



Province of Newfoundland

THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XXXIX

Third Session

Number 67

---

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

*Speaker: Honourable James Russell*

Friday

14 December 1984

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
Order, please!

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier whether he agrees with the approach which Mr. Wilson has indicated that the Conservative Party in Ottawa took prior to the last election, where Mr. Wilson stated they deliberately avoided any references to cuts in social programmes for fear that the electoral might take it the wrong way?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
It does not sound like the way the Liberal Party of Canada would act. I would answer the question with a question, Mr. Speaker. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) agree with the way his leader in Ottawa acted the election before that when Mr. Crosbie came out with eighteen cents on a gallon of gas and the Liberal Party said, no way, then proceeds to put it up fifty cents? Does he agree with that approach before an election?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
The hon. Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary?

MR. BARRY:  
I must say, Mr. Speaker, at the time I felt that that was not really fair pool. Nor, Mr. Speaker, did I feel that the bringing in of wage and price controls after the fact was fair pool.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier whether he agrees that there should be further cuts in spending programmes in Canada in light of the fact that we have a situation where the OECD of Europe had a report recently completed which indicates that Canada is either fifth or sixth in line in terms of the Western industrialized nations with respect to the percentage of the Gross National Product which is spent on social programmes? Does the Premier think that it is appropriate for the Government of Canada to adopt as its policy the cutting of social programmes at this time?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
A number of report by the OECD over the last number of years has also shown that I think we were next to Italy, second last as it related to productivity and that we were not really generating the wealth in this country per capita that other Western industrialized nations were doing.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the approach that the Government of Canada is taking in that they are going to consult widely on a range of social programmes that they wish to review. And to

consult very widely, I do not think, for example, in the unemployment insurance scheme where it relates to provinces like our own, that very many changes could be made at this time, especially as it affects the underdeveloped areas of Canada, and the ones that, for whatever reason, are still disadvantaged. But I think a healthy public debate on that whole area, which is now going to ensue through the First Ministers' Conference first, then through a national summit and then through consultations with groups who are involved in these social policies sphere is not a bad idea at all.

I do believe that we have to increase our productivity generate more wealth in this country. And if we can do that, generate more wealth, then obviously there will be more wealth to go around for social programmes as it will for everything else.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

Would the Premier agree, in light of the economic conditions and in light of the history of this Province, that this Province probably has more to lose than any other province in Canada when this type of review of social programmes is undertaken by the Government of Canada?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, no I do not think

so. Because from most of the comments that I have heard from federal ministers, and, of course, it is all in a very preliminary stage and a consultative stage, from what I have heard, even on the most sacred of social programmes, they are looking at the higher end of the wage scale. And knowing that the per capita earned income and the wage scales in Newfoundland, which I think are the lowest in Canada, we would be the last to be affected because we do not have too many people at the higher end of the income bracket.

So the wealthier provinces like Ontario and Alberta and Saskatchewan and those kinds of provinces would be hit hardest first because they have more higher income people per capita proportionally than Newfoundland has. So I would see it that we would be perhaps the last to feel any impact of that. And by the same token, Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, if that is done at the higher end of the scale on some of the more sacred social programmes, I think one of the thrusts that the federal government is going to take with the savings is to redistribute some of them to those who are less well off and then that will benefit Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier, or maybe the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), but I will probably address my question to the Premier. I understand that the Province of Ontario and the Province of British Columbia have

banned happy hour drinking in their provinces. Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is knowing that our Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has as many pubs and beer outlets and liquor outlets as any other province per capita, and knowing that the Federal Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie) is planning on bringing in stiffer laws for drunk driving, and taking into consideration that there are a lot of accidents and deaths as a result of drunk driving, would the Premier advise the hon. House if there is any intention of this government bringing in regulations abandoning the Happy Hour as it is carried out in this Province by many beer and pub outlets in this Province?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a sneaking suspicion that come January or February, when the offshore agreement is finally signed, sealed and delivered between the two governments, and then legislation is brought in to give legislative sanction to it, and constitutionalization later on, in 1985, hopefully there are going to be an awful lot of happy hours around Newfoundland that we have been waiting for for a long, long time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I believe there will

be an awful lot of happy hours around come January or February. I again would like to ask the Premier, if this government is planning to bring in legislation that will curtail pubs and beer outlets in this Province from selling beers and wines and spirits at a cheaper price at such a time in the day?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY:  
Mr. Speaker, I think it was back in August 1983, there was an unfortunate accident on the Trans-Canada Highway when Barbara Linda Cheryl Randell and Windy Karen Elaine Brophy were killed by a pulpwood truck. The hon. gentleman will recall the circumstances. Judge Jenkins, I think, conducted an investigation into the circumstances of the deaths of these two young girls and made certain recommendations, and regulations were to be put in place governing, for instance, the safe loading of tractor-trailers. Would the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) inform the House - because he was the one who released the report and said that the recommendations would be carried, some of the recommendations involving his colleague, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) - if the recommendations and findings of Judge Jenkins have yet been implemented?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman is probably aware when these provincial court enquiries come in they have recommendations and a number of them can be recommendations involving departments. This particular one was a recommendation to the Department of Transportation with respect to the loading of tractor-trailers. I would really have to check with somebody in the Department of Transportation with what success they have been able to implement that recommendation. I would not know it offhand, but I will certainly undertake to pass it along to the Minister of Transportation.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman also make a note to find out from the Transportation Department if the haul-offs to be provided along the Trans-Canada Highway for tractor-trailers loaded with pulpwoods have been built and also if recommendations governing safe loading of tractor-trailers and the structural design of these tractor-trailers have been implemented? Perhaps I could ask the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) if the recommendation in connection with Occupational Health and Safety carrying out periodic inspections of the equipment has been implemented?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that when the accident happened we had somebody from Occupational Health and Safety go out and do a complete inspection and as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) has said a lot of the jurisdiction for this comes under the Department of Transportation and Communications. The role of Occupational Health and Safety in this area would probably be limited to occasional spot-checks as a result of the recommendations that came out and, of course, the inspectors are doing that.

With respect to the recommendations of Judge Jenkins, we are working with the Department of Transportation and Communications and we will continue to do the spot-checks as recommended by Judge Jenkins.

The other thing is that there was a study done in Ontario on transportation in the pulpwood hauling industry and we have studied that to see what if anything we can do to possibly improve the conditions here in the Province.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is not in his seat so perhaps I will forgo the question until he gets back.

The question I wanted the Minister

of Manpower to address himself to was a recommendation made by Judge Jenkins that Occupational Health and Safety carry out periodic inspections of woods equipment, trucks and tractor-trailers, that transport pulpwood. Now I am asking the hon. gentleman to specifically address himself to that question: Has that been done? I read the Minister of Justice's (Mr. Ottenheimer) statement and when he released the findings of Judge Jenkins he assured the people in the Province that these recommendations would be carried out in the near future I would like the hon. gentleman to tell us whether or not that is being done.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I just found out for the hon. gentleman that over the last year, since the report has been released, the Department of Transportation has held meetings with the Truckers Association, and not only the Truckers Association as such because a lot of them are into dump trucks as opposed to the tractor-trailers, then they sat down and met with all the owners of tractor-trailers around the Province, and then they met with the paper companies who receive the wood and had meetings with them. As a result of those meetings, regulations have been now formulated and will be before Cabinet in the next couple of weeks.

MR. NEARY:

Just for the wood part of it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Just for the wood truck part of it. Now it could enlarge further - I do not know - because I just got the information since the hon. gentleman asked the question. But I know that meetings have been held with all those concerned and draft regulations are now prepared and ready to go before Cabinet.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

The question I have is a serious one and I would like it to be treated that way. Unfortunately, most of the ministers whom I want to ask the question of are not here this morning, so I will ask it of the Premier, I guess.

