

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

Reference is made to the point of privilege raised yesterday by the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) on which I reserved my ruling. As I know hon. members can appreciate, it is not a matter that I have taken very lightly. I have given the matter careful deliberation and consideration and would like, first of all, to quote Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, Paragraph 80, subsection (3) which reads: "Though the Speaker can rule on a question of order, he cannot rule on a question of privilege. His function, when a question of privilege is raised, is limited to deciding whether the matter is of such a character as to entitle the motion, which the member who has raised the question desires, to move to priority over the Orders of the Day."

Also Beauchesne, Paragraph 82, states: "A question of privilege must be brought to the attention of the House at the first possible opportunity. Even a gap of a few days may invalidate the claim for precedence in the House."

And Beauchesne, on the role of the Speaker when a question of privilege has been raised, Paragraph 84, Subsection (1), states: "Once the claim of a breach of privilege has been made, it is the duty of the Speaker to decide if a prima facie case can be established. The Speaker requires to be satisfied, both that privilege appears to be sufficiently involved to justify him in giving precedence (or as it is sometimes put, that there is a prima facie case that a breach of privilege has been committed); and also that the matter is being raised at the earliest opportunity."

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

And subsection (2) states:

"It has often been laid down that the Speaker's function in ruling on a claim of breach of privilege is limited to deciding the formal question, whether the case conforms with the conditions which alone entitle it to take precedence over the notices of motions and Orders of the Day standing on the Order Paper; and does not extend to deciding the question of substance, whether a breach of privilege has in fact been committed." This is a question, of course, which can only be decided by the House itself.

Thus it becomes strictly a judgement that the Chair must make. Our own Standing Orders and other reference books really do not offer much in the way of advice or guidance. Even our own precedents are not very helpful in this matter because they appear to deal with quite different situations. In fact, the reference referred to by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) during debate on the point of privilege that occurred in May of 1978, appears to me in my research of the situation, including the Hansard of the day, to indicate that then there was a much more complicated matter and in fact when that point was raised there was also a considerable amount of documentation and evidence presented to make the case.

In this case, all that has been offered are quotes from specific, isolated answers as they appear in Hansard of March 25th. So again I repeat, because little evidence has been presented to this point of privilege, it puts the Chair in the difficult position of really having to make a judgement decision based on my knowledge of the facts, recollection and research of the events that have occurred over a period of time and not just on one day alone and, of course, the arguments presented yesterday during debate on the point of privilege.

April 2, 1981

Tape No. 872

SD - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Having given this matter considerable thought, I believe that, taking into account all the questions and answers concerning the issue over the course of a number of days rather

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

than just isolating some answers on a specific day, must be very carefully considered. I find in my own recollection of the events, and certainly in view of the contents of the letter of resignation from the former Minister of Transportation (C. Brett) and putting the entire event into its proper context, it does not appear to me that the hon. the Premier has done anything other than provide answers and responses based on information that he had at the time and which he believed to be accurate. This of course was later substantiated in the aforementioned letter of resignation. Therefore it is my opinion that in this particular instance there does not appear to have been a deliberate attempt to mislead the House and thus I find there is no prima facie case for breach of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. THOMS:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anybody in this House or has ever been in this House who has more respect for Your Honour's position than I do. I have heard your ruling and I accept your ruling. I know, Mr. Speaker, that to accuse an hon. member of deliberately misleading the House is unparliamentary. So, Mr. Speaker, in view of your ruling I would hereby withdraw the remarks absolutely.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of personal privilege, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this hon. House members will recall that the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations (J. Dinn) did something that was unprecedented in this House, and I would submit what he did was a breach of my privilege as a member of this House. The hon. gentleman in answering a question, or a number of questions that I put to him the day previously, along with answering some of the questions did read from a letter written by a Mrs. Maynard, wife of the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board, wherein she launched a vicious attack on me as a member of this House. Now, as I say, Mr. Speaker, that is unprecedented for a stranger through the lips of a minister, manipulating a minister, using a minister, to launch an attack on a member of this House.

My research indicates, Mr. Speaker, that it is completely out of order. It is a breach of a member's privilege. No minister or no member of the House is allowed to insult or to viciously attack another member of the House and so, Mr. Speaker, therefore I would assume that an outsider, a stranger cannot do it through the lips of a minister. It was a cowardly thing to do, a scummy and a cowardly thing to do, I do not think I need to elaborate any further, Mr. Speaker. I can

MR. S. NEARY: get at the other things that I want to get at during the Oral Question Period. But I think Your Honour should give this matter very careful consideration. It is the first time that I have ever seen it happen in this hon. House and I do not think we should allow it to stand on the record of the House. It is unprecedented. I think my privileges were breached and I am prepared, if Your Honour thinks I have a prima facie case, to move the appropriate motion.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of privilege, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: There is no point of privilege that the hon. member has raised in this particular case. Your Honour has already quoted extensively from Beauchesne, and I bring up that a question of privilege must be brought to the attention of the House at the first possible opportunity.

Obviously, the hon. gentleman, if he wished to complain, the hon. gentleman had plenty of opportunity to get up, not on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, but on a point of order, when the hon. gentleman was answering the questions. Now that is with respect to the procedure.

But, Mr. Speaker, also with respect to substance, there is no substance to the breach of privilege. All the hon. gentleman is doing is getting up in the House to explain his particular position. And, Mr. Speaker, he uses the House, you know, very effectively for this purpose. He made certain charges himself or certain innuendoes which he is a master at. The fact of the matter is the tables were turned upon him. He has found that the general public is regarding him in a certain way because of his conduct and is very sore about it, so he gets up the next day. There is no breach of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Well, I have heard enough debate, I think. If the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has a new argument to present, I will be happy to listen.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak very briefly, if Your Honour permits, first to the question of timeliness because my hon. friend -

MR. J. CARTER:

Rubbish!

MR. E. ROBERTS:

As I was saying before the eruption from the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), my hon. friend for LaPoile (Mr. Nearv) has raised it at the earliest possible opportunity, namely this day. Even the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) could not counter that. He raised the question that it could have been raised by a point of order. But, Sir, it is a point of privilege and not a point of order.

Secondly, I would simply point out in addition to supporting what my hon. friend for LaPoile said about the merits, I suggest there is a prima facie case. My hon. friend for St. John's East in his remarks was flagrantly out of order and perhaps unwittingly abused the privileges of my hon. friend for LaPoile, because all that he was doing throughout was questioning the motives, imputing motives to the gentleman for LaPoile and that, Sir, is as unparliamentary as anything could possibly be.

I would simply say, Your Honour, in my view, to also consider in addition to this ruling making a direction to the hon. gentleman for St. John's East that he too must abide by the rules and not impute motives to others. He is prone to do that, Sir, and it is really something that ought not to be encouraged.

April 2, 1981

Tape No. 874

DW - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, that, of course, would be a separate point of order. We are dealing with the point of privilege raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): As I understand it, the question that the hon. member is placing before the Chair is whether or not a member may read extracts from a letter, or a minister at least, when he is replying under Answers to Questions, or when he is giving answers to questions. And there is of course reference in Beauchesne which precludes hon. members from reading extracts when asking questions and there may well be some foundation to consider the matter perhaps under the guise of a point of privilege but deal with it more as if it were a point of order. And I will certainly take the matter under advisement and give a ruling on the matter at a later date.

000

PREMIER PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I intended to get up under the privilege the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) raised after your ruling on the privilege yesterday and I never got an opportunity. On a point of order now, Mr. Speaker, I think it very necessary to rise, as leading one side of this House, to indicate that this Chamber is in grave danger, and has been over the last number of days, in reverting back to a time we have known a few years ago, where the privileges of this House are abused on a daily basis by points of privilege, that a point of privilege was raised yesterday which has been ruled by Your Honour to be out of order, that individual members of this House will have their characters and their integrity questioned at length, that it will be carried and splashed over the newspapers and over the electronic airwaves of this Province, and once an accusation is made it is very, very difficult, as hon. members around can appreciate, to get back to where you were before the accusation was made. And it is incumbent upon all members of this House to recognize that whilst there are rules and regulations governing this Chamber and this in-

PREMIER PECKFORD: stitution, and points of order and points of privilege which are going to be raised from time to time and legitimately so by members opposite and by members on this side, we are dealing with people and we are dealing with individuals and we are dealing with character and that should be remembered and that this House in its behaviour by the various members will determine how the people of this Province respect us as leaders, and respect this institution. And I want that clearly understood.

And whilst I could, I suppose, if I was that kind of a person, demand an apology from the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), I do not intend to. He has done the honourable thing and withdrawn his point of privilege. But I just want it pointed out that when these things happen, it does cast a cloud over the personality and character of the person to whom the point of privilege was first raised. In that way I wish to indicate that we are in grave danger of seeing this institution become a lesser one than what it should be.

MR. NEARY: Do not be abusing the privileges of the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour will agree that the Premier raised no point of order but I am sure Your Honour will allow me to respond in brief to what I believe the Premier meant and what I think is a point well made.

We on this side certainly welcome the Premier's statement of belief or of policy or of conviction, whatever one may call it,

MR. ROBERTS: that it is of the utmost importance that this House not degenerate into conduct into which this House has descended on times in the past, and to which other Houses throughout this country have descended. And I suspect if we look at the House of Commons in Ottawa today - and I am not blaming one side or the other - but when we look at what is going on there, that sort of conduct and we all know.

I would say though that the Premier's lecture is perhaps badly taken. First of all, my friend from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) acted perfectly within the rules. He raised a point of privilege. I was not in the House but I have had a look at the Hansard record and I would suggest he raised it properly. Your Honour took it under advisement, Your Honour made a ruling and my hon. friend from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) did as he always does, the honourable thing, and said, "Your Honour has made the ruling and I accept it, I carry it through, I withdraw the words." Until His Honour had made the ruling, of course the question was moot as to whether the point of privilege was founded or not. Your Honour has found that it was not and there that matter rests.

But secondly I would point out to the Premier, and I think it is of importance, and I say to him we will be talking about this on Interim Supply, but what we have here was a question of a member who deliberately misled the House. Not the Premier - I hasten to say that - not the Premier. And the member who did that has paid a very dear price and I do not intend to debate his conduct. I mean, he has made a mistake and he has paid the price for it. But I will say to the Premier that that member did mislead the House deliberately, and that got us upset.

MR. THOMS: By his own admission.

MR. ROBERTS: In fact, I think the whole incident, Mr. Speaker, is one that stands much to the credit of the Opposition and in particular to my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary). And on occasion I have been known to be critical of my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) as he has been known to be critical of me. But I think the whole thing, Sir, is a salutary exercise in democracy and the way things ought to be done, because the matter was raised in the House properly and appropriately. There was no smearing.

MR. NEARY: The truth hurts.

MR. ROBERTS: There were questions asked. We did not determine the response made by the member concerned. He made his own response, Sir. If ever a man dug his own political grave, it was that gentleman. And I do not want to talk any more about his conduct. It was a tragedy, as my friend the Leader of the Opposition said. But the Premier's point insofar as it was well taken - and by the way, my friend from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) was not ruled out of order - the Premier seems to think he was. Your Honour did not make a ruling on whether he was out of order. Your Honour said here is my response to the question of privilege. But I would say to the Premier that, you know, while his general theme is well taken - and we on this side certainly associate ourselves with it and we will work as hard or harder as he and his colleagues do to ensure that that standard of decorum is maintained - I would say to him, Sir, that the cause of

MR. ROBERTS: this whole sorry incident was a gentleman who sat on - who sits, I should say, as far as I know he sits; he is entitled to sit, he is a member of the House - who sits still on his side of the House and whose conduct was found, by the Premier's own admission, not to be up to the mark, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!
To the point of order. First of all, the content of the point of order has been fully debated, I guess, from both sides of the House, the point of members raising points of privilege and points of order. The Chair has no control over that. Members have every right to raise such points and the Chair has to hear the points before the Chair can intercede and determine whether or not they are in fact in order.

As to the point of order raised by the hon. the Premier, it is not a point of order, but I think hon. members took the opportunity to make the statements which they believed.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of the House, because I know the members of the Opposition and all members of the House would wish to be associated with an expression of sympathy to the families of two very prominent and distinguished Newfoundlanders who recently passed away and, as a matter of fact, were buried today. The first is the late R. A. Parsons, Q.C., a distinguished lawyer who had been practicing in the city of St. John's and in Newfoundland, of course, for over fifty

MR. MARSHALL: years. He was also a poet. He was a very learned gentleman, a very entertaining gentleman. He died in advanced years, and right up to his last day he was enjoying life to the fullest and making a real contribution in his own way both to the legal profession and to the literary community of Newfoundland and in many other ways. So, as I say, I think everybody knew Mr. Parsons. He was well known throughout the Province. His wife predeceased him a few years ago. I know the House would wish to associate ourselves in expressing sympathy to his surviving children, Mrs. Helen Sheppard who, by the way, is a very accomplished artist, the artist who has done the portraits in this House of the Speakers; also his daughter, Sheila, who is now living in California, who herself was a lawyer and, I believe, a doctor as well; and his son, Paul, who is also an artist in his own right - a very distinguished family, Mr. Speaker, and I know that all members of the House will wish to be associated with the expression of sympathy to Mrs. Helen Sheppard and the family on their bereavement and to recognize the great loss to the people of Newfoundland by this distinguished person's passing.

