and I will speak to the motion to adjourn.

The question is, why are we adjourning? Very simply, because nothing has been accomplished in this House since we came here last October because of obstruction by hon. gentlemen opposite, nothing at all! I have been here in this House for eleven years and I have never seen a session of this House of Assembly which was so poorly handled by the Opposition as I have seen this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who just took his seat talked about all of the things he wanted to debate. He had fifteen days to debate, but what did he debate? Copious points of order and copious points of conflict of interest, trying to abuse hon. members on this side of the House. Never once, Mr. Speaker, did they lay anything concrete, any real evidence on the table of this House, all they came up with were accusation and innuendo. Never anything concrete!

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that hon. gentlemen opposite have failed miserably to debate the issues which were before this House, they have failed to approach the legislative programme which was put before them back in September by the hon. the Premier and by the hon. the House Leader,

the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). They failed miserably in their duty to the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, we have been here since somewhere around 4:00 p.m. yesterday debating a motion to adjourn. Now, the people of this Province have been well-served, have they not? We have been here the equivalent of four full days - that is even taking into account what would normally be Question Period. If you talk about normal debating time, we have been here about six or seven days debating a motion to adjourn. The people of this Province must be proud of the Opposition tonight - they must be proud of what they have accomplished. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) made a few points.

MR. REID:

They are all going to walk out now.

MR. WINDSOR:

They can give it but they cannot take it. That is okay, Mr. Speaker. They have accomplished nothing by being here, they may as well leave now.

The Leader of the Opposition talked about labour negotiations in this Province. Let me tell him about labour negotiations over the last two months, let me tell him about contracts which have been signed: The Newfoundland and Labrador Nurses' Union, Mr. Speaker, that was the first group which accepted the government's wage freeze, the first very responsible group, some 3,500 of them, which signed an agreement with us. Let me tell them about the Public Libraries Board. Let me tell them about the hospital support staff - by the way, we will be signing that agreement

later this week, the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) and I, the hospital support staff and the interns and residents, Mr. Speaker, a very good agreement with a group which have been left out in the cold for so long. We have signed an agreement with the ferry workers, and we have signed a good agreement with the teachers of this Province, 8,500 of them. We have signed an agreement with the teachers of Labrador West, with the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation workers in Stephenville, the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation, and the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Corporation. All in all, Mr. Speaker, some 16,000 employees of government. We have signed agreements with more than half the public servants in this Province over the last few months, and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition talks about labour negotiations. Mr. Speaker, before the next week is out, we will sign agreements with another 1,000 or so.

Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite talked about job creation. 5,000 jobs have been created by this government over the past number of months, and the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) stood in his place and told us all about them. But hon. gentlemen opposite do not want to hear about that, it is too positive. The Leader of the Opposition should know about job creation. He should know what he did not do for Marystown Shipyard when he was Minister of Industrial Development. Let him tell us what he did not do down there. We had to take over from him to save the shipyard.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to say what I did in terms of getting that shipyard back on its feet, from seeing that the manager was appointed to seeing that it got the financial assistance it needed, to everything which had to be done to ensure that that shipyard would be on its feet.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It just so happens that the Leader of the Opposition is completely inaccurate in what he just said. When he was Minister of Development, he did not want to move on that. It was because of my initiative that we changed the management down there, over the head of the Minister of Development at the time, to get some people in there to do the thing right.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, and they are your offshore regulations, too, 'Brian'.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

To that point of order, there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. There is no point of order.

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition should tell us about Marystown Shipyard. He should tell us about the reception he got when he went down during the last election; all of his supporters at the Shipyard came out to see him - both of them.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the reception I got was something like the reception the Premier got as his bus came down the Burin Peninsula Highway, except they were applauding for me.