As I think all members know, over the last little while one of the former Premiers of this Province suffered a stroke. While I do not want to dwell on that, what it does point out, in a rather more urgent fashion, is the major project that he is working on right now, which is to produce a new encyclopedia of Newfoundland and Labrador. From having looked at the first two volumes, I would suggest is by far the best work that his individual and this publishing company have done. Given that only the first two volumes have been produced, which I think go up to G or H or something like that, as it now stands it will be of very limited use to a lot of institutions in the Province that should have access to this. Out in Alberta, for example, a company are producing a Canadian encyclopedia has been generously supported by the provincial government there. My question to the Premier, or

whoever else is capable of answering it, is will the provincial government look into what help it can give to ensure that this extremely valuable project can be brought to completion so that these resources can be available throughout the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know where the project stands as to its completion, nor do I know the present financial arrangements or whether they are sufficient to complete the project, given that the hon. gentleman may still be able to do some work on it. I do know that last year, on the first two volumes which are now completed, we did undertake to ensure that they were distributed to schools around the Province. That is about to be undertaken now in the next week or two, that is 700 of each volume for a total of 1,400 of them. As a matter of fact, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) brought to my attention there a couple of days ago that they were ready for distribution. So we will be moving on that. I do not know if there is a problem getting the other two done or not but I will surely look into it and check it out.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. the Premier if there have been any meetings with the Buchans Action Committee recently. We all know that Buchans is undergoing

very difficult times, that the mine is in the process of being phased out completely, that they are desperately looking for other minerals in the area and so forth, and that the Buchans Action Committee have been greatly involved in trying to bring about alternatives to the mining industry in that town to keep the economy of Buchans afloat. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House if there have been any meetings, what the purpose of the meetings were and what action has been taken on any of the meetings held recently with the Buchans Action Committee?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of meetings between the Buchans Action Committee and the Government of Newfoundland over the last several years. I had a meeting with them myself earlier this year at which time we reviewed a lot of the alternatives that they had studied or had recommended to have studied. I think five or six Cabinet ministers then went to Buchans as part of the Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet, so a Cabinet committee actually visited Buchans and sat down with them in their own community. I think the Government of Newfoundland paid their way to Ottawa to make representations on things which were under the federal jurisdiction. I promised that I would not have them incur that expense, so we paid for their transportation and board and lodging while they were in Ottawa and helped arrange some of the meetings for them. They are continuing now with some of the projects. As you know, the

federal pen location is still a matter of some dispute and I think they are following through on that. They had brought forward some tourism alternatives, they had brought forward some alternatives relating to their hospital, they brought forward some alternatives relating to their landing strip there that I am aware of. Forestry can be important if you go through on that road past Buchans and go Southwest from there almost to the Burgeo Road, and then there is gap in between there. There is some forestry related activity.

I just have a note from the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) who says that there is a proposal in now as it relates to a tourism development there before his department for his consideration.

MR. NEARY:

What is it? What is the project?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I think it is a hotel - motel proposal for tourism. They are trying to do a lot of work on the Red Indian Lake tourism end of things with the development association. One of the biggest problems you have in Buchans is the same problem you had in my constituency, in Little Bay, Springdale, South Brook, Robert's Arm and Gulbridge is that you built up a large expertise in the mining industry. They are miners, they are drillers, they are mill people, they know no other work.

MR. NEARY:

Muckers, blasters, pipe fitters.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So they have very specialized trades which make it difficult for

individuals, especially if they are, I suppose, beyond forty or forty-five or whatever, to get into a retraining kind of scheme. So the other thing we have been looking at very seriously with the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dawe) is that, as the hon. member might know, in addition to the gold find in the Isle aux Morts area, if you will, or the Burnt Island Pond area, but I think more particularly there is a second gold discovery in the Cinq Cerf Bay area.

MR. NEARY:

LaPoile Bay, yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Cinq Cerf. The distance between Buchans and that Cinq Cerf deposit is not all that far and it may be possible that we can utilize a lot of the miners who are bona fide miners, in that development.

MR. NEARY:

Would Cinq Cerf be underground or surface operated?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is a surface operation. It is one of the more significant gold discoveries in Canada in the last fifty years. The only other one that might equal it, which the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) might know about, is the one in Ontario, Kemlow, which is a major new discovery. It will be an open pit operation. It is extremely promising and there is a lot of drilling going on. So we are thinking that we might be able to do some kind of a linkage as it relates to some of the bona fide miners in Buchans with that development which is not all that far off.

MR. NEARY:

Do not rob all the jobs of the



Southwest Coast now.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Pardon?

MR. NEARY:

I said do not rob the jobs from the people on the Southwest Coast.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, but you are going to need certain expertise there. There are drillers who are not available on the Southwest Coast. My best friend is a driller in the mines and he just finished at Cat Arm and now he is on his way to the Yukon and Northern BC and places like that, and he has special expertise. There are a group of them, I have about five different teams in Green Bay, and every company is after them. They get calls every day looking for their talents. They go down and they actually do the drift in an underground mine, do the drilling that is necessary. It is a very specialized and difficult trade that you learn more by experience than anything else. And it was, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report, mostly the people from Green Bay and White Bay who actually did the tunnels at Cat Arm, all of whom had been in either Churchill Falls, have done most of the mines in Northern BC and parts of Alberta, Baffin Island, the Yukon and Northwest Territories. So there are a number of things you might be able to do in tourism to attract more tourists off the Trans-Canada down to Buchans. If there are some people in Buchans who are forestry minded, there is some wood that is going to have to be cut by Abitibi-Price, from there to the Burgeo road, where we might be able to help them. And if we can get the Cinq Cerf mine underway then we are going to be able to

get quite a few more there. We are looking at upgrading the landing strip because this Cinq Cerf mine could possibly be a fly in and fly out operation; it could be two weeks on and three weeks off, the kind of thing like they do offshore. A lot of the mines in the Northwest Territories are done like that now and that would be a very short trip for the Buchans people, they would not be very far away from home at all. We are looking at the hospital and possible uses for it as some kind of a specialized institution. There is a lot of work going on there and a lot of the ministers have been involved in it. So that is a brief, cursory look at what we are trying to do to assist the people of Buchans.

MR. NEARY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A final supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, God must have been a Liberal or I must be living right because the two gold deposits that are showing the most potential in Newfoundland are in my district, Cinq Cerf and Burnt Island Pond. Mr. Speaker, I was encouraged by the statements from the hon. the Premier that the Cinq Cerf gold exploration and deposit have great possibilities. I think the Burnt Island Pond one has great possibilities also by the way.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Not near as much as Cinq Cerf.

MR. NEARY:

On a scale of one to ten, it might be six.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If Burnt Island is six then Cinq Cerf is ten.

MR. NEARY:

Well, give it 9.5. Mr. Speaker, what is the situation now as far as Buchans is concerned? There are still some people working in the mines. Is it rapidly grinding to a halt? How many people are employed there now? When will the mine cease operations completely and leave the people of Buchans economically marooned?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I think they are just about finished. There is just some clean-up and that going on there right now. I think the last number of people that I saw working there was somewhere around the hundred mark but I think it is down below that now. There may be only thirty or forty working there now, if there is that. The other problem you had in Buchans was they tried to get into the tailing to generate barite for the offshore. Because of transportation costs they were not really able to compete with barite from other places and it proved not to be as successful as they thought, where there was suppose to be somewhere in the order of twenty-five to fifty jobs in that kind of an operation. But it is winding down. I think it has wound down now, and there might only be very few people on right now as it relates to the mining activity itself. There is just no ore.