I would also like to propose as well that the House note the death of the late Samuel J. Hawkins, Q.C., who was an eminent and prominent lawyer practicing in the city of St. John's for a number of years. Mr. Hawkins is well known throughout the Province of Newfoundland. He had participated in his lifetime in many community activities and had made a real contribution to the life of this Province. I know that members opposite would like to be associated with an expression of sympathy to the widow of the late Mr. Hawkins as well.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, as the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) has anticipated, and as I believe my friend from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) who speaks for us on legal matters indicated to the President outside the House, we on our side certainly do wish to be associated. The statements of the President of the Council are eloquent and heartfelt and convey thoughts which we on this side would wish to adopt as well.

I had the pleasure of knowing Sam Hawkins quite well indeed, and not only was he a lawyer of stature and I know my learned friend from St. John's East and the other learned gentlemen in this House would concur that a dealing, a matter with Sam Hawkins, Samuel Hawkins, Q.C., was a learning experience for both sides and an example of the law ought to be practiced - not only was he an eminent lawyer, but a gentleman -

MR. THOMS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: - and an exemplar of the very best of Newfoundland wit. Sam Hawkins had a turn of phrase, a happy turn of mind and was the very best exemplar of not just the law, not just wit, but on top of that a gentleman, a gentleman in every sense of the word.

I did not have the privilege of knowing R.A. Parsons as well, but like many members of the House I had run into him from time to time and again, as the President of the Council has said, the late Mr. Parsons was an ornament to this Province, a man who achieved success at the bar - great success, I understand, at the bar, but also in later years developed a talent for poetry which is notable and memorable and certainly part of the poetical tradition, the literary tradition of this Province.

MR. ROBERTS: In addition, of course, to the children him surviving, the late Mr. Parsons was predeceased by another distinguished lawyer, Austin Parsons, who I believe was also Q.C., but who served with great distinction in the Justice Department for a number of years and was the son of the late Mr. Parsons and his wife.

We on this side, Sir, join with the government and the members on the other side in asking that an appropriate expression be sent. To me it is one of the more worthwhile features of this House, a very nice touch that when citizens of note pass from this world the House pauses for a second and does take note and pays tribute. And certainly Mr. Hawkins and Mr. Parsons are worthy in every sense to be numbered among the company of those whom this House mourns at their passing as having made a contribution of significance to this Province, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): You have heard the motion. Those in favour 'aye'.

HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary 'Nay'. Carried. The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall the stated policy of the Department of Justice in its five year plan to achieve two major objectives in the prosecutorial area, one, to regionalize, and I think that should really read to further regionalize prosecutorial

MR. OTTENHEIMER: services so that there would be a permanent presence in the major areas of the Province; and, two, within a five year period to have all indictable offences prosecuted by the Crown prosecutors. As a result of the Edmunds Decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, it is now necessary to accelerate the achievement of these objectives outlined by the department in its Five Year Plan.

With respect to regionalization, regional offices now exist in St. John's for Eastern Newfoundland, in Corner Brook, Gander and Happy Valley - Goose Bay. Plans are now underway to establish regional offices at Grand Falls and Clarenville and further regional offices are to be established over time.

With respect to prosecution of indictable offences by Crown prosecutors, the department has taken steps to assure that as of the date of the judgement in the Edmunds case all indictable offences are now prosecuted by lawyers. Within the very near future the department will be advertising for six additional Crown prosecutors.

To achieve the overall objectives of the department, that is, regionalization and prosecution of all indictable offences by Crown prosecutors, and the growing demands of the Prosecutorial Division of the Department of Justice, the post of Assistant Director of Public Prosecutions has been created. I am pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. Robert Hyslop to this position of Assistant Director of Public Prosecutions. Under the general direction of the Associate Deputy Attorney General and DPP, Mr. Hyslop will be responsible for the supervision of the Regional Crown Attorneys Offices throughout the Province. He will also be responsible for commercial crime prosecutions.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Hyslop was born in St. Stephen, New Brunswick, in 1947. He is a graduate of the University of King's College, Halifax, as well as Dalhousie Law School. He was called to the Newfoundland Bar in 1975. He has practiced law with the office of the Judge Advocate General in the Canadian Armed Forces from 1973 to 1975. In 1975 he was appointed Senior Crown Attorney in charge of the St. John's regional office and has appeared in most of the courts of the Province. He is married to the former Marie Kavanagh of Harbour Main. Mr. Hyslop brings to his new position a level of knowledge and expertise which is well recognized in legal circles and certainly I, and I am sure hon. members, would wish to be associated with me in congratulating Mr. Hyslop on his appointment to the position of Assistant DPP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I guess the one thing that jumps to mind in responding to the actions taken by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) in connection with this matter is that 'force put is no man's choice'. I think those of us on this side of the House who have been pushing to have these matters prosecuted in court by legally trained people now for some time, I know I have been doing it since I have been elected to the House and questions have been asked of the minister by other members on this side of the House as well in connection with this matter and along comes the Edmunds case,

MR. THOMS: which rules in fact that in order for a person to prosecute indictable offenses, then he must be a lawyer. And it is something that was needed in this Province and I am glad that we are now forced into accelerating, as the minister has said, and making sure that the thing is done and is done properly. I have had an occasion where - myself in my own practice - where I was very disturbed over the fact that the RCMP were doing the prosecutions in this Province, particularly in the rural areas of this Province where the RCMP and our magistrates are so closely connected physically, the physical surroundings, and they were having coffee with each other every day and I had an occasion to, one time, to complain because of this particular situation and I am certainly glad to see that we will now be making sure that these offenses are prosecuted by the proper people.

Also I am pleased to see that the regional offices are being set up. I would hope that the minister, before too long, will see that a regional office is set up on the Burin Peninsula to serve the some 30,000 or 40,000 or 50,000 people in that particular area, and I certainly hope that the Burin Peninsula is a high priority in that respect.

I am not, Mr. Speaker, I am not too familiar with Mr. Hyslop. I understand from my friend from the Strait of Belle Isle (E. Roberts) that he is a fine fellow and -

MR. ROBERTS: Quite a good lawyer.

MR. R THOMS: - a competent, good lawyer, well qualified for this position and all of us on this side, of course -

MR. ROBERTS: He is a prosecutor and not a persecutor.

MR. THOMS: - a prosecutor and not a persecutor. And I am happy to hear that and we hope that he enjoys his new position and does well by it, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Any further statements?

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I have two statements. Maybe I will do one at a time or two of them the same if you want.

MR. ROBERTS:

The minister does many wondrous, strange things.

MR. DINN:

I would like to comment on the position taken by the Leader of the Opposition in his television interview on Here and Now on Wednesday, April 1st, with respect to landing and processing northern codstocks harvested by Nova Scotian trawlers. Considering our unemployment situation and the major effort the Peckford administration has put into alleviating that situation, I can use no less term than 'sad' to describe the Leader of the Opposition's

MR. DINN: position on a matter which could have such a profound effect on the creation of jobs for Newfoundlanders.

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear! Shameful!

MR. DINN: Obviously the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) has gone off half cocked again without first attempting to determine the employment impact of processing in this Province Northern cod caught by other than Newfoundland trawlers. For the information of this House and in the hope that the Leader of the Opposition would perhaps thereby develop a greater concern and perhaps assist rather than damage our efforts to create jobs, I would like to portray the employment impact which it would have had on this Province if the 11,000 metric tonnes of Northern cod harvested in Newfoundland waters, and landed in Nova Scotian plants, had been landed and processed here.

To process 1,000 metric tonnes of raw material into finished product, cod blocks or fillet, generates approximately 18 man years of direct employment. Therefore the 11,000 metric tonnes of Northern cod landed and processed in Nova Scotia would have generated approximately 200 man years of employment in Newfoundland. When we consider that a man year of employment in such a case is about \$12,000 we are looking at a gross loss of \$2.4 million in wages to Newfoundlanders.

I do not think I should have to explain to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition the ripple effect of \$2.4 million in additional wages would have had on the economy of this Province, particularly in rural areas. The hon. the Premier stood up in this House less than a month ago stating with justified pride that since he had been Premier the unemployment rate in this Province had dropped from 17.7 per cent to 12.7 per cent. He indicated then that government would be able to improve job creation

MR. DINN: in this Province still further if he had more control over fishery, offshore oil and gas development and the transmission of hydro power. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) would do well to co-operate in policies aimed at helping Newfoundlanders rather than frustrate their development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I find that -

AN HON. MEMBER: Really good. Really good.

MR. NEARY: The wrong time of the month again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) the Leader of the Opposition on television.

MR. LUSH: - I find this particular statement -

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier would not go on television.

MR. NEARY: The Premier would not go on, would he?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I find this particular Ministerial Statement offensive, repugnant and abhorrent.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, you can talk about statements not meant to be -

MR. NEARY: Talk about lowering the decorum of the House.

MR. LUSH: - debatable -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, I find it unfortunate, number one, that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) chooses to introduce this particular statement when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) is not here.

MR. NEARY: Cowardly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that it did not warrant -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. LUSH: - that kind of emergency, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Settle down. Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, when you talk about impugning motives - here in this paragraph where the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), Mr. Speaker, talks about the Leader of the Opposition not having any concern for Newfoundlanders and damaging the efforts with respect

MR. T. LUSH:

to employment in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that is repugnant and it is unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) is not here to defend himself, which I am sure he can do.

But, Mr. Speaker, I happened to see that particular programme and I saw nothing in that programme which suggested that the Leader of the Opposition was saying anything that was damaging towards employment in this Province. Mr. Speaker, what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was trying to do was to point out the fact that he did not believe in the confrontation approach used by this particular government, the confrontation approach, Mr. Speaker, with everybody and with their friends. And this is what the Leader of the Opposition was doing, he was advising a more conciliatory, a more harmonious approach which he thought would bring about more jobs and not less jobs. That is what the Leader of the Opposition was doing, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, the members on the other side never miss an opportunity to try and paint people in this corner as being against jobs in this Province, Mr. Speaker. What a ridiculous thing! What a ridiculous situation! And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I find this statement totally repugnant, totally offensive and totally abhorrent. And again what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was doing was advising a more conciliatory, a more harmonious approach with our sister provinces to create more jobs and not less jobs. And, Mr. Speaker, what he was doing was talking about the whole approach used by this government, the confrontation approach which is nothing more nor less than cheap, bush-league politics!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Before I recognize the hon. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before I recognize the hon.

minister. The Chair was perhaps a little bit slow there. I believe it is fair to say that the statement presented by the minister did provoke debate. And, of course, Beauchesne, Paragraph 262, is quite clear; it says, 'The purpose of ministerial statements is to convey information, not to encourage debate'. And I do apologize for being a bit slow in pointing it out, but I hope that ministers in the future will remember that reference and that their statements will provide information and not provoke debate, because this is not the place for debate.

The hon. Minister of Labour

and Manpower.

MR. T. LUSH:

Cheap, bush-league politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. J. DINN:

Bringing the unemployment rate down from 17.7 per cent to 12.7 per cent is obviously cheap, bush-league politics, yes.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the proclamation of new radiation health

MR. DINN: new Raditation Health and Safety legislation to come into effect April 3, 1981.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: The new Radiation Health and Safety Act passed in the House of Assembly in June 1977 and since that time considerable work has been accomplished in the Department of Labour and Manpower regarding radiation protection, particularly since the Division of Occupational Health and Safety was established approximately two years ago.

Under the provisions of the Act a Radiation Health and Safety Advisory Committee was structured and has been active in the preparation of regulations which also come into effect on April 3, 1981. The Advisory Committee is comprised of highly qualified practitioners in the medical and radiation field and this Committee will be established on a permanent basis when the Act comes into effect.

A radiation inspector was appointed in January 1979, and the Radiation Inspection Programme is well established. Mr. Everett Price, who holds the position of Radiation Inspector, is also a certified inspector under the Atomic Energy Control Board of Canada.

I would like to address some of the principal features of this new legislation, which are as follows:

- (a) to regulate the selling, supplying and servicing of radiation equipment in the Province;
- (b) to require the resistration of all radiation equipment;
- (c) to regulate the operation of radiation equipment, notification

MR. DINN: of accidents, prescribing maximum levels of radiation, and set out the inspection requirements of radiation equipment.

I draw particular attention to the prescribed minimum age of eighteen years for radiation workers and also the protection provided for pregnant radiation workers and trainees.

My department is in the process of preparing to distribute information on the new legislation to all owners and operators of radiation equipment, as well as to other parties affected by the legislation. The registration of radiation equipment will commence immediately.

I am pleased to see the radiation health and safety legislation in place as this programme is an extremely important part of our Occupational Health and Safety and is another step which this department has taken to ensure that occupational health and safety continues to receive a very high priority in the Department of Labour and Manpower.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, this statement, unlike the previous one by the minister, has some merit and obviously it is a proper statement to make and, in fact, I go a little further; I think he, or more precisely his officials deserve congratulations.