MR. WINDSOR:

He is gone, Mr. Speaker. Let the record show that he turned tail and ran. That is exactly what the liberal supporters at the shipyard did when I went down there during the election, they both left. Both of them left when I walked into the shipyard, they were ashamed to be there.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is gone, he cannot take it. He does not want to hear what he did not do for Baie Verte. He talked about Baie Verte earlier and said it was after he left. It was not, Mr. Speaker. I was on my back in the General Hospital when

the announcement was made that Baie Verte was closing and I had to come out of hospital, when the Premier asked me, to give the Leader of the Opposition a hand to try to straighten out what happened in Baie Verte, and we did it.

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) has run away with his leader. I do not need to tell him what the Leader of the Opposition did not do for Buchans, or what he did not do for Bowater, or what he did not do for Labrador West, or what he did not do for the fisheries, and now he is supporting factory freezer trawlers to ensure that the fisheries will never survive in this Province. What happened to him, Mr. Speaker? He could not take it on this side of the House anymore than he can take it over there, tonight, he ran away. He could not be part of our team anymore than he can lead that team over there.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition asked earlier what free trade had to do with local preference. That will tell you what the hon. gentleman knows about local preference. He did not support it when he was Minister of Development. What does free trade have to do with local preference? The hon. must have heard about the auto pact in Ontario. Now, if that does not protect Ontario against tariffs and so forth going out of Canada, and if we in Newfoundland are not paying more for automobiles because of the auto pact which protects the automobile industry in Ontario, if we are not paying more for clothing because of tariffs to protect the clothing industry in Central Canada, if that is not local preference, then

I do not know what is.

What about tax oddities in Cape Breton, Mr. Speaker? Is that local preference? Of course it is, but under the guise of national interest to help a disparaged region. Well, what is Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker? Our unemployment rate in Newfoundland, all of Newfoundland, is just as high as it is in Cape Breton. Where is our tax oddity for all of Newfoundland, as Cape Breton enjoys?

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend keeping hon. members here all night. Hon. gentlemen opposite have abused the privileges of the House, they have abused the right which the people of this Province gave them by electing them to this House of Assembly by keeping this House of Assembly open until 6:45 in the morning. What have they accomplished by it, Mr. Speaker? What has been accomplished? How have the people been served by keeping everybody here until 6:45 in the morning? I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that they have failed miserably. I would submit that this motion to adjourn is clearly in order, it is clearly appropriate, this government has given the Opposition every opportunity to debate the legislation which was clearly placed before them, given to them well in advance, gave them opportunities which have never been given to an opposition in this House of Assembly before, to have that legislation well in advance of the opening of House of Assembly so that they would have time to study it and so that they could give intelligent comment. We have failed to see any intelligent comment on the legislation here in this House, which shows, Mr. Speaker, that

they do not have any alternate policies. There are no alternatives they can put forward. They could not debate the substantive issues, all they could get into was personalities, into conflict of interest, into innuendoes and accusations. When it came to talking about the real issues which face this Province today, they failed miserably. They did not have one idea, they did not have one alternative, and that shows they are not an alternative to this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:  
I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that before long the Leader of the Opposition will indeed resign. He is the fifth leader of the Opposition the Premier has had opposite him since he took over the reins of power in this Province. We lost Mr. Rowe, we lost Mr. Jamieson, Mr. Stirling and Mr. Neary, and now Leo the Fifth is on his way out. Before long we will have a sixth leader of the opposition and I hope he can serve the people of the Province better than this one.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Is the House ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we looked forward to listening to every member opposite deal with the issues that we have raised during this debate this evening. But we will point out to Your Honour, and we will ask Your Honour to consider, whether the Premier and the Government of this Province are recognizing the customs and traditions of this House. Are they engaging in that co-operation which they referred to earlier, and are they taking the procedure which ensures the best possible debate in this House? I mention this for one reason only, Mr. Speaker, that what we see here now is the government, in addition to shredding the rules with respect to the series of motions we have had, imposing closure without going through a closure motion. We now see the Premier and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) for some sort of silly, childish exercise, some sort of silly, childish reason, I do not know if it is out of spite because this is now Saturday and they did not get the House closed on Friday, I do not know what the reason is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, may I please have quiet so that I may make the point?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has asked for silence, and I would ask the hon. Leader if he would come to his point of order.