MR. NEARY:

If my hon. colleague will allow me I have another quick question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A final supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

In connection with the barite operation that the hon. gentlemen there opposite held out great hope for for the people of Buchans, what has happened to that operation? I heard the hon. gentleman just refer to high transportation costs. Well what about our local preference? Has it gone out the window as far as barite is concerned? We are bringing it from long distances, from Asia somewhere or the Middle East.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

From Ireland.

MR. NEARY:

We are bringing it from Ireland. There must be heavy transportation costs involved there, Mr. Speaker, as far as the barite operation is concerned. Anyway I would like for the hon. gentleman to answer that question. I had another important one that I was going to ask but it has slipped my mind at the moment. These late nights get to me.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well there have been studies done and I have seen the studies comparing the costs and why they are so great and it is just way beyond the local preference, the cost is far more. It might also be in the quality of barite that is produced and what it can do in relation to other barite. The other factor there, another piece of information is that the barite mine at Colliers Point, I think is under development right now. I think there were some early start-up problems with various operators who for one reason or another did not have the cash to complete the job but it is underway now and most of the barite, I think for offshore, is

going to come from Colliers Point. But there has been problems in the whole barite operation using the tailings in Buchans which have proven that in order for it to be economic we have to charge a price which is a lot more.

MR. NEARY:

While you are on your feet, what about the big holes, the glory holes? Are they all going to be filled?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, that is the other thing that is happening now. While there are still some people on there is a lot of environmental clean-up going on in Buchans right now. There are a number of good buildings there, I was told a little while ago, that I think the community are going to get their hands on which could be of some benefit down the road.

MR. NEARY:

For \$1.00, I hope.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, not \$1.00, for nothing, a big difference.

MR. NEARY:

Well to make it legal, \$1.00.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I think they are just going to give it to them as a gift which is also legal. So there have been a lot of studies done on the barite situation. We, as a government, sort of pushed it but the studies just show, and I do not know all of the factors that are involved, that the cost that they would have to sell that barite for is a lot more than it can be delivered here from other sources, a very, very different price. But we did then continue to push the Colliers

Point area and it looks like we are going to get most of our barite from indigenous sources for the offshore over the next few years.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell);

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. Some time ago when the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) brought in the food prices survey, one of the recommendations was that government would take the necessary steps to terminate its involvement in the food retailing business in coastal Labrador communities. Government operated stores should be turned over as soon as possible to private operators and competitive markets encouraged. Could the minister advise if his department have advertised or have received any proposals from private enterprise to operate the government stores on Coastal Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, the department has not advertised as such recently for proposals or other bids to operate the retail stores on the Coast of Labrador, there are five of them involved. There was some activity about a year ago when a couple of interested companies visited several of the stores along the North Coast of Labrador and expressed an interest in them. However, the department is analyzing the report that was presented by my colleague and

other members of the hon. House earlier this year, and in my opinion it would be a prudent move on the part of government at the proper time to get out of the retail trade on the North Coast of Labrador, especially in light of the fact that there are a number of responsible business people along the Coast now who it appears would be willing in most cases to expand their operations and take up trade that we have been doing in the past. So what I am saying, I guess, Mr. Speaker, is that we, as a government, would be interested in turning these stores over, based on certain conditions, to the private industry, but as yet the decision has not been made.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. If it is the intention of the government to turn over those stores to private enterprise - for example, in Makkovik at the present time there is a new store that is probably going to cost \$400,000 to \$600,000 to construct and there is a new one proposed for Hopedale next year - if the government is planning to turn over the retail operations to private enterprise, why would they spend such an extraordinary amount of taxpayer dollars to build new facilities if they are going to turn it over to private enterprise?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware, and perhaps other hon. gentlemen, the operation in Makkovik, the retail store there, has been one of the best run operations along the North Coast of Labrador, if not the best. One of the problems we had is that the building in which goods are sold, plus the storage space, has not been as adequate as it should have been. In the case of Hopedale, the building itself is in very poor repair as well. So what we are doing, and have been doing over the last number of years, is replacing the retail stores in all of these communities with modern, more efficient buildings. One of the rationales behind that, other than providing a much better and improved service to the residents of each community, is we think it might be a little more attractive to private industry if these facilities are there and they then are in a position to take over a much better operation that it had been in the past.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! The time for the Question Period has expired.

#### Notices of Motion

MR. SPEAKER:  
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 Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act, (No. 2)".

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Insurance Act."

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Minister of Education I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Consolidate The Law Respecting The Department of Education."

### Presenting Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to present a petition signed by forty-eight residents of the community of Hopedale in the district of Torngat Mountains. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) presented two such petitions, I think there are a number of those petitions, Mr. Speaker, and it has to do with a uniform electricity rate throughout the Province. And, Mr. Speaker, as the other petitions state, those residents in Hopedale have asked the government to assure them, as residents of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, that they should be treated equally. Why should there be three electrical rates? Even in Labrador alone there are three electrical rates. In fact, Mr. Speaker, take for example Rigolet which is only ninety miles out the

bay from Happy Valley-Goose Bay, and for the same number of kilowatts in the Wintertime, for example, 1500 kilowatts, residents of Rigolet pay 152 per cent more for residents of Happy Valley-Goose Bay, to keep their lights and their freezers going, their electrical stoves and their appliances going, and keep themselves comfortable. They have to pay 152 per cent more for electrical rates in Rigolet as compared to Happy Valley-Goose Bay. Because Happy Valley-Goose Bay, naturally, is on the Churchill grid.

And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the people in St. John's, also are paying a different rate again, a little more expensive rate than the people in Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

MR. HICKEY:

Your buddies gave it all away.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) interjects and says, 'Your buddies gave it away.' Now, Mr. Speaker, hindsight is a great thing to have and I would probably think that with Bill 37 we can see that this government is giving a lot away also.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that nobody in this Province, bar none, would not agree that there should be a uniform electrical rate in this Province. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people in Rigolet, the people in Hopedale, the people in Black Tickle, or the people in Grey River, should not be required to pay more for electrical rates than people elsewhere. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if this government, if the Department of Consumer

Affairs, or the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), who is responsible for liquor and beer sales in this Province, will allow liquor and beer to be the same price throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, surely goodness they should demand that the Public Utilities Board make sure that the electrical rates will be uniform throughout the Province.

This petition is signed by forty-eight residents in the community of Hopedale, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to place it on the table and refer it to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I want to wholeheartedly support the prayer of the petition.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Have a cup of tea.

MR. NEARY:

I will not say what is on my mind. I think we are all getting punchy here, Mr. Speaker, but I could not help but think of the cup of tea that was in here.

DR. COLLINS:

Send it out for a lab report.

MR. BARRY:

A urine analysis.

MR. NEARY:

No, not a urine analysis. I suggested they send the tea down to the laboratory and have it analyzed.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the prayer of the petition soably presented. This is the

second day in a row that we have had a petition of this nature and there will be more such petitions in future. And the hon. gentleman who is responsible for energy (Mr. Marshall), his only excuse is that the economy is bad because of the mismanagement of the administration of which he is a member, the economy is bad and therefore they cannot equalize, standardize electricity rates in this Province for people who have to purchase their electricity from Newfoundland Hydro using these diesel generators. And, Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter indeed because these people consider themselves to be third or fourth class Canadians and Newfoundlanders. I have three communities in my own riding - Petites, Grand Bruit and LaPoile using diesel generated electricity. Mr. Speaker, these people are being punished unnecessarily. But it is not the horrendous state of the economy brought about by the mismanagement of this administration that annoys these people. All you need, Mr. Speaker, is use your head, use a little common sense and eliminate the oil drum. Now down in Hopedale they have, but down in my district they have not. All up and down the Southwest Coast they are still dragging those forty-five gallon oil drums up over rocks and stumps and cliffs in the middle of Winter, very expensive, very inconvenient, and it creates a hardship for the people. Now Woodward's are in the process of installing storage tanks along the Southwest Coast, thanks to my suggest, because I was the one who initiated it in Northern Labrador in case the hon. gentleman is not aware of that. That was my project.