The proclamation of this legislation is the combination or the penultimate step before the culmination of the process which began many, many years ago in establishing hazards adequate to deal with the radiation problems and the exposures to them which the citizens of this Province from time to time have suffered.

MR. ROBERTS: There is no point in going over it in detail. The regulations I have not seen. I do not know how they are in detail but the thrust behind them is certainly one which we on this side support, just as we supported the Occupational Health and Safety Act.

This type of legislation if needed, I do not if

MR. ROBERTS: it is fair to say it is long overdue, because these are problems which were only recently perceived and been accepted as being problems. In any event, it is high time we had this kind of legislation and it is high time that the people of this Province were given assurances that they would not be exposed, either at the work place or elsewhere, to unnecessary radiation and if they were exposed to radiation, as must sometimes be the case, particularly the men and the women who work with X-ray equipment who are exposed to radiation, then in that case adequate protective measures are taken and adequate measures are taken to ensure that they are not exposed to intolerable or dangerous levels of radiation.

Let me conclude by saying that a year or two past, we on this side raised, and we were well advised to raise very real concerns about the adequacy of the X-ray equipment which was being used in many of the hospitals throughout the Province, specifically or particularly I think, the Cottage Hospitals. Now, like so many things it was a flare-up and then it disappeared into the morass of government activity or bureaucratic activity, I will simply say now to the Minister and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and to the Minister of Health (Mr. House), I think this is an example of one of these divided jurisdictions, but I would say to them that the problem, in my understanding, is still as real as it ever was. It may not be as widespread, but I would say to them that it is a most serious problem and in fact, if I am correctly informed, and I believe that I am, it is today in Newfoundland by far the most serious radiation problem that we have. So I would say to both ministers that I would hope in the implementation of these regulations

MR. ROBERTS: they would take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that adequate and safe equipment is available in our hospitals throughout the Province, X-rays are an indispensable diagnostic tool and radiation treatments are also, I suspect, an absolute necessity in the treatment of some malignancies, some carcinomas, and I do not pretend to be an expert on them but they must be used. This means people are being exposed to them on a regular basis. It is essential, absolutely essential that the men and the women who do this work be assured that their safety is being given every possible consideration. I am not sure that is so at present. I would say to both ministers, I think they have to do even more than they have to make that so.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. It is an historic occasion.

MR. ROBERTS: It would be even more historic if the government answer.

MR. THOMS: I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Justice (G. Ottenheimer).

MR. ROBERTS: That will be historic if you get an answer.

MR. THOMS: I am wondering if the minister could confirm the cost of transferring prisoners from the Labrador portion of our Province to the Island portion, whether or not the cost of doing that is more than the total of costs of the transferring of prisoners within the Province,

MR. THOMS: the Island portion of the Province, in other words, bringing them to correctional facilities on the Island?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If I understand correctly, it would be sort of on an annual basis, the total cost of transportation of prisoner from Labrador to the Island would be more than within the Island transportation during the course of the year. I would have to check on that, but I will and should be able to give the hon. gentleman an answer tomorrow.

MR. THOMS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, one of the things that really makes in my opinion anyway and in an awful lot of the other people's opinions, makes a mockery of the principle in law that a person is innocent until proven guilty is the prisoner's box that we do have in the courthouses in our Province. I have asked the minister questions on this before. I wonder if the minister could bring us up to date on his efforts to have these things removed?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I have had discussions with members of the judiciary with respect to that and I think it would be fair to say - I suppose, you know, one is generalizing here - but it would be fair to say that in general there was an agreement that there should be perhaps less visibility or that not in all instances would this be necessary and the presence of police necessary, - and they felt that in some instances it was necessary. It is a matter in which they agreed to get back to me with any particular improvements they thought would be feasible, would be workable, and I will get in touch with them again to see if they have made any further conclusions on that subject.

MR. THOMS: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Final supplementary, the hon.
member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Does the direction of this have
to come from the judiciary or can the minister undertake to
solve what I consider to be a real problem in that area?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I have not to date
examined from the jurisdictional point of view, you know,
whether the minister can say there will or there will not
be, because obviously the Minister of Justice is responsible
for the administration of justice, the judiciary is responsible
for the running of the court and if there were to be
a dispute on that specific matter, that would be something
which would have to be decided. I am hoping, and I am sure
the hon. gentleman will agree there, that this is the kind
of matter which hopefully would be solved through
discussion, through negotiation rather than through that
kind of, if you wish, confrontation, you know, between the
department and the judiciary. So, you know, I would hope
that it is through consultation and discussion that the
matter can be resolved.

We have not looked at it from
the point of

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

view nor, I hope, would it be necessary to, you know, in the final analysis who has the last word the judge in running the court or not. I do not think it would be healthy to get into that.

MR. THOMS:

They have to be nice.

The Golden Rule.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle yields to the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. ROBERTS:

Well, we will all get our try in.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

I have a question, if I might, for the Premier in his capacity of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and it is with reference to the DREE road's agreement or, to be more precise, at this stage the lack of the DREE road's agreement because, if I understand it correctly, the agreement expired two days past at the end of the fiscal year, the 31st of March. Can the Premier tell us where in his understanding we stand with respect to the proposals, which I understand were put into Ottawa - I am going from memory, but last Summer at some point I assume they were put in by the Premier as the minister. Could he tell us, please, where we stand with respect to those? What response have we had?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, last year Mr. DeBane, the DREE minister, and myself got together early in the year to review the whole DREE programme. At that time the DREE minister felt rather reluctant to say very much about the

PREMIER PECKFORD: programme because there was a re-examination after the election as to just what the mandate of DREE would be. I went through the various agreements then outstanding; primarily on the front end were the forestry agreement which is now signed, the only one which has been signed in the last year; the NORDCO agreement which is still outstanding, the roads agreement, the land and mapping, which is only a small one, and the coast of Labrador one and the arguments that we had over the road. And the others that I indicated to him that would be added, because we had other proposals ready to go in. We have been communicating back and forth by telegram and letter and some phone calls. The upshot of it all is now that two weeks ago tomorrow he phoned me and we had a long conversation about it. This phone call was prompted by several telegrams from me almost on a weekly basis to him because he had committed himself to come to Newfoundland for the next meeting and discuss the whole general development agreement under which all the subsidiaries spring up, and to look at that, to renew the general development agreement and then to sign a number of agreements. That has never happened, that meeting has never happened, and the dates kept getting changed because of various events in Ottawa. So the upshot of it was this phone call finally from his office and from him personally, so I spoke to him on the phone and he indicated to me, and apologized for not getting down to Newfoundland on the dates that he had already indicated to me in writing. I said that is fine and dandy, it is okay, I understand that you are busy and so on but I must reiterate what I have said in my telegrams and in my letters to you: There are some that are very outstanding. The coast of Labrador is ready for signing

April 2, 1981

Tape No. 886

AH-3

PREMIER PECKFORD:

and we should get on with it.

The pulp and paper modernization, I think all the other
provinces have

PREMIER PECKFORD:

signed their pulp and paper modernization agreements which was announced about two years ago. So we need to do that. The companies have all put in their plans to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power). So he indicated to me that there were two ready to sign, the Coastal Labrador and the Pulp and Paper Modernization, and I indicated back to him, well, you know, 'I hope you can get down here soon.' He said, 'Hopefully, the end of April.' I said, 'Well, could you please between now and then, with your officials, go through the other proposals that are there outstanding for such a long, long period of time? The NORDCO one is only a small amount of money, the land and mapping, and we have to do something on Highways this year as part of a programme.' So he said, 'Okay.' So I gave it all over the phone to him verbally and he wrote them all down and I assumed - he said, 'I have a pen here, I will write them all down and I will get my officials working on them again.'

After the telephone call, I started thinking about it myself and I decided that I would summarize the telephone conversation in a letter to him. So I wrote it and mailed it that day. In it I went through the agreements, and there are nine now in one stage or another. There would be four on the front end, I think - Coastal Labrador, Pulp and Paper Modernization, Highways, NORDCO and so on, are there. There are a number of others which are very regular and we have already had other agreements outstanding, for example, the Western Newfoundland one, Industrial, when that was signed during the provincial election of 1979, in which the Corner Brook people now want the harbour development put in there. It was left out because of environmental assessment. So I indicated and went through the status of them, and

PREMIER PECKFORD: because of their very nature, the vary. Some should be able to be passed quickly, others we have to negotiate. And then I went on and finished off the letter by indicating to him, besides these nine - four, three and two in different stages that could be approved - there were also two more about ready to be submitted to his department, and therefore, by talking about those two, I expressed the urgency of getting on with the other ones to start making some movement. I have not heard back from him on that letter. I did not expect for him to get back that quickly. But I am hoping now that I will get a response back from him indicating the exact time, whether it will be April 30th that he will be here, that we will have a discussion on the General Development agreement, have those two signed, and hopefully he will be in a position to indicate the signing of two or three more before the end of May or something so this construction season will not be lost on the roads and the other more construction orientated agreements.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I believe I should perhaps make a point here, that the answer was very lengthy. Obviously, the question, I suppose, required a lengthy answer; however, I did not notice any objections and I notice the hon. member who asked the question nodding as the answer was being given. But I want to make sure that ministers are aware that answers as well as questions should be as brief as possible.

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

MR. ROBERTS:

I appreciate what you said.

I mean, I certainly listened to the answer because much of it was news and it is always pleasant to get news.

My supplementary is that the Premier, in the course of a very full and complete explanation or exposition, did not really deal with the precise point which I raised, at least did not deal with it in any substantive or any complete way, so let me ask him again. I wanted to zero in on what I call the DREE roads agreement which, you know, is not NORDCO, is not Coastal Labrador, is not Mapping, is not the Pulp and Paper, is not even Trans-Canada, it is the DREE roads agreement. And I asked him, if not in precise words then certainly my thought and I will repeat it now perhaps in different words: Could he tell us whether we can expect one this year? The agreement has expired, the work to be done under it has been done including, for example, the Northern Peninsula Highway and a number of other roads in the Province. Could he tell us whether we can expect one this year please?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I really cannot answer that in any definitive way and I regret that I cannot answer it, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle because, as I indicated to him, the DREE minister said in his telephone conversation with me, 'We will sign these two.' And then I indicated, 'Look, you know, this roads one is very important. There is a lot outstanding that could be signed quickly, but the roads one has a lot of jobs and a lot of construction activity associated with it and I am very, very high on seeing that signed.' He did not give any indication. I did go on to indicate to him that on the roads I know he has been

PREMIER PECKFORD:

appropriated additional money.

The other part of the conversation that I did not relate to the hon. member, which I should be totally fair on it, is that the DREE minister is concerned about his own department, because there is a debate going on internally about whether they are going to continue to mandate the DREE in the way it is, and I indicated in my letter and in my telephone conversation, I thought DREE was a valuable vehicle and it has performed and done a lot of work and I have no great argument with it. But to come back to the Roads agreement, per se, he did not commit himself to being in a position to sign the Roads agreement when he comes down at the end of April if he gets here.

I indicated to him I would like to see it signed before the construction season starts. He said he would take it under advisement. I indicated that we would be prepared to budget - this was my other problem because all my telegrams was that we have to budget our share of the money, and as the Budget is being finalized, I wanted to not be caught in June or July, if possible at all, with having to find additional monies at that time. I would like to budget for it on the front end so that no special warrants would be necessary. But there is no guarantee that we will have a Roads agreement through DREE in place this year.

MR. ROBERTS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

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

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has said there is no guarantee and I understand that. That is, I think, the first time we have come that far. That is news.

Can the Premier tell us whether he has had any indication that DREE might not be participating in a Roads agreement this year? - a new one, or a renewal -

MR. ROBERTS: not a renewal, you know,
another one in the series. There have been two or three.
I mean, has he had any indication at all to that effect?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, nothing specific to that
effect. All Mr. DeBane indicated was that he is ready
to sign two, the Coastal Labrador and Pulp and Paper
Modernization, and he would take under advisement my
remarks that I made to him over the phone and see whether
he could advance them along. There have been negotiations
on the local DREE level here and

PREMIER PECKFORD: through to other offices to Ottawa on it. But there has been no specific indication from Mr. DeBané that they will not finance roads anymore, or will not finance it even to here. All he indicated last year was that his budget was tight and he did not expect to get a lot of money this year. He has got substantial sums of money, I am led to believe, but all he indicated was two for sure and 'I will look at the other ones including the roads'. And that was all he said to me.

MR. ROBERTS: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary.

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

MR. ROBERTS: A very brief supplementary, and I know the Premier will listen to what I have to say and I hope he will act upon it. I wonder if he will be good enough when he leaves here to check his files. The memory is fallible, and even the Premier's memory may be fallible. I am reluctant to press that point, but I wonder if he will check his files with a view to reviewing the correspondence that may have passed between him and Mr. DeBané with respect to the DREE roads agreement and, when he has done that, would he undertake to tell the House what is in it and, particularly, would he undertake to table in the House any relevant correspondence with respect to it?