MR. BARRY:

If they are quiet, Your Honour, I

will.

The point is, Your Honour, that it has been the practice in this House, since I have been in, since 1972, that the form of debate takes the approach of members alternately, from each side of the House, rising. Your Honour is aware of that. Now, there is nothing Your Honour can do, and Your Honour gave every opportunity for members opposite to rise in their turn, when members on this side finished.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You cannot take it 'Leo.'

MR. BARRY:

Oh yes I can, 'Brian'. I am not trying to close down the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Who is trying to close down the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

You are. You are!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

It is not Friday, 'Brian'.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

And now we see the Premier in a fit of pique, in a fit of spite, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

What is his point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BARRY:

The point of order is that the

Premier and his administration has decided to deviate from yet another time-honoured practice of this House.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

A point of privilege, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I would like to know, as one member of this House, where is the point of order the Leader of the Opposition is trying to get at? He is now infringing upon my privileges as a member of this House. We have listened to him now for eight to ten minutes, and we have yet to hear anything which shows that there is a point of order in what the hon. member is saying. Now, when does the hon. member stop, so that he does not infringe upon my privileges in this House?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

To that point of privilege, I do not think there is a prima facie case of privilege but I would ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to make his point, which he has not attempted to do yet, not that I can see.

MR. BARRY:

On a number of occasions tonight Your Honour has gone back to precedents. There has been a time-honoured precedent set in this House which recognizes that the best debate comes when there is an alternation of speakers, on both sides of Your Honour. Now, there is nothing Your Honour can

do during the course of the debate, but Your Honour can recognize that this is a precedent which has been established in the House and can point out to members that there is a serious breach -

MR. WINDSOR:

That is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I quite understand the point the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is making. There is no point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

No, there is no point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Too bad.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We should be able to respond. I will not take as long as the Leader of the Opposition took. All I want to say -

MR. BARRY:

On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We now have a direct attempt by the Premier to intimidate Your Honour by insisting upon speaking

after Your Honour has ruled. I accept your ruling, Your Honour, if you say there is no point of order. Now, let us move on and hear the minister who has been recognized to speak in the debate. There is no right of the Premier to speak, the minister has been recognized and, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has already spoken in this debate.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. You had recognized me to give a submission on the point of order.

MR. TULK:

No, he had already ruled on it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

As I understood it, when the hon. the Leader of the Opposition had finished, I ruled that there was no point of order.

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

MR. SIMMS:

On a further point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A further point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known practice in this Legislature that members are not allowed to consume any kind of beverage other than water, and I would ask Your Honour to have the pages check the Leader of the Opposition's desk to see if he is drinking coffee in this House, because that is not permitted.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, I did draw hon. member's attention to that point some time recently, that hon. members are not allowed to bring any beverage into the House.

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make some points about what has happened in this House in the last thirty days or so, while we have been here trying to do the people's business.

While the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) was speaking he became very upset because I said this was not the place to come to solve the problems of the people of Newfoundland. That is the exact truth, and it has been identified in this session of the House more than in any other since I came here in 1975. This session of the House was a waste of time. We did not deal with the problems of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, all we dealt with were silly conflict of interest accusations, which were made without proof. There were no questions to ministers who were trying to do things in this Province. When you want to come to this House, Mr. Speaker, to solve problems, the the House should work in a certain fashion. It certainly has not workers, and that is why we are on a motion to adjourn.

There are things on the Order Paper which should have been discussed, which should have been debated, but were not. We did not spend any time here solving the real problems. I will give you an

example of two pieces of legislation which deal with my department. One is that we want to pass a very simple amendment to the Marine Institute Act. Why? Because we want to reorganize that institute to be one of the best places in the world to train young people for the jobs that will become available.

I wanted about thirty seconds of the time of the House to bring in an amendment to that act which would allow us to appoint a vice-president who would oversee the reorganization of the institute, however, because of the actions of hon. members opposite, this cannot now be done, it will have to wait until we come back in February.