MR. GOUDIE:

Indeed it was.

MR. NEARY:

Right on! Right on, Sir!

Mr. Speaker, there are things that they can do to reduce the cost. They can modernize the operation and there will be countervailing savings. And there countervailing savings should be used to standardize to equalize electricity rates for everybody across this Province. These people in Northern Labrador, Southern Labrador, the Great Northern Peninsula, on the Southwest Coast, Mr. Speaker, are second or third rate Newfoundlanders. They will never be equal to the rest of Newfoundland until their electricity rates are standardized.

The hon. gentleman should get up and support this petition. The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), Mr. Speaker, very seldom, very rarely speaks out on the problems in the Southwest Coast. And we have as many problems on the Southwest Coast as in Northern and Southern Labrador in the remote communities. And the hon. gentleman should get up and say, 'I wholeheartedly support the prayer of that petition,' and try to push it in Cabinet, try to persuade his colleagues, especially the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) to abandon this negative attitude that he has that they cannot do anything until the economy improves. I say God help the people in Hopedale if they have to wait that long, Mr. Speaker, until this crowd does anything positive about improving the Newfoundland and Labrador economy. They have wrecked the economy of this Province, Mr. Speaker.

This administration has made Newfoundland a disaster area. And the hon. gentleman gets up, very pious like and self-righteousness, and says, 'Oh, we cannot afford it now because of the terrible state of the Newfoundland and Labrador economy,' which was brought about by their own mismanagement, an admission of failure. We hear the Premier at it here night after night telling us the same thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, these people are not equal to Newfoundlanders inasmuch as they have to pay higher electricity rates than people who live in the urban centres, people who live in St. John's. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) should be able to find sufficient money to standardize these rates to make them equal. It is a big issue, Mr. Speaker, for a lot of people. This is a big issue. And hon. gentlemen should realize that there are quite a few votes involved in this issue too, Sir.

MR. ANDREWS:

So that is your concern!

MR. NEARY:

No, but I am reminding hon. gentlemen, I am reminding the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) that voters in these communities who are forced to buy electricity from the diesel generating stations at higher costs than their fellow Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker, there are quite a few such voters in these communities that could defeat or elect the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker. And he should be the first to take the lead because there are so many communities involved. I have three.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The time for the hon. member has expired.

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS:

Just a brief comment, Mr. Speaker, because I cannot let this pass. The ex-Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) talks about votes, and he should certainly be concerned about that. He had a major victory of eighteen or twenty-one votes. I am more concerned about the welfare of the people. The member for LaPoile talked about, Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the South Coast as second-class citizens. They are indeed not second-class citizens.

MR. WARREN:

They are treated as such.

MR. ANDREWS:

They are not treated as second-class citizens. And I will tell the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) of the \$22 million that this government put into the community of Burgeo, and the \$9 million that we put in the community of Ramea, and the hundreds of thousands of dollars that this government put into Francois, McCallum, and all of the communities along that coast. And there is not one community in my district where forty-five gallon oil drums are dragged up over the rocks as he referred to.

Now on the petition, Mr. Speaker, there are some concerns, yes. There are a great many concerns about the equalization of hydro rates in this Province. I have some concerns, the residents of the South Coast have concerns, but the simplistic mentality of the

Opposition is not going to solve this problem. This is a very complicated problem. It is one that is being addressed by the government and by Newfoundland Hydro.

Mr. Speaker, issues such as this, difficult issues require difficult solutions. And one of the most difficult solutions that we are facing here is where we are going to get the money to do that. We have been assured by Mr. Mulroney that our equalization payment will not be reduced, that we will get a fair deal on the offshore, and, when these things come to pass, I believe then we can address these major issues affecting the people of the South Coast and other areas of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Are there any other petitions?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to stand and present a petition on behalf of the residents of Grey River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

And I am very happy to hear the member for that area get up and say that he is concerned about the residents of the South Coast. We look forward with interest to his rising now in support of this petition.

MR. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.



MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for St. John's North on a point of order.

MR. CARTER:

I am all for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), or any member bringing a petition into this House, but I am well aware that the rules governing petitions are very loose.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, and your tongue is very loose.

MR. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder would you protect me from the idiotic element in this House?

I am well aware that the rules governing petitions are very loose. I wonder if, for instance, it would not be a good idea if all petitions were to be checked by the table, examined by the table for authenticity before they are presented in this House. I do not blame the hon. gentleman for voicing the concerns of people in Grey River or any other community in the Province, but I firmly believe that we should have proper procedures and make sure that they are genuine petitions and that they agree with reasonable guidelines. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that it would not hurt if the member were to perhaps put off presenting his petition until it could be checked by the Table or by some competent authority.

MR. TULK:

No, no, no.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

To that point of order, the Chair has no intention at this point in time of checking petitions.

MR. NEARY:

He wants you to censure members..

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There was an incident a little while ago when a copy of a petition was presented. At that time I made a ruling indicating that the responsibility really lies with the individual members in presenting original petitions and proper petitions to this House. Certainly if there is any further evidence to indicate that copies of petitions or documents are being presented that are not proper, then maybe the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) could be considered at that time. But the Chair has no intention of doing that at the present time.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think it might be an idea for somebody to ask the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) to table the speeches that are written for him before he presents them in the House as well.

Mr. Speaker, the petition is that, 'We the residents of Grey River, hereby petition the Provincial Government to pass immediately legislation so that there would be one price for electricity throughout our Province, whereas now there are four or five different rates depending on where you live. In our Province we pay the same sales tax of 12 per cent,

the same income tax, the same airfares, there is only one price for beer and liquor throughout our Province, we also pay the same tax on a carton of cigarettes.'

Why is it that we have to pay a different rate for electricity is the question of these eighty-four residents of Grey River.

'At present if you consume electricity that is generated by diesel, the more kilowatt hours you use the higher your bill becomes, whereas if you consume electricity generated by hydro power the more kilowatt hours you use, the cheaper your bill is. We believe that we are not treating our citizens equal and we hereby petition the government to have one rate for all our citizens regardless where they happen to live.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, presumably the government will be announcing a new appointment as President and Chief Executive Officer of Newfoundland Hydro, who will also become involved in heading up the Power Distribution Districts of the Province, and this might be the appropriate time to have government have a review, Mr. Speaker, of its policy with respect to the diesel powered communities of this Province. We know that there are problems of financing. However, Mr. Speaker, I have long felt that we could do with a review of our electricity policy with respect to our smaller communities, that we are a bit unsophisticated in our approach right now where we do have such a heavy discrepancy between the electricity that is available to the customer or consumer on a hydro grid and the customer or consumer who is dependent upon diesel generated electricity.

We can also do more, I believe, Mr. Speaker, to follow up on some of the mini-hydro projects that we started to experiment with when I was minister. I have not heard very much about those lately. There are possibilities for some mini-hydro projects, possibilities for other alternate sources of generating energy, one of which might be to use some of the excess heat generated from members of the other side in the course of debate. I think that is called cogeneration, Mr. Speaker. But we support on this side of the House, the eighty-four residents of Grey River who are seriously concerned about the cost of electricity that they are now experiencing and we would ask that this House give favourable consideration to their petition.

The people in Grey River have certain disadvantages not the least of which is the member standing in the doorway of the House here now. They have other geographic disadvantages. They have costs involved with their being an isolated community and we think that they deserve a little sympathy.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please! The time for the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has expired.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to comment on what I presume is a bona fide petition, I will take the word of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr.

Barry) that it is a bona fide petition. I would like to say that the Leader of the Opposition was a former energy minister and he knows what has to be done. He had a solution when he was energy minister which he not only failed to implement but failed as far as I am concerned to recommend. And even now he gets up and talks some kind of nonsense, talks about -

MR. NEARY:

Go eat your savoury.