The point is an important one and I would - I am not going to say anything more except ask if the Premier would do that. I say to him that my understanding, and he may read what he wants into that, but I use the words 'my understanding' is that his answer is perhaps not as accurate as it could be and so I would ask if he could check the matter.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will check the correspondence to see whether there is a phrase or a paragraph or something in some of the correspondence between his office and mine which indicates the negative on the roads agreement.

MR. ROBERTS: (inaudible) the minister or Premier (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, okay. Well, between the two of us, whether there is a negative somewhere in that correspondence. I do not remember it off the top of my head that there was ever definite - I have heard that the M.P. for Grand Falls - White Bay - Labrador, the hon. Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Rompkey) indicated to some people, perhaps in the hon. member's constituency, in the last couple of days or so, that there would be no roads agreement this year signed between the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and DREE.

MR. ROBERTS: We were both down the weekend (inaudible) there will be no agreement.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, well, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) well - that is his opinion, or that is what he has been told by -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) what I have been told (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, well, I will check my correspondence to see if there is anywhere in the files that this is so, and if it is I will definitely make it available to the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Sure. Sure.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour and Mapower. The minister made a statement in the House yesterday that the policy being followed now at the Workers' Compensation Board is to have cocktail parties to try to keep high morale amongst the strikebreakers. Now, I am not sure if it was high morale - I do not know that the cocktail parties are going to do for their morale, but I do not think it will have a very good effect on the morals of the people who attend these parties. But in the meantime, could the hon. gentleman elaborate on the cocktail parties, tell the House what is involved, how much it is costing?

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I refer to Beauchesne on Questions, and questions should not contain inferences or imputations. I think the tenor of the Question Period has been splendid today.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is unfortunate the member for LaPoile(S. Neary) wishes to bring it down to his lowest common denominator.

MR. ROBERTS:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

To the point of order, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, I will disregard the cheap cracks from the member for St. John's East (W. Marshall) because that is what we have come to expect from him, but I would say that my friend from LaPoile was not making any imputations. In fact, what I heard him say was he was quoting an answer given by-what is his department?

MR. SPEAKER:

Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROBERTS:

Labour and Manpower, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (J. Dinn) yesterday in the House and surely, Sir, if it is proper to make an answer with certain statements in it, then it is proper to make a question a day later that builds upon that answer and goes on. I do not think my friend is out of order. I think he is perfectly in order. It certainly may do wonders for the morale of these people to have the government using public monies to buy them liquor, we do not know what it does for their morals, but that is not the point of the question so I ask my friend be allowed to carry on and ask his question. Who know? We may even get an answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, with respect to the point of order, there are a number of restrictions placed on questions, as outlined in Beauchesne, one of which was raised by the hon. the President of the Council (W. Marshall). It goes on to say, of course, that many of the traditional limitations on questions are now applied more strictly to

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): written questions than to oral questions, and also it goes on to say, I suggest that if each and every one of these restrictions were applied in every case, very few questions would ever reach the Order Paper. I think there is a valid argument been made that the question relates to an answer to a question which was given by the hon. minister on another day, and I will see how it goes, if it does not get too much out of hand,

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am asking the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour (J. Dinn) what is wrong with the morale of the strikebreakers.

MR. SPEAKER: If I may, I believe the question was asked and then there was a point or order raised.

MR. NEARY: No, I did not finish my question.

MR. SPEAKER: You had more to add to the question?

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly, by all means.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The minister made a statement that in order that there continues to be high morale, it is necessary to have cocktail parties at the Workers' Compensation Board for the strike breakers. Now, would the minister care to elaborate on that. How much are these parties costing the people who contribute to Workers' Compensation, namely the employers, and why is the morale of the strike breakers so bad? Why is it necessary to have cocktail parties?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the morale is bad. I think that the idea was to keep the

MR. DINN: morale up, which would indicate that the morale is up so it is just a communication I had from the Chairman of Workers' Compensation Board who indicates that it is a difficult situation, what we have at the Workers' Compensation is a fairly difficult situation, and that he had a

MR. J. DINN: party, I believe, and intends, if the strike continued for a long period of time, could possibly have another party to keep the morale up. I was not aware that there was anything wrong with the morale.

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is this in keeping with the Financial Administration Act for the Workers' Compensation Board to throw cocktail parties for strikebreakers using funds that had been contributed by the employers of this Province for the protection of the employees who receive benefits from Workers' Compensation? Is this in order, Mr. Speaker? The hon. gentleman said, obviously from the answer, that they intend to continue these cocktail parties. Would they not be very provocative, Mr. Speaker, would they not provoke trouble between the strikers and the strikebreakers when they look in and see boozing going on inside the Workers' Compensation Building and cocktail parties and booze flying around? And would the hon. gentleman also, while he is on his feet, tell the House if all those who are attending these cocktail parties where booze is being served are of the age of nineteen?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to dignify that with an answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman also yesterday reported on the cocktail party that was thrown at the Holiday Inn. And, of course, the hon. gentleman realizes that he has to stand by documents that he tabled in this hon. House.

MR. S. NEARY: Now I asked the hon. gentleman the day before why it was necessary for the Executive Director of Workers' Compensation Board to sign for that room in the name of ACM Sales? The hon. gentleman reported yesterday that all Mr. Baggs did, the Executive Director, was to sign for the key. Now I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has discussed this with the Executive Director directly or did he just take the word of Mrs. Maynard that that was exactly what happened? Because this House was misled, as hon. members know, a week or so ago, and I hope we are not being misled again, Mr. Speaker. Did the hon. gentleman take the trouble to discuss this with the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board and the Executive Director, or did he merely take Mrs. Maynard's word for this?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I think I answered that question very adequately. I tabled two documents, as a matter of fact, and several others. I could not table the mask but I still have it available for the hon. member because he continues to get egg on his face and he is going to continue to do that as long as he asks questions like he is asking. The fact of the matter is, yes, I did contact the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board and he did explain to me quite clearly the circumstances surrounding a party that was held at Workers' Compensation that I could elaborate on but I will not, and the private party that was held at Holiday Inn.

MR. S. NEARY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in the documents that the hon. gentleman tabled yesterday there is no evidence at all concerning this cocktail party at the Holiday Inn. There are bunch of statements here from the Holiday Inn to Mrs. Maynard for 1980, but there is no statement for that particular night.

April 2, 1981

Tape No. 891

DW - 3

MR. S. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman promised to get the House that information and the information is not yet forthcoming.

MR. S. NEARY:

I would like to ask a number of questions again in connection with that brawl they had at the Holiday Inn, Mr. Speaker. Why was it necessary for ACM Sales, Mrs. Maynard's company, to have that party for the strikebreakers? Why was that necessary? How did it come about? And is Mrs. Maynard's company doing business with Workers' Compensation Board? Is she selling skin cleansers to the Workers' Compensation Board? Why was it necessary for her to have this party?

Why was it necessary for her to have this party? And in the beginning when it was arranged for, Mr. Speaker, who undertook to pay for the cocktail party? Was it the Workers' Compensation Board or was it Mrs. Maynard? Now these are legitimate questions, Mr. Speaker, that have to be answered and the minister can slough it off all he likes but I hope there is nobody misleading the House because the truth will eventually surface, Mr. Speaker, and the minister has to stick by -

MR. W. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order, the hon.

President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is making a speech. The hon. gentleman has also made the statement, 'I hope there is nobody misleading the House'. You are not allowed to say indirectly what you cannot say directly. The hon. member is saying indirectly, making imputations the hon. minister is misleading the House and should withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I agree there is a point of order. I suspect that hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), being the friendly individual that he is, would be quite prepared to withdraw.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the last thing in the world I would want to do is to offend members of the House, especially the hon. gentleman. I certainly respect -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

- the Chair -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

So the hon. member withdraws.

MR. NEARY:

- so I withdraw, That is offensive, that is unparliamentary. But, Mr. Speaker, it is very curious, it is passing strange that Mrs. Maynard, the wife of the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board, should throw a cocktail party for strikebreakers.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I understand there are other members who wish to ask questions. I believe the hon. member has put a series of questions and maybe it might be appropriate now to call on the minister to see if he wishes to respond.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not going to respond in this House to anything with respect to a private party held at Holiday Inn or information that the hon. member may have gotten in washrooms or wherever he got the information. The fact of the matter is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:

- there was a private party, which is none of my business, is none of this House's business, it certainly is not of urgent public importance that needs to take up the time of the House in Question Period. And if the hon. member does not have better questions than that, I suggest he allow his colleagues to ask important questions.

MR. NEARY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, it is a urgent matter. It is a matter involving possibly a conspiracy to defraud public funds, Mr. Speaker, and that is a pretty serious matter.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has sent -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: This House is entitled to have the information, Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour knows. Has the hon. gentleman sent for the Executive Director, has the hon. gentleman sent for the statement from the Holiday Inn to see what it was the Executive Director of the Workers' Compensation Board signed, why he signed it, why it was necessary for him to sign for Suite 408 at the Holiday Inn for that cocktail party? We are entitled to have this information. And the hon. gentleman can make light of it all he wants.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is making a speech and a series of questions. The hon. gentleman got egg all over his face yesterday and he is obviously reacting to it.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order -the hon. member is finished his questioning?

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, as I said before,

MR. DINN: I am not going to carry out any investigations for the hon. member with respect to a private party held at Holiday Inn.

MR. NEARY: You will be sorry.

MR. DINN: I am not going to do any investigations in washrooms or toilet facilities or anything else for the hon. member.

MR. NEARY: 'Brett' said the same thing.

MR. DINN: I am going to allow him to stay as low as he is.

MR. NEARY: 'Brett' said the same thing.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower, re the Workers' Compensation Board situation. I have correspondence that is available to the minister -

MR. ROBERTS: The minister (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: - where the Chairman of the Board indicated that during the month of January and February more claims were processed, more claims were processed in those two months than any other year -

MR. MOORES: In the same period.

MR. FLIGHT: - prior, prior to this year. More claims were processed in January and February than any other time in those two months, in any other January or February. Could the minister confirm whether that is a fact or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly check that out for the hon. member and get the information.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A very quick one, about ten seconds remaining.

MR. FLIGHT: When the minister is checking it out, and the Chairman of the Workers' Compensation Board is on record having stated that, would the minister care also to bring an explanation to the House as to how it can be that more claims can be processed in two months with all the staff on strike than could have been processed with 100 support staff available to the executive?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower, about five seconds for a reply.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly check that out and get the information for the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has now expired.

MR. NEARY: Time flies.

MR. SPEAKER: May I take the opportunity, on behalf of hon. members, to welcome to the galliers a delegation from the Town of Windsor, led by the Mayor, Mayor Clarence King, and also the Deputy Mayor from the Town of Marystown, Mr. Glenn Tobin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Provide For The Funding Of Certain Pension Plans And Retirement Benefits Sponsored By The Province And Consequential Amendments To Certain Pension Acts Related Thereto."

MR. SPEAKER: Further notices?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question asked by the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) yesterday regarding polar bears in Cartwright: There are two bears involved, and my understanding is that one of the reasons is the seals in the area are very plentiful this year and polar bears are naturally attracted to such fine food.

Only one bear has been observed and that was last Saturday, fifteen miles East of Cartwright at a place called Southeast Cove. There is nobody living there at the time, however, the bear did tear a screen off a Summer house there. The regional biologist from Goose Bay is on his way to Cartwright and will attempt to track down the bear and tranquilize it and move it North of Gross Water Bay.

MR. NEARY: Nothing but the bare facts.

MR. ANDREWS: Nothing but the bare facts, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ANDREWS: This is only a tale of two bears. The tracks of a second bear were seen - this is a mystery one - in Cartwright last Sunday. Nobody saw the bear but the wildlife officer in the area will keep a monitor on the situation and if that bear is spotted it will be tranquilized and moved North also.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) concerning the former IGA building at Northwest River. We are responsible for a senior dormitory down there, Sir, and the estimated cost for mothballing the building for the year would be \$80,000. This is for security and heat and the IGA are looking after the security, Sir, and if it costs any less than that, that is all we will have to pay.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

I would like to point out to all hon. members that six hours and fifteen minutes have been used in debating Interim Supply. Shall the resolution carry?

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, I will answer it as best I can. I cannot speak for all members, but I will speak for those of us on this side. We have a mere sixty-seven hours left, is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Sixty-eight hours and forty-five minutes.

MR. ROBERTS: And the way the government is going, we will probably have to go on that long to get anything of substance out of them. However, my colleagues and

MR. ROBERTS: and I would like to say that for our part-and we are, of course, such a minority in the House and that is not our doing, I assure all concerned - but for our part, we propose to allow - for our part, now others on the other side may differ - but for our part we are prepared to allow this resolution to come to a vote tomorrow at some point sufficiently before the adjournment at one of the clock -

MR. THOMS: If they are good over there.

MR. ROBERTS: - to allow the necessary, not only the votes to be taken but I assume there will be a bill to be brought in after that, after the resolution is adopted, and so I suppose at - what? - a quarter to one tomorrow, you know, for our part. Now, of course Sir, that is conditional, as all things in life are, and I would rather be conditional than in the sort of condition the gentleman from Mount Scio (L. Barry) finds himself - not Mount Scio, I am sorry I keep saying that - the gentleman from St. John's North (J. Carter) keeps finding himself. He seems to have set out to establish new standards in rudeness and in ignorance in his conduct in the House and he is constantly doing that, Sir. He is surpassing even his own achievements in that line.