Another simple piece of legislation I had had to do with making sure that every student in Newfoundland had access to student aid; we were trying to amend a piece of legislation to make sure that if students went to the Bay St. George Community College, or to the College of Trades and Technology, or to the University, they had equal access to student aid. That is not happening now, Mr. Speaker. There are students in this Province who are going to be prejudiced in the kind of education they receive simply because this Legislature did not function as a legislature in the last two months. Since we opened this House, we have not done the simple things which can expedite some of the business of government, some of the problem-solving, if that is what you want. We wasted an awful lot of time here on personal attacks, on -

MR. W. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

If the hon. minister has bills he wants to get through, and I am not doubting that for a moment, then why close the House? We are quite prepared to keep the House going. The hon. Premier and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), these are the people who want to close the House, it is not the Opposition. We are quite prepared to stay here until Christmas Eve, if we have to. So do not moan and groan about your bills not going through, talk to your Premier and talk to your House Leader.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order, it is a silly waste of time, as we have seen for the last two months, that is all it is.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have heard enough to rule on that point of order. There is no point of order.

MR. POWER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

MR. POWER:

There we have it, Mr. Speaker, the identification of why this House does not work, nobody is allowed to speak here anymore, except on points of order.

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies has raised a very important question. He is saying that this House cannot function, therefore, the government is going to close it. I would like to know, does he intend to abolish the House of Assembly? Are we abolishing it?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is not a point of order.

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

MR. POWER:

Again, Mr. Speaker, when we get up to speak the Leader of the Opposition gets up and says, 'You cannot speak over on that side of the House because you did not do it one for one. We have decided we are going to speak. If we have points to make we would like to make them, and if we have legislation we would like to get passed, we would like to do it. But there has to be some degree of co-operation in order to make any legislature work, and this legislature has not worked because there is no element of co-operation from that side over there; there are points of order, points of privilege, points of conflict of interest, or whatever. But there is legitimate business which has to take place in this Province, which is not now being done, therefore, I am speaking on a motion to adjourn, and I say we should adjourn. I do not know when the House Leader might call the House back

together, February 6 or some other time, but if it is not going to function any better than it has functioned in the last month or so, then I will tell you there is a serious, serious problem.

We will get through some legislation in the House, but to filibuster through points of order, through points of privilege, this House cannot work.

Mr. Speaker, all I have heard here in the last day, or in the last four or five hours is that members opposite wanted to discuss job creation - where are the jobs this government promised in April? Look, right here there are \$9.5 million, there are 3,700 jobs. I can read out every district if you want. Do you want me to read them out? Every district is represented. There is Port de Grave, Branch, Point Lance, Fleur de Lys, New Melbourne, Jamestown, Sweet Bay. Do you want the amounts and the jobs?

MR. BARRY:

Are they working yet?

MR. POWER:

Yes. Point La Haye can go to work anytime they choose to go to work, the money is approved. I mean, how far can you take some people? We have given approval, we have given money, we have given them a letter to go to the bank so they can get interim financing. There is no problem there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. POWER:

There was no problem. I answered in the House yesterday -

MR. DAWE:

We always did. That was always

there for Canada Works, always there.

MR. POWER:

There is a system in place, Mr. Speaker. If you want real proof that the Legislature does not work, I had one representation from the opposite side about a project, but today, the member for, I guess Port de Grave (Mr. Efford), brings in this great big point, that you cannot get project approval for the six weeks. All that member had to do if he was serious about his business instead of trying to play a political game in this House, was come to me or go to the CEIC office nearest to Carbonear and he would have found that there was a system in place for interim financing. The system is there, there is approval, there is a form letter which says, 'The Carbonear group has a project approved for such an amount of dollars,' it is signed by the project officer at CEIC, they take it to the bank and the project starts as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I can read out these jobs.

MR. TULK:

Read them out.