MR. CARTER:

If the hon. gentleman would eat what I put in front of him I would supply him with his daily ration.

Mr. Speaker, the answer quite clearly lies in bringing in a uniform electric rate for all the citizens of this Province and also making sure that the initial kilowatt hours burned are at a lower rate than the later ones. There is nothing wrong with the schedule of rates for the diesel areas, what is wrong is the size of them. If all of the electricity rates in Newfoundland were to be restructured so that the initial rates were cheaper, say, for the first 1,000 or 1,500 kilowatt hours, and thereafter the succeeding kilowatt hours were more expensive, then you would see far less frivolous use of electricity. And I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that an awful lot of electricity is wasted in this Province with a consequent strain upon our generating resources and a good partial solution lies in a complete restructuring of the rates. I would suggest that the ministry have a look at this.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition presented by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) in behalf of eighty-four residents of the community of Grey River.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) with all due respect, came in with a good recommendation to government through Cabinet to make sure that there is a uniform rate in this Province. After all, Mr. Speaker, we all are Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, we all should be treated equally.

Another thing that should be borne in mind is the weather experienced by people on the Southwest Coast and people on the Coast of Labrador, Mr. Speaker. For example, the temperatures in Hopedale in January month could go as low as minus forty, and subsequently it requires more heat to warm their homes. And with diesel generated electricity, the more kilowatts that are used the more costly it becomes. Whereas, on the other hand, the more hydro generated kilowatts used the lower the cost is reduced accordingly.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is very, very unfair. There should be a maximum cost for a maximum number of kilowatts, whether it is hydro or whether it is diesel generated. This government has been preached at time and time again since 1979 by members on this side of the Legislature, saying that we need a uniform rate. And the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is the first member on that side of the Legislature who has said that we need a uniform rate in this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) has said we cannot

afford it. That is what the member said, "We cannot afford it." Now, Mr. Speaker, the people in Grey River cannot afford it either. The people in Grey River cannot afford to pay high electrical rates compared to the people in St. John's or the people in Goose Bay. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) should assure the residents in those communities throughout Newfoundland and Labrador who have to rely on diesel generated power that they will be treated as equal Newfoundlanders and equal Labradorians. I support the petition that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has placed on the table because it goes to show that there are in this Province, as far as this government is concerned, second-class citizens. Let us try to treat everybody equally.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Lapoile on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my colleague across the House, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), was hoping to have a few minutes on this petition and we were going to grant leave to the hon. gentleman, providing, of course, that I have equal time. So the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) tried to cut across him to make a motion of closure again, to try to gag the members of the House, including his own members, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

That is not a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

It is a point of order. How else can I raise it if I cannot raise as a point of order? The hon. gentleman is going to bring in another gag rule and this time he is going to cut off his own members because the petition happens to be from the hon. gentleman's district. So be fair and give the hon. gentlemen a chance to speak to support the petition.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

To that point of order the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Let me say first of all this is another abuse in the rules of the House as far as I am concerned. The petition was given to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews). It is silly to have two or three members opposite signing petitions and putting them before the House. So it is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and there is no leave given for anyone to speak beyond the people who have already spoken.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To the point of order raised by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the presentation of petitions was over and no other member could speak except by leave. The Chair, of course, has a policy of recognizing the first person who catches the Speaker's

eye and recognized the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House not rise at 1:00 p.m. today and that is seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer).

MR. SPEAKER:

That is not a debatable motion.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman stands in his place in this House -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

That is not a debatable motion.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, when I rose to speak the motion was not seconded.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is not a debatable motion. The Chair has to put the motion immediately.

The motion is that the House not rise at 1:00 p.m. Those in favour, 'Aye'?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against, 'Nay.'

MR. NEARY:

What a dictatorship!

MR. SPEAKER:

Carried.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the

Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the Orders of the Day be now read.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

That is not a debatable motion.

Those in favour, 'aye'?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against, 'Nay'?

Carried.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 4, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The School Attendance Act, 1978," carried. (Bill No. 60).

On motion, Bill No. 60 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 3.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 3 is third reading of Bill No. 37.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I have a motion with respect to this. I move that this

question be now put pursuant to Standing Order 40, seconded by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

MR. SPEAKER:

It is moved that the previous question be now put, which, of course, is a debatable motion.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I made the motion, I guess I am entitled to lead off the debate. Is the mover not permitted to debate?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes.

MR. MARSHALL:

I wish to have the opportunity for a few moments to lead off the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to once more indicate that -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo on a point of order.

MR. TULK:

I think the minister has moved third reading on Bill 37, if I understood him correctly. What he moved under Standing Order 40 was the previous question. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

That is how I understand it.

MR. TULK:

I would ask the Speaker to take a look at Beauchesne to ascertain if indeed you can move the previous question on third reading.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, why does not the hon. gentleman look up Beauchesne before he gets up in this House and asks questions of the Speaker.

Beauchesne, Paragraph 460, says: "When the previous question is moved on the third reading of a bill and voted in the negative" - which I am sure this bill will not be - "the main motion must be dropped." So authority is replete in Beauchesne. Why does the hon. gentleman not quote Your Honour some authority instead of getting up as Opposition House Leader and asking the Speaker what to do? Why does he not go back and ask Mr. Speaker Sparkes, who is still alive, or Mr. Speaker Clark or any of the other gentlemen? If the hon. gentleman cannot carry out his duties, Mr. Speaker, why does he not give over to the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) who did such a good job?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

To the point of order raised by the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), some research has already been done by the Chair on this

particular item and it is in order.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak for a long period of time but I want to say that we moved this motion, as we have moved all motions on behalf of the people of Corner Brook, in the interest of Kruger taking over the Bowater mill and to avoid the awful possibility, which was upon us, of Kruger backing out of this deal because it could not get through in time enough for Kruger to be able to take certain tax advantages. That should be as obvious and as clear as the noses on the faces of the hon. gentlemen. The fact of the matter is if this had been January or February or April or something like that, there would not be this urgency, but this is the end of the year; we approach the end of the year, we approach the end of the taxation year. In addition to the many reasons why Kruger is taking over this mill, obviously one of the reasons has to be to get certain tax advantages. What has happened, what the hon. gentlemen there opposite have been doing with their filibuster is they have been playing with the lives of the people of Corner Brook. We do not want to see the awful stultified atmosphere that occurred during the negotiations when Kruger walked away and went back to Montreal when people did not believe the situation. These motions, Mr. Speaker, have been brought in to stop the hon. gentlemen there opposite from filibustering on behalf of the people of Corner Brook. Now, Mr. Speaker, also I want to point out that here we are in third reading of the bill and we are debating

the previous question. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I think it is wise for the hon. gentlemen to look up Beauchesne and see what can be debated and what cannot be debated. What has gone through second reading, Mr. Speaker, is the principle of the bill, so we cannot debate the principle of this bill at the present time. Now let us make that perfectly clear to everybody as this debate goes on. There is a reference in Beauchesne, page 221. To the so-called Opposition House Leader, that is this red book. The fifth edition of Beauchesne, page 221, (5) says: "Third Reading - The purpose of the third reading is to review the bill in its final form after the shaping it has received in its earlier stages." Now, there is no other purpose for this debate. There cannot be debate as to the substance of the bill, of whether it should have passed or whether it was wise to pass or whether it was unwise to pass and I am going to refrain from making any comments with respect to the principle of the bill. The only debate that is allowed in third reading is to review the bill in final form. There are certain amendments allowed, one of which I have moved, which is the previous question which can be debated, Mr. Speaker, as well as whether the previous question should have been moved. Some of the hon. gentlemen there opposite can understand why we moved it. It means if this is resolved in the affirmative the question will be put, the matter will be over, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor will come in and give his assent to the bill and enact it into law. There can be no further amendments. So we have given the gentlemen there opposite one more chance to repeat their empty speeches with respect

to this. They have half an hour each to respond and then we will put it to a vote. We have done this, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Corner Brook. We have been forced to take these measures which we do not like. We would prefer to have these things debated out we do not like closure, we do not like moving the previous questions - but we are faced with an irresponsible, immature, uncaring, reckless, stupid, asinine Opposition who do not realize the realities of life and the dire consequences that will be visited upon the people of Corner Brook unless there is speedy passage of this bill. Hon. gentlemen opposite would not believe us before, but now there is a letter before them, signed by Kruger, supporting exactly what we said earlier, but they still do not want to believe it. As the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) quite rightly said, they are playing Russian roulette with the lives of the people of Corner Brook, and they could not care less about the people for Corner Brook.