But I will soldier on as best I can. I have run into many will-nots over the years and the hon. gentleman is a prime example of a will-not and I shall regard him as a will-not and not let him won't me.

MR. CARTER: Hate, hate!.

MR. ROBERTS: No, that is not hate, Sir. the hon. gentleman knows hate. Too bad he cannot recognize it, he exemplifies it. What I was saying is that we would hope that the government are prepared to make some substantive responses, for a change, to some of the points that we have raised during this supply procedure. We have raised a number of very important matters and the ministry have been

MR. ROBERTS: conspicuous by their absence.

In fact, I believe the only minister who made any speeches of substance are the President of the Council (W.Marshall), who gave his usual spleen, and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), who gave us his usual performance. Other ministers spoke, including my friend from Pleasantville (J. Dinn), but they added nothing of substance so I do not need to deal with them.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Stephenville (F.Stagg), as he now is, recognizes vintage material. He has, I venture to suggest, immersed himself in it many times over the years, a fact which is self-evident. Mr. Speaker - Mr. Chairman, I am sorry. I keep saying that. I carry on, do I ?

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt): The member for the Strait of Belle Isle, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. I apologize if I am boring the gentleman for St. John's North (J.Carter), Sir. I really am deeply repentant if I bore him. He, Sir, knows a great deal about boring, having done that to us for ten or eleven years. But let me make a deal with the hon. gentleman

MR. ROBERTS: from St. John's North
(Mr. Carter):if he does not open his mouth to expose
his ignorance, I will not tell the truth about him
either.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: So, Mr. Chairman, I
wanted to deal with an aspect of a matter which has
arisen in this House recently, which is the conduct of
the government and the official conduct of the Premier
in dealing with this unfortunate situation with the
member for Trinity North(Mr. Brett).

Now, I do not want to
say anything about the member for Trinity North. As
was said in the House earlier today, he has made his
bed and he will lie in it, and it is up to him whether
the bed is comfortable or not.

I want to talk about the
Premier's conduct when he was aware, or ought to have
become aware, of the fact that there was something rotten
in the State of Denmark, to use that phrase.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the
Premier of this Province, as our own Premier is more
than aware, is the chief of the government. The old
description was, 'First among equals'. But, in fact,
a premier is much more than that because the Premier
decides who sits in the Cabinet, who comes in, who goes
out, and with that power he has a very great responsibility.
And I think our own Premier, the gentleman from Green
Bay(Mr. Peckford) has acknowledged that when he brings in
proposals, or his ministerial statement foreshadowing his
proposals on the conflict of interest regulations and he
says that he will take it upon himself that he will -
Mr. Chairman, I do not really mind if nobody is listening
to what I say, but I do mind when people, including my

MR. ROBERTS: friend from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) and from Ferryland (Mr. Power) are speaking so loudly that I have to raise my voice to be heard.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt): Order, please!
The hon. member wishes to be heard in silence.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I do not wish to be heard in silence, Sir, but I would just be grateful if they would keep it down to a dull roar. I mean, it is so seldom that we hear from the gentleman from Fortune - Hermitage that I would not wish him to keep silent.

But, Mr. Chairman -

MR. STAGG: A darn good man.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, he is a fine man, Sir, and he will be a marvellous one term member. We have seen a lot of them over the years and they come in with the tide and they get swept out with the tide and he too, Sir, will be swept out by a very independent tide which is exactly how he came in.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I was saying is that the Premier in his foreshadowing of his conflict of interest regulations has said that he takes it upon himself to police the Cabinet, and that is right. It is only the Premier who can take that upon himself and he is right to do it. Now, I want to examine the Premier's conduct in dealing with this matter of the member for Trinity North(Mr. Brett).

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it quite clear, lest there be any misunderstanding, that I am not accusing the Premier of any deliberately misleading the House, that matter has been disposed of and I do not quarrel with the ruling. Whatever opinions I may have are mine. Here in the House I shall abide by the rules and be happy to do so.

MR. ROBERTS: But I do feel, Sir, that the Premier's conduct in dealing with this is open to some question and I propose within the few seconds - I do not know how long I have left. I have not very long left-to deal with it, but there will be other opportunities in the course of this debate.

The member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) was asked certain questions in this House on, I believe it was 19 March. My friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) raised some very pertinent questions, he asked them. The member for Trinity North made some answers. Now, I do not have the Hansards here but the Hansards make it quite clear. We all recall it, it is the sort of event that one would recall fairly vividly, I think. A couple of days later - and I ask my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who really has done

MR. ROBERTS:

great service to the Province in this matter - I ask my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to correct me or to refresh me-but it was a couple of days later the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) stood in the House and made an answer, I believe it was in that part of the rubric which says Answers to Questions, but he made an answer in which he tabled certain documentation -

MR. NEARY:

Correct.

MR. ROBERTS:

- and certain information.

I believe that is the last we have seen of the member in this House from that day until this. He has not been here since then.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. ROBERTS:

He was away for a day or so on official business and he has been away from the House since then, and that is within the rules. As my friend, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would be the first to point out, I have not been here every moment of this session, nor has he. The difference is I have been missed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Premier on the 25th. day - have you got those Hansards there we were looking at earlier?- on the 25th. day of March was asked some other questions about the series of events which had gone on, and there the Premier repeated categorically, and we had marked some of his words, he had made categorical statements. The Premier said, for example, on - I am quoting from Hansard on page 1776, "Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Transportation paid for the services in question before this matter became an issue in this hon. House." Now that was March 25th., Mr. Chairman. "I know that the Minister of Transportation paid for the services in question before this matter became an issue in this hon. House."

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Chairman, the question is not whether the Premier knew or did not know. I am prepared to accept the Premier's word that he believed the statement he made. And I think it is of the utmost importance that when a minister makes a statement we can believe it. We are not required to believe it, but the only justification for that all-important rule, the only justification for the all important rule that we must believe a member when he says something is so, is that in fact it is so.

Now the Premier said so to the best of his belief, I do not quarrel with that. But what I do want to say, and I have come to the end of my first ten minutes, but I do want to say that I have very grave questions based on the record as to whether the Premier acted as he ought to have acted. I would suggest to Your Honour that the Premier acted negligently. Now I am down to a half a minute; I can only carry on if I have leave; if hon. gentlemen will give me leave I would like to carry on; if they do not, I cannot.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Is it agreed?

DR. COLLINS: Go ahead.

MR. ROBERTS: If there is no leave I will sit down. I will simply say, Your Honour, that I think the Premier acted negligently and I will later in the debate, if I get the opportunity, I will -

MR. DINN: He only comes every few days.

MR. ROBERTS: - I will lay forth the evidence, but I thank Your Honour.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I want to give my hon. colleague, if nobody else wishes to speak, an opportunity to carry on because I think he has a great speech going there, a great point. But I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) if he would, before we pass the

MR. NEARY: he would. Before we pass the Interim Supply Bill, and I have no intention, although my hon. colleague indicated that we would let the Interim Supply Bill go through in a reasonable period of time, but I have no intention of letting it go through myself unless and until one condition, only one condition under which I will agree, and that is that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will undertake to get a log from Air Services indicating the number of occasions in the last year that the Premier requisitioned the government aircraft, who travelled on the aircraft and the purpose of the trip. Now, that is a very, very reasonable request, a simple request, something that the Minister of Finance should be able to get for us quickly, because that is the whole purpose of going into Committee of the Whole, to ask questions and get answers, get information. So I will repeat the question in case the hon. the Minister of Finance, if I can get his attention for a moment, will make a note. Before I agree myself to grant Interim Supply I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he would get a list of the number of times since January, 1980 - would the hon. gentleman care to make a note of that? - from January, 1980.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Could we have a bit of order in the House, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: I apologize.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not referring to you.

Could I ask the minister if he could get the information in connection with the number of times the Premier requested the government aircraft since January 1, 1980, who the passengers were that were carried on the aircraft and the purpose of the trip? Now that is information the House is entitled to have, Mr. Chairman. Your Honour is nodding his approval. Your Honour even agrees

MR. NEARY: that that is reasonable. We are entitled to have it. And I hope that before the afternoon is over that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will be able to produce that information.

Now, one other point I will make before I sit down is this: I also, Mr. Chairman, have no intention myself - and I give notice, I put the government under notice now - that I have no intention of giving leave this year to broadcast the Budget, to televise the Budget Speech, no intention at all - it is useless for the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) to get up and ask - unless, and here is the condition -

MR. STAGG: That is blackmail.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not blackmail, it is a trade off, if you want to call it that, Mr. Chairman. Unless the government is prepared to agree to have the sessions of the House televised, all the sessions, all the sittings of the House televised the same as they do in the House of Commons that we watch on channel eight every night, we watch the proceedings of the House of Commons.

AN HON. MEMBER: Channel twelve.

MR. NEARY: Excuse me, I have been told by a great authority that it is on channel twelve you can watch the proceedings of the House of Commons. And Westminster is televised. Practically all the provinces of Canada allow their sessions of the House to be televised in living colour and broadcast on radio.

Now, unless the government is prepared to do that, it is useless, it is a waste of time to come in and ask us to give them leave to allow the Minister of Finance to get up on only one day and pump out his propaganda to the people of this Province.

The government now has a - what is the date, Mr. Chairman? The second - the government has

MR. NEARY: twelve days in order to take that matter under advisement. They have twelve days to consider that matter, they have twelve days to caucus, discuss it amongst themselves and decide whether or not - and the same thing applies for next year's Throne Speech; no more broadcasts from the House unless all the sittings are broadcast. The reason I want to do that, Mr. Chairman, apart from the people being interested in the people's business, we have a Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) who goes out of his way in his nastiness to undermine the credibility of people in this House. Now, I think the people should be able to see that in living colour. People are not dumb or stupid. If they saw the hon. gentleman in action they would know who is responsible for the decorum of this House. It is the

MR. S. NEARY: Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) who provokes members of this House with his nastiness.

And so, Mr. Chairman, never again, as long as I am in this House, never again will I agree to allowing the government to have live television, live coverage of the House so that they can squirt out their propaganda in the Throne Speech and via the Budget Speech. It will only be done if the television cameras and the microphones can be brought into this House on a daily basis so that the people of this Province who cannot come and sit in the public galleries will be able to see what goes in the people's House.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. member St. John's North (Mr. Carter), I would like to welcome to the House on behalf of all hon. members a former member, Mr. Wornell who represented the district of Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has decided to blackmail this House. There is no other name for it.

MR. L. THOMS: The hon. member is out of order, Mr. Chairman, I believe the word, 'blackmail' is unparliamentary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

It is unparliamentary and I would ask the hon. member for St. John's North to withdraw.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I would gladly withdraw, I am certainly in your hands, but I would like to point out before doing so that we had an example. I am not responsible for what the hon. gentleman said, and I am perfectly prepared

MR. J. CARTER: to move the motion and go through all the procedure that is necessary to debate the blackmail. But if you rule otherwise, Mr. Chairman, I will certainly withdraw.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt): Is it agreed that the hon. member has withdrawn?

MR. S. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. L. THOMS: No, he has not withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: No, he has not withdrawn. That is the point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do I understand the hon. member has withdrawn?

MR. J. CARTER: Yes, I withdraw absolutely provided that -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: But I would serve notice, Mr. Chairman, that if it happens again I will move the appropriate motion and we will debate it further.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I would say about the hon. gentleman's threat is that if he keeps up acting the way he is acting he probably will not be sitting in the House when the time comes to decide whether or not the cameras will come in because he will have been named, he will be serving a sentence.

Now, Mr. Chairman, yesterday just for something to do I read a little bit of astrology out of the paper. I do not believe in astrology but I could not help looking at it again today. And look what they say under Taurus, 'Welcome this slow-paced weekend. Budget may have to

MR. J. CARTER: be revised. Self-improvement projects, community efforts hold special appeal. Children should be encouraged to stand on their own two feet!"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. CARTER: Is there another one?

MR. STAGG: What about Aries? Aries is a big one.

MR. J. CARTER: Aries says, 'Be prepared for the unexpected, a member of the opposite sex is on your trail. Do not take chances with your money. Come to grips with your troublesome domestic problem'. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, it is uncanny how these soothsayers seem to be predicting events in this House. But rather than stay with astrology, I would like to draw what I think is a very useful parallel from astronomy.

There have been some extraordinary developments in astronomy in the last few years and the latest phenomeon to have been discovered and mathematically looked at is a phenomeon known as black holes. These are areas in space where gravitation is so intense that everything is sucked into it, not even light can get out. And I think there is a very useful analogy here, Mr. Chairman, because I would say the analogy between a black hole and the Liberal Party, or the Opposition over there, a very, very useful can be drawn. Some good, decent, honourable men stand and run and get elected to office and some very clever men. There are some very clever people on the Opposition, far cleverer than any of us -

AN HON. MEMBER: Name them.

MR. J. CARTER: Well, I do not wish to name any one. It is the Chairman's job to name someone.