MR. POWER:

Port de Grave, 43 jobs, \$120,000;  
Branch and Point Lance, 50 jobs,  
\$177,000; Fleur de Lys, 29 jobs,  
\$67,000; New Melbourne 10 jobs,  
\$35,000; Jamestown 13 jobs,  
\$40,000, Sweet Bay, 15 jobs,  
\$42,000.

Mr. Speaker, I have a list here which goes on - Salvage, 20 jobs, \$85,000; Dover, 10 jobs, \$28,000; Belleoram 12 jobs -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh. Oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. POWER:

MR. Speaker, members opposite do not want to hear about something constructive, something real and something which has happened because this government has had the willingness and the power of its position to make sure that we do create jobs in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, this is not what this P.C. government is about. We are not a Canada Works government, we are not into short job creation programmes. The things we are doing in this Province, which were not discussed and not debated, are things like Baie Verte, St. Lawrence, the new company, Fishery Products, and Kruger in Corner Brook, solid, substantial long-term jobs.

Why is the mining industry more active in this Province than in some others? It is more active because our legislation makes it attractive for companies to come here, and that is why we have discoveries.

MR. DAWE:

Legislation which was brought in by that member there.

MR. POWER:

That legislation was brought in because we want to stimulate mining exploration in this Province. It has worked, and we are going to have long-term, permanent jobs created. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, as we are going for long-term, permanent jobs, we are not forgetting the short-term; we have put our \$7.5 million in this year for the first time.

We had 5,600 students working in this Province this year, 1,800

more than worked in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Sure, it is not perfect, but the jobs are there, and not once did someone on the other side say at least the Newfoundland Government spent \$7.5 million to get somebody working who was not working before. Nobody said, 'Thank you very much;' nobody said, 'The money was there.' All I got today was the member for Port de Grave trying to get a little, tiny bit of press to criticize the details of the programme.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite are so worried about leadership, they are so worried about their image that they forget the real people they serve. The people of this Province have not been served by what has happened in this Legislature in the last month or so, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly be one who will vote for adjournment.

But just because this Legislature did not work does not mean that the government does not work. We are going to continue on. When this House closes today, sometime, when we come back to work on Monday morning this government will work, and we will work for short-term jobs, we will work to reorganize our vocational school system during the month of December - we will not go home and do nothing until February. When we come back we will have better training programme in place in my department, in the Department of Mines and Energy, and in other departments. We will continue to do the things the people of Newfoundland deserve, but this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, does not appear to be the right place to do it these days.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
I thank hon. members for their indulgence and I want to say that having sat here now for seventeen hours, since yesterday morning at 10:00 a.m., I am going to have my say, despite the wishes of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). Despite his attempts to muzzle us, despite his attempts to convince the Speaker not to allow us to speak, I am going to have my say whether he likes it or not. He may have to miss Mr. Chretien's breakfast, but that is just too bad. You have had your say, we will have our say.

Mr. Speaker, I want to, in a gentle sort of way, summarize once again for members opposite what has transpired here over the last number of hours. Let there be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that what we have seen is a gigantic filibuster on the part of members opposite. They can admit it if they wish, but whether they admit it or not, it is a fact and it will go into the history books as a gigantic filibuster.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard all of them speak over there, and there has been no depth whatsoever to their debate. They have been crying because they have not been able to debate matters in this Legislature, they say, yet we have been here for seven solid weeks - forty-three days, I think it has been. We have had finance bills which, Your Honour will agree, are very open in terms of debate,

members opposite can speak on just about any matter they wish, we have had forty-three days of Question Period and they have asked nothing with respect to the issues which are important to this Province; they talked about conflict of interest for twenty-five days, or whatever it was. We have late shows every Thursday afternoon, where there is a half hour provided for debate on any issue they wish to debate, and half the time, Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, there have not been enough items on the Late Show for debate.