We have used the established procedures that have been set down in British parliamentary practice for years precisely for the purpose of protecting the people of Corner Brook and the people of Newfoundland, on the West Coast from a reckless Opposition such as we have opposite who would delay this bill over and over again and eventually see Kruger pick up its papers and leave and go back to Montreal. But the hon. gentlemen do not care about it, Mr. Speaker. They are so stupid that they do not understand. They think they are in a Grade V classroom and they are talking to the teacher, and they are relating to the teacher and their

intelligence quotient has not gone anything beyond that. But the chilling part of all of this, Mr. Speaker, is that the lives of the people of Corner Brook have been toyed with, and as far as this government is concerned, it cannot allow the situation to continue any longer. It is an essential prerequisite to pass this.

To those people who ask why do you not just resolve the Kruger situation, wait until the court case is decided, and then do it again, if necessary?, we reply it is either right or it is wrong and in our opinion it is right to do this.. Should we have nine or ten debates like this going on month after month, year after year, when it is so obvious what has happened? What has happened is this is not retroactive legislation, it is conformatory legislation, conformatory of the original intention.

MR. NEARY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please.

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

MR. NEARY:

I do not know if Your Honour has been following this debate very closely or not, but the hon. gentleman is debating the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker. He gave us a lecture a few minutes ago which was low in quality, very low in content, and could only come from a stinker, from in this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:



The hon. gentleman is now debating the principle of the bill and he should be made follow his own advice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

I did that, Mr. Speaker. I must say I transgressed the rules of the House. I have to make an open confession.

MR. NEARY:

What a stinker.

MR. MARSHALL:

I assume Your Honour is going to draw me to order and, having drawn me to order, then, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen there opposite must comply also. They now know what we mean by debating the principle of the bill. So I will sit down while Your Honour makes the ruling, but I just want to say to Your Honour I join in the point of order raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) against me. And I say, Mr. Speaker, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and when it comes time for the hon. gentlemen to speak, we will not hear any debate on the principle of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is quite correct that we are not permitted to debate the principle of the bill. We are dealing with third reading and it is very direct.

The hon. the President of the

Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just say the purpose of this debate is to review the bill in its final form, not for the purpose of debating the principle of the bill, which Your Honour has just indicated, most for the purpose of discussing the reasons for posing the previous questions, whether it was wise to move the previous question on third reading. I suppose the other type of amendment is normally put on in third reading is whether there should be a six month hoist.

So let us get the debate, Mr. Speaker, constricted in that area. Let us make some progress for the people of Corner Brook, the people of the West Coast, and all of Newfoundland. The biggest thing about all of this debate, I will say in closing, is the shameless, disgusting, unreasonable, immature and stupid way in which the hon. gentlemen there opposite have been prepared to toy with the lives of the people in this Province. They know just how close it has come to Kruger picking up its papers and going back. I think that might even get through the thick heads of the hon. gentlemen there opposite and they might be constrained to vote in favour of the people of the West Coast and the people of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we have just heard and witnessed the most despicable performance I have seen in this

House in a long time. He says we are toying with the lives of the people of Corner Brook. What we are toying with in the last week in this House, Mr. Speaker, is a dictatorship. We are fighting for democracy. We have never in our lives in this Province witnessed such tactics in this House, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman says they are using established procedures. What a joke, Mr. Speaker. What a joke. Is the hon. gentleman on some kind of a bad trip? We are using established procedures, he says. They are using dictatorial tactics, Mr. Speaker. They are using the kind of tactics that you will only find in totalitarian countries, the kind of stuff you would find in Poland and in Nicaragua, Mr. Speaker. In totalitarian countries, behind the Iron Curtain, is where you will find this kind of strategy, this kind of tactic. Mr. Speaker, democracy has been trampled on in this House in the last few days. This recent motion by the hon. gentleman is closure, it is to gag members of the House, make no bones about that. I hope nobody there opposite is deluding themselves into believing that it is anything else but closure. It is closure, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, it is only a scoundrel that would take refuge in making statements -

DR. COLLINS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance, on a point of order.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I did not want the hon. member to get into a state of

apoplexy or anything of that order. We are on the third reading and the debate has to be confined precisely to the final form of the bill. The hon. member by his own words just now was getting into debating a previous motion which was non-debatable, and, of course, having been non-debatable it was already passed by this House. He is now opening a debate that is quite out of order and I would ask Your Honour to direct him to confine his remarks to the third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my remarks are perfectly in order. We are debating a motion on the previous question, how the bill got where it was. The procedure that we are using is closure. Mr. Speaker, I have not referred to the principle of the bill in any way, shape or form.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

To that point of order, when remarks are made to the bill they are referred very directly to the bill. But we are also debating, at the present time that the previous question be put. Both are debated at the same time, although the principle of the bill is not to be discussed because we have passed it.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the scoundrel who just made that despicable speech

and then ran out of the House, scurried out of the House like a coward because he was too ashamed to stand his ground, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentleman told us that we are following established procedure. We are not following an established procedure. We are following the procedures of a dictator, of a dictatorial administration, of an arrogant government, of a government that is on the run, of a government that is desperate, a government that is out of control, Mr. Speaker. They have taken leave of their senses, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that same hon. gentleman, as I remember well - I was on the other side of the House when that hon. gentleman was over here - when closure was invoked in 1971, almost had a breakdown. He almost, Mr. Speaker, committed hari-kari. Now he is over there moving closure two days in a row, when he told us only last week that they would never do it. They would not do it. Only Liberal administrations, federal and provincial, move closure, the hon. gentleman told us. Well, it is only a dictatorship that does what this hon. crowd are doing here in the last two days.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said in his remarks that he is giving us a last chance. Since when did the government give us the right to speak in this hon. House or outside the House? Since when? It is our right to speak in this House any time we feel like it, within the realm of good taste and within the rules of the House. The hon. gentleman does not give us a last chance. The hon. gentleman is trying to gag us. They are using brute force, they are using their large majority to ram, to railroad this

bill through third reading, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman starts talking about toying with people's lives the hon. gentleman should look in the mirror and hon. members there opposite should take a look at themselves and what they are doing in this House. They are making a sham out of the House. Mr. Speaker, what is happening in this House in the last week is similar to what we see happening in Poland. They are trying to suppress debate. If the Newfoundland Teachers' Association speaks out, the Premier writes a letter to the newspaper condemning them, they are not allowed to express their opinion. If a municipality speaks out, the next thing down comes the administration on them like a ton of brick, and or the trade union movement, if they fight for their rights. The hon. Premier should have heard the professor of history who was on CBC this morning interviewed about the anti-labour policies of this administration and he would have gotten an eye-opener, Mr. Speaker. Nobody dares speak out, The Mayor of Corner Brook spoke out during the federal election and wrote a letter to Mr. Crosbie, and the Premier tried to gag him. They are trying to gag NAPE, they are trying to stop the NTA from expressing their opinion, they are threatening the Fishermen's Union, and hon. gentlemen opposite know that. Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing in this Province in the last year is an administration that is on the road to a full dictatorship.