MR. F. STAGG: I dispute that there are any clever people over there.

MR. J. CARTER: They were clever and they were elected. Very clever people, far cleverer than average, and yet we get nothing but dirt,

MR. J. CARTER: We get nothing but dirt and stupidity coming out of the Opposition. Decent people go in and nothing decent ever comes out. In fact, if you get too close to the Opposition your chances of ever being decent again are very, very rare. There have been some notable exceptions, of course.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I realize that when points of order, and there have been some legitimate and quite interesting points of order that have come up - the one regarding the length of time that we may speak here in this Chamber came up a little while ago and Your Honour was very, very wise to listen to points from both sides. I know it does not need to be said to Your Honour but I think it should be said for the record that whereas you must give the Opposition the courtesy of listening to their arguments, it is really quite useless to do so because they are not concerned with promoting good order in this House, they are only concerned with promoting chaos and trouble. And, of course, I do not need to -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is unparliamentary, Your Honour knows that. The hon. gentleman should withdraw it. We had a school teacher lecture already today from the Premier about that sort of guttersnipe behavior in this House, Mr. Chairman, and, you know, most of us agreed with what the Premier said, but we cannot allow that to stand on the record, Mr. Chairman. I ask you to ask the gentleman to withdraw and apologize to the House.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, further to that point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: To that point of order I am merely saying, Mr. Chairman, that the advice that is being given to you by the Opposition is worse than useless and

MR. CARTER: designed to confuse more than to elucidate.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CARTER: Now, if that is unparliamentary I withdraw it but I do not think it is unparliamentary.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butt): The Chair is ready to rule.

MR. ROBERTS: All right. I was just going to say -

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member wishes to -

MR. ROBERTS: - what the hon. gentleman said was not what he just said, he said. What the hon. gentleman said clearly imputed motives and that, Sir, is about as unparliamentary as something can be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I had not been listening, Mr. Chairman, but I just want to correct that.

MR. ROBERTS: How can you speak on it then?

MR. MARSHALL: No, but I can speak on the point that the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) made to the effect that it is out of order to impute motives. It is out of order, Mr. Chairman, to impute base motives. I think the word used is disavowed motives. I mean, anybody who gets up in the House and speaks has a motive obviously, but it is the nature of the motive that the Chair is to be concerned about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In this particular case it is a little difficult for the Chair. It is a very fine line but I think it is fair to say that the hon. member may be imputing motives and, therefore, to perhaps clear the air for the Committee I would ask him to withdraw.

MR. CARTER: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I would not impute motives to the hon. gentleman opposite, I do not think they are capable of having any motives.

MR. ROBERTS:

Well said! Well said!

MR. CARTER:

So I would certainly withdraw unqualifiedly.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time there is a by-election in the district of Bellevue and I understand the members of the Opposition are absent from the House largely because they are campaigning there. I do not wish to help them in this endeavour but it might help to point out that what they need is a new sort of colour, a new flag, a new banner, shall we say. And I would like to suggest that having listened to the debates here for the last month or so, that a new sort of colours, new Liberal colours, could well be black, pink and yellow. And I think that that would be a very useful banner, it would represent the black for their intentions, pink for their philosophy and yellow for their courage. And I think it would help to elucidate their philosophy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, something else that I would like to mention before I sit down is that I am informed that April 8th is a civil service pay day and if interim supply is not passed by April 8th then the civil servants will not receive their paycheques. And I am quite sure from listening to hon. gentlemen opposite that they have no intention of allowing interim supply to pass until many hours of useless, wasted debate have passed by. And I would urge them to think about this long and carefully. The civil service will not be all that happy with them if they cause their cheques to be late.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) member for the Straits of Belle Isle is useful.

MR. CARTER: The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has been so patronizing and useless in his debate that it has passed by my ears completely. I have yet to hear him say a sensible thing that I have not heard him say time and time again. Every year he comes in and makes the same speech, time and time again.

So now, Mr. Chairman, I would urge members opposite to pass interim supply certainly before next Wednesday, otherwise they risk the righteous wrath of the electorate.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by saying to my friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter)—and I am sorry he has not been able to understand anything of what I have been saying, that simply, I would suggest with temerity, Sir, illustrates the truth of the old adage that you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink. In the case of the hon. gentleman it shows you can lead half a horse to water and you still cannot make him drink. And he also told us he did not want to help us in Bellevue district. Well, I would say to him the only way he could help us in that election, Sir, is by going out there to campaign for his party. He did that once a number of years back, in 1966, and the people there have fond memories of him, Sir, and I think would like to see him again. That would be of great assistance to the gentlemen on this side of the House, if he would go and campaign for his party in the by-election.

Now, Sir, let me come back to the question of the Premier's official conduct and what I suggest

MR. ROBERTS: is negligence on his part. The Premier was in the House Committee a moment or so ago and he is gone again but some of his colleagues are here and what I have to say will stand on the record in any event.

I had said, Mr. Chairman, that the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) had made certain statements on March 19th in answer to some questions which were asked of him by the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and on the 23rd of March, according to the records of the House, he tabled, he the member tabled in this House certain documentation and on March 25th the Premier, in response to questions again from the gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), made the remark which I read earlier, which I shall read again, it is quite brief and quite definite: "I know that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) paid for the service in question before the matter became an issue in this hon. House." And I have also said -

MR. CARTER: A point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): A point of order. The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: We discussed in debate (inaudible) privilege ad nauseam and there is a rule in our Standing Orders, I cannot quote the chapter and verse but it is certainly there, against being repetitious, needlessly repetitious and certainly being tedious.

MR. ROBERTS: To the point of order, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) one cannot be needlessly repetitious. The mere fact that one needs to repeat this, Sir, shows it is not needlessly repetitious. And if the hon. gentleman finds it nauseating I would say I find the Premier's conduct in this sense repellent as well. I would suggest to Your Honour there is

MR. ROBERTS: no point of order and I ought to be allowed to carry on without this nonsense.

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Well, if the hon. member could, you know, give the Chair some guidance as to how he is going to tie these remarks in with interim supply which I know is very broad-ranging and so on.

MR. ROBERTS: No difficulty, I mean -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me just a minute to continue. That matter, I think, has been dealt with and dispensed with today, previously today, by the Speaker. And, you know, I fail to see the relevance but perhaps the hon. member could tell me how he is going to tie it in with interim supply.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, if Your Honour cannot see the relevance let me try. The Speaker today dealt with a point of privilege and he ruled there was none and I am not questioning that. What is relevant? The \$450 million blank cheque which Her Majesty's ministers are requesting us to approve, includes an amount of money for the Premier's salary. Your Honour will concur that is a fact, correct?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, if that is so I can talk about the conduct of the Premier in his official position as Premier and that is what I am doing. I am suggesting the Premier was negligent. I am suggesting that the Premier did not measure up to the high standards which he has set for himself, standards which I suggest are proper ones and ones which the Premier of this or any other

MR. ROBERTS: Province ought to attain. So I think they are relevant, Sir. Now, if Your Honour rules they are not relevant then Your Honour is in charge of this Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): There is obviously no point of order.

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour. Your Honour makes a very good Chairman and would make an even better minister and I hope in due course Your Honour's talents are suitably recognized.

MR. THOMS: He got all kinds of praise on Open Line this morning.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. - did he call Open Line?

MR. THOMS: No, he got good praise on Open Line.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, now did the Chairman call Open Line?

MR. THOMS: No, he did not call.

MR. ROBERTS: Despite that?

MR. THOMS: Despite that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I really do not think that is relevant to interim supply -

MR. ROBERTS: The Chairman is too modest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: - my popularity in Conception Bay South.

MR. ROBERTS: I think the hon. gentleman's popularity speaks for itself, Sir. And I had occasion to see Monday's Daily News and I was shocked. Perhaps we should censor it. There was no picture of the Chairman in this week's Daily News but I am sure that was an accident, it will not happen again.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, where am I? I had said that I think the Premier's conduct was negligent and I think it behooves me to say why. I had said that on 19 March the gentleman for Trinity North (C. Brett) made certain statements and that on 23 March he tabled certain documents and on 25 March he had- the Premier, I am sorry, had said, and again I repeat the words 'I know that the Minister of Transportation paid for the services.' He also said on page 1779 of our Hansard, 'He has', he referring to the gentleman for Trinity North, 'has the receipt and he', again referring to that gentleman, 'will have the cheque when it is returned from the bank and then it will be tabled in this hon. House.'

Now, I suggest that the Premier, making as he did those answers in full conscience and full belief-and I believe the Premier did believe them to be true. But I will say, Sir, that the Premier in making those answers in full conscience and belief revealed incontrovertibly that he acted negligently. Because if the Premier, Sir, I suggest to you, had made the least inquiry into the documents which were public on 23 March- he may not have seen them before that. I accept that the member for Trinity North may have tabled the documents without showing them to the Premier. I would find that unlikely but it is certainly not impossible. But as of 23 March at about three o'clock of the afternoon those documents were public. And I would suggest to Your Honour that any person looking at them, certainly a person as capable as our Premier, bright, resilient, intellectually nimble, all the things which our Premier is, that any person doing that, Mr. Chairman, would have realized that there were

MR. ROBERTS: substantial questions arising out of those documents, that those documents did not prove what they purported to prove, that those documents ought to have been pursued and questioned.

For example, the documents conspicuously lacked a receipt, and yet it is the most elemental principle of the administration of the finances of this or any other government, that if one pays a bill one gets a receipt. And I would say that the Central Cashier's Department has a mandate, an order, a directive that whenever they receive payment in any form, a cheque or money or a money order however it comes, bank draft, whatever form it takes that they issue a receipt immediately, immediately that same day, instantly. That is a very elementary and a very important rule.

The Premier ought in his own mind to have said to his colleague, where is the receipt. I accept the fact the cheque may not have cleared, but the minister said he had paid the bill on the 17th. of March or whatever date it was, a day or two before it had been raised here. It had been raised on the 19th. The minister, I am sorry, the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) said that he had paid the bill. He said that here in this House. The Premier ought to have said, where is the receipt? And if the Premier did not say it before he saw the document the Premier ought to have said it when he did see them. That is one thing the Premier ought to have done, Sir.

The second thing the Premier ought to have done is to say to his colleague, as he then was, his friend as he still is, and properly so, you do not

MR. ROBERTS: have to abandon your friends just because they are in a little trouble or a lot of trouble.

MR. CARTER: Listen to the (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Chairman, yes I say listen to me because what I say is true and what I say is worthy of consideration by even the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) - it goes that far - that the Premier ought to have said to his then colleague, 'You said in the House on one day you had paid the bill but could not remember the amount, and two or

MR. ROBERTS: three or four days later you were speaking in the House and you said you had vivid recollections of the amount because of the sizeable bill, the bill, the size - I do not have the words, but the effect of the words was that 'The size of the bill shocked me'.

MR. THOMS: He went snakey.

MR. ROBERTS: He went snakey, was it? Was that his phrase?

MR. THOMS: That was his phrase.

MR. ROBERTS: The phrase was 'I went snakey'. Now, I say, Mr. Chairman, quite simply that those two facts, and those are incontrovertible, that those two facts ought to have put the Premier on his guard to the point where he had a duty to the people of this Province to make enquiries. And if he made those enquiries, he ought not to have made the statements he made in the House. The fact he made the statements in the House and believed them to be true shows he did not make the enquiries, and that shows that he is seriously negligent and calls into question these whole conflict of interest rules and whether or not they will be enforced as they ought to be enforced. I am not questioning the Premier's motives, I am questioning his ability, I am questioning his strength, I am questioning his willingness to enforce those rules based on this case here. It is a sad and a sorry thing. I feel sorry for the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett), but he has paid a price. But his crime - not crime - his parliamentary, his political crime was in misleading this House which the member has admitted doing. And the Premier's offence - and it is not a crime - is in falling down as Premier, and falling down in the most solemn and one of the most important of his duties, namely, of governing his own colleagues. And I say to the Premier, Sir, he owes this

MR. ROBERTS: House and the people of this Province an explanation. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt): Before recognizing the President of the Council, I would like to announce the Late Show for the hon. the Speaker. Pursuant to Standing Order 31(h), it being five o'clock I can inform the House that I have received one motion for debate at 5:30 p.m. when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be in order.

Notice is given by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) arising out of a question asked to the hon. the Premier re irresponsible statements being made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would not have gotten up except for the remarks made by the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). I do hope that in making my remarks, because they are touching on that subject, they are the type of remarks that can cause one to emote a certain amount of emotion which I hope in the ten minutes available to me I will be able to restrain myself from doing.

Mr. Chairman, the contention of the hon. member is that the hon. the Premier was negligent. Now I would indicate to the Committee that the position of the Opposition has been tempered down since yesterday, and I am glad to see it is tempered down, it has been tempered down from yesterday to an allegation which was withdrawn today which was, I understand, given by the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) but which represented, unfortunately, I believe, the decision of the Liberal caucus, he was speaking for the Liberal

MR. MARSHALL: caucus at the particular time. Now, today, we get it down, reduced down to another level, an allegation of negligence. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say first of all that I regard it as a matter of deep regret the hon. members there opposite would see fit to continue along in this particular vein, in this particular area. I can dismiss what the hon. member said quite easily, and as far as the hon. the Premier has indicated, the hon. the Premier indicated quite clearly, and the record shows quite clearly, that certain documentation was tabled, the hon. the Premier accepted the word that he was given at the time, as anyone would in these circumstance. It was found out afterwards, through an error of judgement, that this was not so and certain steps were taken.