They say they have had no opportunity for debate. Mr. Speaker, the record will show there has been plenty of opportunity, they just have not been able to take that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind hon. members opposite, in particular, about what happened at their last Liberal Leadership Convention, when the present leader over there narrowly defeated the member for Eagle River, we will all recall, who was the runner-up. On his election as leader, he was interviewed by the media, the next day. CBC, I believe, did the interview, and I remember it very vividly. They asked him what his leadership was going to be like in comparison to his predecessor's, Mr. Neary, and here is his answer: The Leader of the Opposition said his approach was going to be very different from Mr. Neary's approach in that, one, he was not going to criticize for the sake of criticizing, he was not going to be like that because that was what Mr. Neary did and, two, he did not believe in preaching doom and gloom. Now, those were his two major points, he did not believe in preaching

doom and gloom, and he would not criticize for the sake of criticizing. Well, Mr. Speaker, what a joke! What a turnaround in philosophy! What have we seen for the last seven or eight hours? Nothing but doom and gloom, nothing but criticism for the sake of criticism, never anything constructive.

MR. DOYLE:

He is turning his back on you.

MR. SIMMS:

He has turned his back on me for obvious reasons, he knows I am accurate in my description.

Mr. Speaker, we have had two or three speakers only from this side, maybe we will speak for a total of an hour or so. The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn) spoke earlier this evening, he gave one of the best performances of anyone in this House, a stinging attack on members opposite. Just a few minutes ago the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) outlined what this government has done in a very short period of time, and he covered just about everything, and that contradicted everything said by the other side.

The Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), of course, who just preceded me, gave a fairly good indication of what we have been doing in terms of job development, and there has been more in those three speeches, which took about an hour, than we heard in the eleven speeches from members opposite, which took six or seven hours, at least. So they have, without a doubt, Mr. Speaker, wasted the time of the House.

They spent fifteen days on a supply bill, which was with respect to money already spent, incidentally, they had forty-three days of Question Periods when they could have asked this government about all the things they wanted to ask.

MR. WINDSOR:

All on the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall).

MR. SIMMS:

All on the member for St. John's East. To give you an example, Mr. Speaker, we had a minor bill here to change the name of the Department of Development to the Department of Development and Tourism, they spent three days debating that bill and they say they have not had time to debate any other legislation. What a waste of time.

And just to conclude it all, this morning we see the Leader of the Opposition once more get up and try to muzzle us - we are not allowed to speak. They have all spoken - try to convince Your Honour that we should not speak because we did not do it alternately. Well, that is not necessarily accurate or true. Members can speak any time they wish to speak, and the Leader of the Opposition knows it. He can give but he cannot take, and that is very obvious.

Now, just briefly, Mr. Speaker, what did we hear from the speeches? The member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) said something about there being more meat on a butcher's apron. That was his major quote and contribution to the debate. The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) spoke at least twice today.

MR. WARREN:

Two sermons.

MR. SIMMS:

Two sermons, but said nothing. He wanted to hear some jokes. He said he has not even heard a good joke. That is his interest in the debate, he has not heard a good joke. The member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), one of my favourite people, talked about how the 'sun will shine'. This was his theme, 'the sun will shine'. Well, I say to the member for Windsor - Buchans, will the sun shine on those 130 university students from Grand Falls whom you insulted? Will the sun shine on them? I say to the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

That was his contribution, Mr. Speaker. The rest of them did not say anything, and I predict that the media, the printed media in particular, will say, 'The member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) also spoke in the debate, and the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) also spoke in the debate.' That is what will be quoted, Mr. Speaker. That is what they wasted the time of the House on and it will be evident when the media reports on this whole thing.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is trying very hard to pump up his troops, get them going, and he always tells them that we are on the way out. I mean, my God, you would not know that it was only six months ago we were elected. We are on the way out. I wonder if the leader of the Opposition also told his caucus members that in the 1985 election, this one just passed which he led the Liberal

Party into and out of, the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador gained the least percentage of votes that they have ever gained in the history of this Province since Confederation?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

I wonder if he has reminded them of that - 33 per cent of the vote, and that is the lowest of the vote the Liberals have had in the eight or nine elections since 1949.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I meant to raise this earlier, but I was just reminded, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if we could have the Clerk send a telex off to the member for Menihok (Mr. Fenwick) and tell him the House is still open. I understand he went home yesterday thinking it would close. Could we get him back here, I wonder?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

MR. Speaker, I want to repeat what I just said. Since 1949 there have been at least eight or nine general elections - the Premier would know.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Nine or ten.