MR. BAIRD:

You supported one for twenty-three years.

MR. NEARY:

And only a scoundrel and only a group of scoundrels would hide behind statements like 'you are toying with the lives of the people in Corner Brook.' Only a warped mind, Mr. Speaker, would make that kind of a statement, only narrow-minded partisan, warped individuals, only somebody who is the ultimate in nastiness could make that kind of a statement, Mr. Speaker, that we are toying with the lives of the people in Corner Brook. The hon. gentleman should have seen the interviews on television last night when the majority of the people, nine out of ten of them, who were interviewed in Corner Brook said they agreed with amending the legislation but they did not agree with the retroactivity part of it.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

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

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman just a moment ago was talking about some radio programme or some television programme I guess it was, and his perception was that the people of Corner Brook agreed with the bill but they did not agree the retroactivity. In introducing elements like that, the hon. gentleman is talking about the principle of the bill. He drew me to order and I now draw him to order with respect to it.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I would have to rule that discussion of the retroactivity of the bill would be discussing the principle of the bill and, since that has been passed, it is out of order.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, two world wars were fought to give people the right to freedom of speech. Two world wars and the Korean war were fought, and Newfoundlanders and Canadians laid down their lives, Mr. Speaker, to protect democracy, to protect Canada and the world against tyranny, to protect society against the kind of dictatorial procedures that we are seeing in this House in the last week. The last time this came up and a war was fought, men and women fought against Hilter and Nazi Germany and fought against Mussolini's fascist Italy. Mr. Speaker, I ask Your Honour is any comparison to what we are seeing here today, is there very much difference between the wild-eyed, frothing-at-the mouth, arm-waving Adolf Hilter, Mr. Speaker, and the present leader in this Province?

MR. ANDREWS:

What regiment were you in? You were old enough!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, only a scoundrel and a rogue would interrupt with that kind of a remark. The hon. gentleman should go out and take the breathalyser test or leave the House. Now if the hon. gentleman wants to get dirty, Mr. Speaker, we will get dirty and we will demand that people come into this House sober.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! I would remind the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that he is insinuating that members of this House are not sober and he was pointing towards one hon. member of the House. I would ask him if he would withdraw these remarks because I consider

them to be unparliamentary.

MR. NEARY:

I will, Mr. Speaker, because I should have pointed towards a number, but I will withdraw the offending words.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Even that remark is considered unparliamentary and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

MR. NEARY:

I withdraw, Mr. Speaker. But if the hon. gentleman wants to play with fire he is going to get burnt. What a low, rotten, stinker, Mr. Speaker! What a general nuisance! I am amazed that Napoleon would keep the hon. gentleman in the Cabinet at all, Mr. Speaker.

So we have similarities between what is happening in this Province today and what happened in Nazi Germany and in Mussolini's fascist Italy, and what is happening in Poland today and in Nicaragua, and what happened in Argentina. The administration there opposite is developing into a fullfledged dictatorship, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Newfoundland are beginning to realize it. We do not need the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to come in and tell us he is going to give us one more chance. We know what our rights are, Mr. Speaker, and our rights are being trampled on by hon. gentlemen there opposite. And the rights of the people of this Province are being trampled on. The iron heel of the Fuehrer on the other side has come down in the faces of the Newfoundland and Labrador people, the iron boot, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAIRD:

You should have got an iron boot somewhere else years ago.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should go out and try to explain his behaviour in this House to his constituents. So, Mr. Speaker, the iron boot has been shoved into the face, ground into the faces of the Newfoundland and Labrador people by this administration. It is a sad and sorry day for Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, because we cannot have free and open and continuous debate in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentlemen are moving to gag the opposition, they are moving closure every day now in this hon. House to choke off debate, to gag members of the House and that is tyranny, that is as close to fascism and Nazism as you can get. And, Mr. Speaker, how hon. gentlemen can sit over there with smirks on their faces, how they can sit there and try to be smart-alecky, try to be humorous when they are not is beyond that.

MR. CALLAN:

Why, do you think there is something wrong?

MR. NEARY:

Yes, there is something wrong with them, Mr. Speaker, there is definitely something wrong with hon. gentlemen there opposite.

MR. CALLAN:

In what way?

MR. NEARY:

They have no conscience, there is something wrong with their moral views, their moral attitude, their moral thinking. There is something wrong with them, Mr. Speaker. It is very easy to come to that conclusion when you look at the attitude and you listen to

the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) making the most despicable and rotten innuendo and accusation and insinuations, Mr. Speaker, you would not hear in *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*. Now we are having the Fourth Reich emerging in this Province, we are seeing the rise of the Fourth Reich, and the next thing we will all have to do the goose step up and down the centre of the House of Assembly and we will all have to come in and say, "Hail Fuehur", Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

We will cook a few geese before that.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, I guarantee you we will cook a few geese before that. If I was the hon. gentleman standing in the doorway I would go out and sleep it off. We have had enough of the likes of the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, looking at the world through rose-coloured glasses, do not know what is going on, while democracy is being threatened in this Province. democracy thrown out the window. Mr. Speaker, we have to tolerate in this House day in and day out interruptions from the likes of the hon. gentleman. And you would not mind if they were worthwhile, but they are low and rotten, Mr. Speaker. We saw an example of that last night. How low can you get? The hon. gentlemen there opposite are so low now that they could crawl under a snake's belly, that is how low they are, Mr. Speaker. You could not get any lower, you could not belittle yourself any more than hon. gentlemen are doing over there in the last couple of days. How low can you get?

Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill that

is now being rammed and forced and bullied by brute force through third reading had a very rough ride in this House, a very rough ride indeed.

DR. COLLINS:

You have had your say, so you might as well vote for it now.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are going to reach the point where we have no choice and that is precisely what the complaint is about.

MR. DINN:

Is that not normal and reasonable?

MR. NEARY:

What is normal and reasonable?

MR. DINN:

That the people of this Province see you vote on something.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we are not at the pleasure of the hon. gentlemen there opposite.

MR. DINN:

You are now.

MR. NEARY:

We are now, yes, and we do not like it, Mr. Speaker. It is frightening. It is frightening.

MR. DINN:

It is not frightening for the people out there.

MR. NEARY:

You know, Mr. Speaker, when the people of Newfoundland woke up on April 7, 1982, and they realized that there were 43 members on that side of the House and 9 on this side, when they woke up on April 7, 1982, Mr. Speaker, do you know what went through their minds? You know the questions the

majority of people in this Province asked themselves? Do you know what it was, Your Honour? They said, "Oh God, what have we done? We have given the Tories a sweep. We have reduced the Opposition and the real danger is that they are going to become arrogant and dictatorial." That was the concern of the majority of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians on April 7, 1982.

Now, Mr. Speaker, have their words come true?

MR. DINN:  
Whose words?

MR. NEARY:  
The people's. It is the people who count.

MR. DINN:  
Have they been speaking to you lately?

MR. NEARY:  
God save the people, that is all I can say, from the tyrants that we have in control in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today and I tell you that I am having a difficult time - to keep my breakfast down for one thing - to find the words to describe the disgust that we have for this hon. crowd.

MR. DINN:  
You are a real Charlie McCarthy.

MR. NEARY:  
Mr. Speaker, what they are doing is they are using brute force, they are using their large majority, they are using bullying tactics, they are using jackboots, they are using Nazi, Mussolini, Fascist-like tactics.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):  
Order, please! The Chair has been

very lenient with the hon. member. He is making an emotional speech and I am sure he means every word of it. But it has been ruled in this House, and he can find it in Hansard that the words "Nazi" and "Mussolini" have been ruled unparliamentary and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw them and please restrain.