Now, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) makes a great deal of a hullabaloo; he had a duty to make enquiries and all the rest, but how does the hon. member, for heaven's sake, feel that this matter was resolved? It was resolved before the House. And I think the matter is now resolved and I just ask the hon. gentlemen there opposite, when they are continuing on this way, to consider a few things.

First of all, I find it somewhat amusing that the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle would end his remarks by saying he questions the strength and the willingness of the Premier. I am not going to dwell to any great length on the actions taken by the hon. the Premier, and the reactions taken, but I can say that in the circumstances it took a great deal of strength, it took a great deal of commitment and it indicated his - that is it certainly indicated, Mr. Chairman, the Premier's strength and his dedication to take a position such as that. I

MR. MARSHALL:

feel it is rather regrettable, this whole situation, that the hon. gentlemen there opposite would try to attract political kudos out of a situation like this which has arisen. It is obviously an unfortunate one and it is obviously one in which the person who made the error in judgement has atoned for it in this House, has taken certain steps because of the error of judgement which have been of considerable detriment to him, and it has been a considerable penalty. And I would just like to ask the hon. gentleman you know, how much more do they want to exact? How much more, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MARSHALL:

How much more do they wish to subject the hon. the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) to? Now, I do not deny the hon. members opposite their right to speak in Parliament about matters that they deem to be of interest to the public and I am not saying that the hon. members are out of order, but I do really question their taste and their judgement in this particular area.

The hon. member in question, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member in question obviously has paid a grave and heavy penalty for this. Now, I do not know whether the hon. members there opposite wish to be like the Ayatullah and the Iranians and all the rest of it and after somebody is down - as a matter of fact, I could go on to other analogies which I will probably not get in. But I do question their good taste and their judgement. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, they miscued yesterday when they came to the House and they did this because the very grounds of public opinion have swollen up against them as they have found this morning, and I think this has tempered, Mr. Chairman, the attitude which they have taken with respect to this.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the general person out on the street is

MR. MARSHALL: decent, and when people out in the street, the general public see the actions that were taken by the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett), accepting responsibility for what amounted to an error in judgement on his part, I think that the matter should rest there and members opposite in the House should realize that the member for Trinity North has a family and I do not see any reason or any profit in further pursuing it at this particular time, whether on the guise of a point of precedent or a matter of trying to prove the Premier negligent or for whatever reason.

I saw the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) yesterday on the air making a lot out of it, on CBC, as he did today. And I know that from the reports that have come back, that this has backfired and backfired greatly against the Opposition as it certainly should.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - I will just say this, Mr. Chairman, the hon. -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) did the right and proper thing. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had a report made against him at one period of time -

MR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. MARSHALL: - questioning at the time his actions, and making certain recommendations -

MR. CARTER: Stayed on him like glue.

MR. MARSHALL: - which we have yet to see the hon. member adopt. So let he who is in glass houses not cast stones, Mr. Chairman. And I do not want to bring that up as the hon. member gets upset when you do it.

MR. NEARY: Oh, nastiness!

MR. MARSHALL: - but the hon. member and the people -

MR. STAGG: Right, in glass houses.

MR. MARSHALL: - who hear this kind of thing, when somebody wants to jump on a person and kick him when he is down, should consider, Mr. Chairman, from whence it comes. And when they realize from whence the charges -

MR. NEARY: No, no -

MR. MARSHALL: - yes - from whence the charges come, Mr. Chairman -

MR. NEARY: A.B. Walsh's lawyer.

MR. MARSHALL: - from whence the charges come, they will realize what weight should be given to it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this particular incident was an unfortunate one. It was an unfortunte one for all members of the House. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the situation has now been adequately disposed of and I can see no possible useful purpose for proceeding with it.

Now I know -

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman squirms.

MR. MARSHALL: - continuing and they will continue to do it, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - because that is there wont.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, the people of Newfoundland realize - they were using these tactics in the previous assembly of this House and they got their answer as to how the people of

April 2, 1981

Tape No. 904

NM - 4

MR. MARSHALL: Newfoundland reacted to it in the last election and I would suggest that there are much more positive ways in which this Committee or this House could spend its time.

MR. STAGG: That is right.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Bring in the television cameras.

MR. THOMS: On yesterday afternoon, Mr. Chairman, the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) stood on his feet -

MR. NEARY: Like a coward now, he is running away.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: He stood on his feet and he said what despicable action on the part of the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) because he stood up in the House of Assembly and he exercised his right and his privilege in this House of Assembly. That, Mr. Chairman, was a despicable action according to the President of the Council.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what do we get in this last ten minutes? What did we get from the President of the Council?

MR. NEARY: Poison. Scandal.

MR. THOMS: What did we get, Mr. Chairman?

MR. NEARY: Smear tactics, low, rotten, sneaky, slimy -

MR. THOMS: The most despicable, unorthodox dirty tactic that I have seen since I have been a member of this House. Mr. Chairman, what did he do?

MR. NEARY: - dirty, scummy.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Not from talking to the hon. member, no.

MR. NEARY: Only from a coward (inaudible) scummy and cowardly.

MR. THOMS: We have in the question of privilege today that I brought up, a situation where a fool rushed in where angels would fear to tread. This is what happened when the Premier of this Province stood on his feet to answer questions from my colleague from Lapoile (Mr. Neary); a fool rushed in where angels would fear to tread.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: That is a state of fact in the case of gentleman from Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: But what happens when the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) stands on his feet this afternoon? This is the despicable thing that happened: Instead of trying to defend what his own Premier did, he tries to put the blame on somebody who did the honourable thing and resigned, the Minister of Transportation

I had not in my point of privilege - I doubt very much, I may have in passing, referred to the Minister of Transportation, but not once did I mention him by name and I did not refer to him in any way, shape or form. My point of privilege was directed at the actions of the Premier of this Province, had nothing to do except indirectly and peripherally at this point in time, with the Minister of Transportation.

What does the President of the Council get up this afternoon and do? He puts all the blame right back on the Minister of Transportation. He referred to him throughout the ten minutes that he spoke here this afternoon. Now, Mr. Speaker, for sure, if what I did was despicable - and of course, it was not despicable - I was exercising a right that I have in this House. But what the President of the Council did this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, that is despicable; that is low, that is cowardly, what he did this afternoon. To try to protect the Premier of this Province and maybe to try to protect his own job -

MR. STAGG: Shame! Shame (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: - he wants to cast this whole thing at the moment - and we are questioning, of course we are questioning the strength and the credibility of the Premier of this Province. Of course we are after what happened. The Minister of Transportation, remember,

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, resigned his portfolio. He was not dismissed by this strong Herculean-like figure that we have sitting in the Premier's chair today. He was not dismissed. The Premier of this Province did not have the intestinal fortitude. Neither did he have the intestinal fortitude to dismiss the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) when he so foolishly went out and signed the petition saying that the offer to the workers was an insult

MR. THOMS: any more than he had the intestinal fortitude to dismiss the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) when the Public Accounts Committee,

MR. THOMS:

of which the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is a member, made a unanimous recommendation saying that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) had knowingly, knowingly, Mr. Chairman, not in ignorance but knowingly, contravened the Public Tendering Act. This is what we are questioning.

MR. STAGG: What has this got to do with supply?

MR. THOMS: That has nothing to do with the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett), nothing to do with the Minister of Transportation, but the President of Council (Mr. Marshall) gets up in his glee and brings in the Minister of Transportation. Mr. Chairman, what we saw the Premier of this Province do on the 25th of March was what I said, we saw a fool rushing in where angels fear to tread. He did not investigate, he did not investigate. He rushed in making statements like, 'I know for a fact, I know for a fact -'.

MR. NEARY: That is correct.

MR. STAGG: I know for a fact.

MR. THOMS: 'I know for a fact.' There was no question about it.

MR. STAGG: Is that verbatim?

MR. THOMS: And not only that -

MR. NEARY: Yes, in Hansard.

MR. THOMS: - 'I know for a fact' - yes, I can quote you Hansard.

MR. FLIGHT: Read it to him.

MR. THOMS: I can quote you Hansard on it.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) I do not want to hear it.

MR. THOMS: He says, 'I know' - Mr. Chairman, this is Hansard, March the 25th, 1981 - 'Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Transportation paid for the services in question before this matter became an issue in this hon. House!

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) for a fact. Now let us hear that.

MR. NEARY: All right. Here it comes.

MR. THOMS: Okay, the hon. member wants to hear that. 'No' - and I am quoting the Premier of this Province - 'No, he has paid in full. And I am persuaded to that point of view and not only persuaded I know it to be a fact.' Now, even somebody with as little intelligence as the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) can understand that.

MR. CARTER: A point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please! A point of order raised by the hon. member from St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, it is a cardinal rule of the procedures of this House that you cannot do indirectly what you cannot do directly. The point of privilege was dismissed by the hon. the Speaker earlier today and yet the hon. gentleman persists in trying to obviously - what I would consider challenging the decision of the Speaker, of the Chair. So I think he should be ruled out of order -

MR. NEARY: There is no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order, the hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: There is no point of order, Mr. Chairman. The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is just making a general nuisance out of himself as he continues to do in this hon. House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that there is no point of order but, obviously, a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

The hon. member for Grand Bank has two minutes.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Two minutes is hardly enough time to say what I want to say about the despicable action that I saw this afternoon on the part of the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). At no time when I presented my point of privilege to this House, did I cast any aspersions on what the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) had done, at no time. Who used the Minister of Transportation, who used that sad situation in this House today? Who used it? It was not the member for Lapoile. He was talking about the negligence of the Premier of this Province. He was not talking about the Minister of Transportation. Of course, it was the President of the Council, the President of the Council trying to take the heat off his boss' shoulder by talking about the former Minister of Transportation. How low, Mr. Chairman, how low can a man sink? And no wonder. And then you talk about getting interim supply through the House giving this crowd \$500 million, a half billion dollars? I would cut a dollar bill in two before I would give it to them. And this is what we are asking - this is what you want us to do, this is what we are being rushed to do. And we will hear it, we will hear all the arguments, that if it does not go through the civil servants will not get paid. But we get somebody on the other side saying now, 'We agree with - the hon. member for Lapoile said that we would let it go through tomorrow. We would let it go through but he should have added a rider.

MR. THOMS: but he should have added a rider:

If the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) would keep his mouth shut, Mr. Chairman, you would have a better chance of getting interim supply through.

MR. NEARY: He should go out and look after his savory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: If the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) would not stand up and shoot his venom and his poison you would have a better chance. If the President of the Council did not get up and try to use the former Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) in his arguments, you would have a better chance.

MR. STAGG: Playing politics in the House.

MR. THOMS: Playing politics! If the hon. member only knew how to play politics he might have gotten elected a second time, you know, instead of being elected and then getting defeated. The problem out in Stephenville is they have short memories. They forgot in-between what you are really like.

MR. F. STAGG: What is your record?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): I wish to advise the member that his time is up.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Before this Interim Bill goes through there will be plenty more time.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, we are supposed to be talking about \$500 million - \$448 million of interim supply here, and hon. members continue to go on about foolishness in this House. Here is the hon. member over there from one of

MR. DINN: the greatest fishing districts in Newfoundland.

MR. F. STAGG: They will not let him talk about the fishery.

MR. DINN: And they will not allow him to talk about the fishery. He would be ashamed to talk about the fishery, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. DINN: His leader was on T.V. last night -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to listen to the hon. member chiming in. He had his ten minutes. He abused his ten minutes, he did not use his ten minutes very wisely and now I would like to use my ten minutes wisely. The hon. member will not talk about the fishery. A very important aspect of the life of the people in his district, one of the biggest fishing districts in Newfoundland and he will not talk about the fisheries. He should be up decrying what his leader said on T.V. last night -

MR. STAGG: Tell us about it.

MR. DINN: - trading off the Northern cod stock with whomever; 11,000 metric tons went to Nova Scotia this year and the hon. member is not concerned in the least about that. He is not concerned about the fact that for every 1,000 metric tons of fish that goes out of this Province you are talking about eighteen jobs for a full year. You are talking about \$12,000 per person per year for eighteen, for 1,000 tons of fish. Now, Mr. Chairman, this year it was 11,000 metric tons of fish, last year it was 25,000 metric tons that went to the European countries, foreigners. Mr. Chairman, my job for the past two years has been to try to decrease the unemployment rate in this Province. I have worked with every resource-based minister in this government and the Premier in

MR. DINN: trying to get this unemployment rate down and have succeeded to a certain point. But, Mr. Chairman, it is running out. The only thing we have in this Province is to develop our resources for the benefit of the people of this Province and, Mr. Chairman, it makes me a little bit sick - and I may have gotten to a bit of a debating point, I could not debate earlier today, as the Speaker ruled, but I can now.