MR. SIMMS:

Nine or ten. The Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador in the 1985 election received the lowest percentage of popular vote that they have ever received since Confederation, 33 per cent -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

- and that, Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). And not only that -

MR. FLIGHT:

How much did the Tories go down?

MR. SIMMS:

I will answer that question for the hon. member. Let us forget the percentage vote, Mr. Speaker, and let us look at the total number of votes cast. In 1949 the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador received 110,000. And do you know, Mr. Speaker, every election since that, those ten or twelve elections since that 1949 election, they have never gained 110,000 votes. The Liberal Party is going down and the Tory Party is going up. Mr. Speaker, I even suspect that the former member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) probably would have garnered a few more votes than the hon. member for Mount Scio did.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, when he says we are on the way down -

MR. BARRY:

Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. SIMMS:

He will in a moment.

When he say we are on the way down and they are on the way up, let

him reflect on those two little statistics. Let him get his people to go out around the Province, visit the people around the Province, let them take their heads out of the sand, let them get closer to reality, let them understand what is going on around the Province, and I am sure that if he does, and if his colleagues do, he will obviously have to come back and admit that the reverse is accurate, which I know he will not, that they are on the way out and are on the way up, without any question or any doubt in our minds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
The member for Mount Scio, as my friend and colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn) pointed out, lost Placentia in 1975, he lost the leadership convention in 1979, he lost the provincial general election in 1985. That is his record. We are prepared to put the record of our leader up against the record of that gentleman over there any time in the world, and I would think that even the most stupid person in the world would have to agree that the record our leader has - winning the leadership in 1979, winning a general election in 1979, winning a general election in 1982, winning a general election in 1985, has never been defeated - is certainly a much better record than the one I described for the hon. member.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the minister would confirm that what he is now engaged in is the same strategy of support that Mr. Mulroney gave to Mr. Clark.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS:  
Would the hon. member explain to us what help he was to Mr. Clark in a particular leadership convention? Is that the help he is talking about?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Another loss.

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

Is the House ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:  
All those in favour 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Those against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Nay.

MR. BARRY:  
Division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Those in favour of the motion, please rise:

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell), the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the Minister of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett), Mr. Baird, Mr. Greening, Mr. Hickey, Mr. Reid, Mr. J. Carter, the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt), Mr. Hodder, Mr. Warren.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against the motion, please rise:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), Mr. Flight, Mr. Tulk, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Efford, Mr. Baker, Mr. Furey, Mr. Decker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I declare the motion carried.

We will now vote on the main motion, that the House adjourn

today and stand adjourned until Thursday, February 6, 1986, at 3:00 p.m.

All those in favour 'aye'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the motion 'nay',

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Ayes have it.

MR. BARRY:

Another division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

All those in favour of the motion, please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development, the hon. the minister of Forest Resources and Lands, the hon. the Minister of Health, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, the hon. the Minister of Finance, the hon. the President of Treasury Board, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services, the hon. the Minister of Transportation, the hon. the Minister of Education, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the hon. the Minister of Labour, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, the hon. the Minister of Social Services, Mr. Baird, Mr. Greening, Mr. Hickey, Mr. Reid, Mr. J. Carter, the hon. the

Minister of Environment, Mr.  
Hodder, Mr. Warren.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against the motion, please  
rise:

The hon. the Leader of the  
Opposition, Mr. Flight, Mr. Tulk,  
Mr. W. Carter, Mr. K. Aylward, Mr.  
Efford, Mr. Baker, Mr. Furey, Mr.  
Decker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I declare the motion carried. The  
House stands adjourned until  
Thursday, February 6, 1986 at 3:00  
p.m. The House is now adjourned.