MR. STAGG: That is right.

MR. DINN: I can now say what was going on last night on T.V. where we had a leader of a major political party in this Province go on a news network in this Province and tell the people of Newfoundland how he would trade off the resources of this Province, sell it out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, it would make people sick.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. DINN: We are talking about \$448 million and the hon. member gets up in this House and makes a fool of himself for ten minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Give it away!

MR. DINN: And he is from a fishing district. Mr. Chairman, he should be up lambasting his leader for what he said on T.V. last night. A sell-out, that is what it is, a sell-out like the Upper Churchill. He wants to sell out the fisheries now. He would sell out anything he could sell out. Well, it is important to me, Mr. Chairman. Every job that the hon. member - 1,000 metric tons of fish -

MR. STAGG: This is his position on the offshore.

MR. DINN: I have seen enough of the Leader of the Opposition to know that I should not read junk.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, I saw him on T.V. last night and he talked about how he would sit down and negotiate and trade off more. That is what he talked about.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: There is another hon. member from St. Mary's - The Capes. One thousand metric tons -

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible), Mr. Chairman, (inaudible).

MR. DINN: Stand up in this debate and

MR. DINN: tell us how you disagree with what your leader said last night on TV.

MR. STAGG: Right.

MR. DINN: A thousand metric tons of fish is eighteen jobs for St. Mary's. That is what it is. That is what it is all about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: It is \$12,000 for that one man year.

MR. FLIGHT: What about the (inaudible)

MR. DINN: It is \$12,000 per year for that plant worker.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Moores is saying (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh;

MR. DINN: That is what it is all about, \$12,000. Not only does he write off the \$11,000 that went this year to Nova Scotia - I am not against Nova Scotia -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: - but my job is to make sure that our resources are to the benefit of the people in this Province, not sell it out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: You sound like a Liberal to me.

MR. DINN: Not sell it out. Get up on your feet, you are from a fishing district, get up on your feet and tell your leader -

MR. STAGG: Get out of your -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Baird): Order, please!

MR. DINN: -tell your leader that you disagree with his position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. DINN: Surely -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Baird): Order, please!

I realize that some debate is flexible in this House, but I think we are getting a little noisy and it is very difficult for the Chair to hear what is going on. I would ask members to please restrain themselves.

The hon. Minister for Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Surely, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) is not for the position his leader outlined on TV last night.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Is he?

MR. DINN: Surely he is not. Stand up on your feet in this debate and you will have ten minutes right after I sit down. I want to hear -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. STAGG: What your position is.

MR. DINN: - what your position is. The people of Newfoundland want to hear what your position is from St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. STAGG: They wanted two more Come By Chances (inaudible).

MR. DINN: Is it sell it out? Is it negotiate it away? The leader of the Opposition on TV said last night the fishery is in a mess. Do you know who controls the fishery in Newfoundland?

MR. STAGG: Yes.

MR. DINN: Romeo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes. Yes.

MR. DINN: We are looking for -

AN HON. MEMBER. Lover Boy.

MR. DINN: We are looking for shared jurisdiction. It is in a mess because Romeo is handling it.

MR. STAGG: Yes.

MR. DINN: That is what is on the go.

MR. STAGG: Romeo, Romeo wherefore art thou?

MR. DINN: Get up and disagree. Get up and fight for the people of this Province that is what you are here for, that is what you got elected for, Mr. Chairman.

The people in the fishing districts of this Province had to sit by last night and watch the Leader of the Opposition, a major political party in this Province, go on TV and tell us about how he would sit down and negotiate it away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Trade it off.

MR. DINN: It has been going on for years. It has been traded out for years.

MR. STAGG: Yes.

MR. FLIGHT: What did Mr. Moores say?

MR. DINN: We listened to the debate for the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) talk last week about another refinery.

MR. STAGG: Yes.

MR. DINN: Another refinery like the one we had before?

MR. STAGG: Yes that is what he wants.

MR. DINN: Does the hon. member understand what happened to the Come By Chance refinery?

MR. STAGG: He wanted two, two Come By Chances.

MR. DINN: That this Province was on the hook for \$600 million if that deal had not been renegotiated.

MR. STAGG: Right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Six hundred million dollars, a sell-out is what it was.

MR. THOMS: Go back to (inaudible).

MR. DINN: We had nothing to do with that refinery going down, it just went bankrupt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: And we would have been on the hook for \$600 million.

MR. STAGG: We would have been owned by the (inaudible).

MR. DINN: It was renegotiated, renegotiated -

MR. STAGG: The (inaudible) would have (inaudible).

MR. DINN: - to the tune of - we cut down on the debt -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Baird): Order, please!

MR. DINN: We cut down on the debt to this Province -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) cannot take it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Baird): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: That is all right (inaudible).

MR. DINN: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans stood up in this House, a man from a forestry area, Half of his district depends on the forestry and he stood up in this House of Assembly against the spray programme, is what he did.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame! Shame!

MR. DINN: I would like to have his speech, to have it published in The Grand Falls Advertiser for his people.

MR. RIDEOUT: Their leader had to apologize to the millmanager in Grand Falls.

MR. DINN: So his people could know what he said.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Yes, as the hon. member said,

AN HON. MEMBER: Your leader had to apologize.

MR. DINN: As the hon. member said, he had to apologize. He had to go out -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Baird): Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: He had to apologize to the people of Grand Falls.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, one can see that the hon. members opposite cannot take it.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. DINN: They cannot take it. They can listen to their leader on TV tell the people how he would sell-out our resources.

MR. BARRY: Remember Barry's theorem now.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is that?

MR. BARRY: The louder they howl the closer you are getting to the truth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right. Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: That is absolutely correct,

Mr. Chairman, the closer you get to the truth the louder they howl.

MR. STAGG: Right.

MR. DINN: And we noticed the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is starting to howl again, baying like the wolves, cannot listen in the House of Assembly, continues to break the rules. He is not even in his own seat, and he better watch the seat he is in because when you get near areas like that you are apt to get a little bit of egg on your face, you see.

Mr. Chairman, this government is for employing Newfoundlanders, we are doing it at a rate of 9,500 a year and if we are not impeded -

MR. STAGG: Right, right!

MR. DINN: - by foolish statements, like the statement of the Leader of the Opposition last night -

MR. STAGG: Subversion, subversion is what it is.

MR. DINN: Absolutely. Correct.

MR. DINN: That is what it is

MR. STAGG: Subversive.

MR. DINN: If we are not restrained, if we are not held back by statements made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) on television last night, it may go to 10,000 in 1981. What will hon. members say then? We will have the poor old hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) stand up in this House and say, 'But are they new jobs?'

MR. STAGG: Are they new jobs?

MR. DINN: Are they new jobs? He stood up here last year, Mr. Chairman, and made a fool of himself. I said last year that we created 9500 jobs. He said, "Yes, but are they new jobs?". I said, 'No, but they were not there last year, so they are relatively new'. Well, that is the same way I will tell the hon. member that the 9500 jobs that were created in 1980 are not new jobs but they were not there in 1979.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not too dusty.

MR. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, they are not too dusty. That is right. And, Mr. Speaker, if we do not hear more statements like the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition, we will be able to get more jobs in the fisheries. Every thousand pounds now - I want it to sink in - is eighteen jobs. So every pound that the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to sell out, I want the members for the fishing districts at the next caucus to grab a hold of him and shake him so he knows what he is talking about, Mr. Speaker. That is what I want. I want to make that point to the hon. members opposite, especially those members who are, as I know, very concerned about their districts and embarrassed about what the hon. Leader of the Opposition said last night, embarrassed by what the Leader of the Opposition said on television last night. And another thing,

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, another thing that the hon. members should know before I sit down - I only have about a minute left -

MR. CHAIRMAN (BAIRD): You have about ten seconds left.

MR. DINN: - I would like all hon. members opposite to know that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) last night said that the fishery is in a mess. Well, Mr. Chairman, if we could get a little bit of shared jurisdiction, if we can negotiate with Ottawa and get a little bit of shared jurisdiction we might be able to clean up some of the mess that Romeo has the fishery in. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman -

MR. DINN: He wants to tell us what his position is on it (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: No, Tom, he is too hot.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I simply want, first of all, to put in perspective some of the things that have gone on in the House over the last couple of days and to give some rationale for some of the actions that the Opposition took in the last day and a half. Now, Mr. Chairman, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. House Leader, would make it appear that the Opposition was attempting to discredit the hon. the Minister of Transportation, the hon. the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett). Now, Mr. Chairman, that was not the intention of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman. It was not the Opposition. We indeed expressed our sorrow, we expressed our regret at the results of these particular actions. And I, for one,

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, want to personally say how sorry I was. And, Mr. Chairman, we indicated today when we raised the point of privilege, as we thought we should have, when we raised the point of privilege we indicated today, when the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) immediately withdrew his remarks, we certainly indicated where we stood on that particular matter. And, Mr. Chairman, we believed the letter that was submitted by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett), we believed what the member said. And, Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate because when this sort of thing happens it casts negative reflections on all hon. members and I think that is something we forget. And, Mr. Chairman, I, for one, was certainly not happy over that particular situation.

Let me further say I do not believe that the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) intentionally set out to defraud the government, I do not believe that. And, of course, what was unfortunate was an error of judgement under a pressure situation and that was unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, and that has happened to so many politicians. But again let me say that we on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, have had no intentions to undermine the member for Trinity North, Mr. Chairman. We have made it quite clear. We accepted his own admission of error in judgement, Mr. Chairman, and we think that we did the people of this Province a great favour by raising the point of privilege so that the Premier could get a chance to clarify his particular position.

Mr. Chairman, Hansard is the official record of what happens in this House, and if somebody were to read these incidents in the future with only the record that we had, I think that there would be some

MR. LUSH:

questions asked, Mr. Chairman, as to the way the Premier performed in that particular instance. And, Mr. Chairman, with these few remarks I will end on that note and I want - I realize that I have to finish at five-thirty-

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave. By leave.

MR. LUSH:

- but I only wish that I had the time to respond to some of the dribble that was thrown out here a few moments ago by the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). And, Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that he chose to make some cheap political points out of a tremendous interview on television last evening by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) who, as I said, Mr. Chairman, in responding to the Ministerial Statement that the minister made earlier this afternoon, was not at all, Mr. Chairman, was not at all doing anything damaging to the hiring of Newfoundlanders or increasing employment in this Province, but rather was advocating a policy that would encourage the employment of more Newfoundlanders, Mr. Chairman, that is what he was doing. That was the approach of the Leader of the Opposition, enunciating and advising this government to take a different approach, advising this government to get away, to drop its confrontation tactics with other parts of Canada and with Canada as a whole. That is what the Leader of the Opposition was doing, advising the government, Mr. Chairman, to take a more conciliatory, a more harmonious approach for the benefit of Newfoundland and for the benefit of Canada. That is what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was doing, Mr. Chairman, and was not engaging in cheap, bush league politics. That is what the -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird):

Order, please!

MR. LUSH: - the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) was taking the highroad, Mr. Chairman. And I see Mr. Chairman is looking at me. I guess he wants me to sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave. By leave.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, if I have leave I will continue on but if I do not have leave -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Is it agreed the hon. member continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave. By leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Leave is not granted.

MR. LUSH: The hon. the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has -

MR. MARSHALL: How long is the hon. member going to be?

MR. LUSH: Oh I would just take up my time, about ten minutes. I have been six minutes now. I would just take up my time.

MR. THOMS: Give him four minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has four minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, if I have leave I will continue for the four or five minutes. Do I have leave?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. LUSH: No. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Leave is not granted.

MR. LUSH: The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) has demonstrated his graciousness again, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): A point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I saw, Your Honour, and I am only raising this point of order to make sure that the Chair is properly protected, Your Honour, I saw the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) doing this to the Chair, as much as to say get out.

MR. FLIGHT: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Now, the Government House Leader does not direct the Chair in this House, Mr. Chairman, and I think he was very discourteous to Your Honour.

AN HON. MEMBER: You tell him that.

MR. HANCOCK: He does not want to be in the House.

MR. NEARY: And I am afraid if it is not brought to the attention of members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that it could get out of hand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order -

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, there is no point of order really.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not think there is a point of order.

MR. NEARY: It is a point of ignorance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Obviously the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) interprets something the hon. the President of the Council did which really the Chair did not see.

MR. NEARY: You should not motion the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the Committee rise.
On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

April 2, 1981

Tape No. 910

NM - 4

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and directs me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): It being five-thirty or just beyond five-thirty a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House.

The matter raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is irresponsible statements being made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I note that the Premier is not in his seat and my dissatisfaction was with the statements that were made by the hon. the Premier. I do not know - he has been under tremendous pressure in the last few days, Mr. Speaker - I do not know if he is still in his office or if he is not feeling well and gone home or just what the problem is. But seeing that he is not here - and I would not want to add to his troubles and put him under further pressure, Mr. Speaker, I realize the tremendous pressure the gentleman is under - so I withdraw the - seeing he is not here to answer it, I do not want anybody else to answer it because there is only one man who can answer my dissatisfaction, the Premier himself - so I withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member withdraws.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday at 10:00 a.m.