MR. NEARY:  
I withdraw them, Mr. Speaker. What is unparliamentary?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The word "Nazi" and the word "Mussolini" have been ruled unparliamentary.

MR. NEARY:  
Did anybody raise a point of order with Your Honour or has Your Honour taken the initiative in doing it?

MR. SPEAKER:  
It is the Chair's responsibility to keep decorum in the House and the Chair took the initiative.

MR. NEARY:  
I withdraw.

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

MR. NEARY:  
Well, Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing from the Premier - Fascist is allowed by the way - is the last squeek from a pig. And there was another gentleman in the world in 1939 that the whole world knew as a pig.

MR. TULK:  
They are the black sheep of democracy.

MR. NEARY:  
They are the black sheep of democracy is right. And what we

are seeing now is the last squeal from a pig. The messenger is the rotten stinker, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is the stinker, the Lord Haw-Haw, Dr. Goebbels, carrying out the orders from the Fourth Reich, and the Fourth Reich in this world is in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I believe after watching the present House Leader when he was on this side of the House, that now he is over there he espouses different principles and I would say the hon. gentleman is a fraud.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has been skirting around unparliamentary remarks all morning and one is being lenient to him because he knows that he is on a losing wicket here, he knows that he has lost the sympathy of the working people in this Province, he has lost the sympathy of the public, that they are in total disarray over there. Nevertheless, one can only let him go so far and he has been skirting so near the edge that I think if you put all the skirtings together he has really gone over the edge, as he has even pointed out himself now when he used the word "fraud". So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he has now got into the area of unparliamentary conduct.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

There is only one person skirting and who keeps skirting in this Province and that is the Minister of Finance. He is skirting the financial affairs of this Province, and skirting them right down the drain. I would remind the hon. gentleman - I know I do not need to remind the Speaker - on page 112 of Beauchesne the word "fraud" has been ruled to be parliamentary since 1958. So the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is not using a word that is unparliamentary at all if that is the only word that he wants to refer to. I understand that was the word, the word "fraud".

DR. COLLINS:

He has been skirting many things.

MR. TULK:

No, no. You said he has used the word "fraud" and was therefore being unparliamentary. It is not unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to that the hon. gentleman quoted the use of "fraud" in 1958. However, on page 107 it shows that that ruling has in fact been overruled and that in May 1960, December 1960, and April 1962, fraud has ruled to be unparliamentary.

MR. TULK:

Different ways that is being used, Mr. Speaker, that is all.



Fraudulent is perfectly in order.

MR. DINN:

We do not like it in this House.

MR. NEARY:

We do not like what you are doing to this House either.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To that point of order, I know it is in Beauchesne, page 107, that the term "fraud" has been ruled as unparliamentary. On page 112 the word "fraud" is acceptable. So that is a later ruling so we will have to accept the word "fraud".

MR. NEARY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can understand the feelings of hon. gentlemen there opposite being offended, being hurt, Mr. Speaker. These are very strong words that I am using here this morning, Mr. Speaker, but it is a most unusual situation that we are talking about here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the bill, as I started to say a few moments ago, had a pretty rough ride to get where it is now, to third reading.

Mr. Speaker, could we have a quorum call because I want to be able to look into their faces to see the look of shame on their faces when we are debating this. So I would like to have a quorum call if Your Honour does not mind.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A quorum has been called. Call in the members.

#### Quorum

Three minutes have elapsed and there is a quorum present.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

So, Mr. Speaker -

MR. CARTER:

What are you trying to say? Say it.

MR. NEARY:

What am I trying to say? If the hon. gentlemen have not gotten the message by now, Mr. Speaker, I would say that it is possible for something to happen to you if you inhale enough savoury.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should stop clowning around while we are talking about a very serious matter. We are talking about an administration that is trying to establish a full dictatorship in this Province. Even poor old Frank Moores, when he was in trouble, when he was boxed in, when he was on the ropes, did not invoke closure.

DR. COLLINS:

(Inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I really cannot find words to express how I feel here today. When I look across at hon. gentlemen there opposite and I see the smirks on their faces and I see how they look at their Fuehrer, their Napoleon, with goo-goo eyes, with their mouths open, looking for their favours down the road, some of them trying to worm their way into the Cabinet - they would sacrifice their principles to get into the Cabinet - some of them crawling on their hands and knees, on their bellies trying to get a little bit of recognition so they can get into the Cabinet, some of them out doing Dale Carnegie courses, Mr. Speaker, as a prerequisite to try

to get into the Cabinet, so they sit there day in and day out like trained seals looking up at the Fuehrer with their mouths open and their eyes popping out of the sockets while he leads them astray, while he takes them on the road to a full dictatorship. Mr. Speaker, is there anybody on that side of the House who has any courage or any principles left? There are a few over there I thought had some gumption about them, had some courage. Is there anybody over there who does not have the yellow streak? Mr. Speaker, is there anybody? What about the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook)? In her senior years, does the hon. minister not realize what is happening? Does the hon. minister have any gumption or any principles?

MRS. NEWHOOK:

I will go with him all the way.

MR. NEARY:

You will go with him all the way! You will go down with him all the way.

Mr. Speaker, the administration have become cynical. I am not allowed to compare them to Mussolini's Italy, to Fascist Italy but we have a Newfoundland Mussolini. Is that permissible, Mr. Speaker? If it is out of order I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. NEARY:

There is not point of order because I have withdrawn it.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, again the hon. member is taking undue latitude. We have a certain sympathy for the member opposite because he is trying to mend fences, he has dug himself into such a hole with the people of this Province that he is trying to mend fences desperately. We have a certain sympathy for that because he is only going to be in the House for a few more years anyway. We would not like to see him going down to defeat. We have that much regard for the hon. member, we would like to see him retire gracefully from the House. He is not likely to do that because of this present debate. I think people of this Province are rising up so much against members opposite over their opposition to this particular situation we are in now, because it is so meaningful for jobs in this Province, that he is in grave danger that he will be totally repudiated in the next election. Now we have a certain amount of sympathy for that and we would like him to try to mend fences, but he is doing it in such a manner now that it is really outside the limits of parliamentary procedure. We would ask Your Honour, in a very kind way, to lead him by the hand back into the fold again.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, in regards to the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) rising in this House to say that the member for LaPoile's (Mr. Neary) days are numbered, I would remind him of an old saying in the

Bible, "Many are called but few are chosen." In the case of the member for LaPoile, I would remind the Finance Minister, that many have tried but none have succeeded and they are not likely to. Now the truth of the matter is there is no point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was about to get up on a word that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had used, but when he was halfway up - they have a serious habit of being half up and half down over there; the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) would know what I am talking about - to make a point of order, the member for LaPoile withdrew the remarks that he had made. So there is no point of order. The Minister of Finance is just trying to waste the time of the member for LaPoile who is making an excellent speech, one which hurts the other side of this House because it strikes at the very truth and essence of this bill.

MR. NEARY:  
Right on.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
To that point of order, I do not have to remind the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that we are just dealing with this bill in its final form, he is well aware of that. However, there is no point of order.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what I would suggest to hon. gentlemen who are interrupting me on that side of the House is if they want to find out from the people of this Province who betrayed the people,

let them call an election on this issue, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:  
We will very shortly now.

MR. NEARY:  
No! The hon. gentleman found out about the polls after the federal election and that is why he did not try to ride in on the coattail of Mr. Mulroney in the federal sweep. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman saw the weakness, saw how much trouble he was in. But one thing this debate has produced, one thing it has shown the people of this Province - the hon. member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) should bear this in mind - is that the government is weak and that the Opposition is strong. That is what it has shown, Mr. Speaker. And if hon. gentlemen doubt that, call an election and let the people say who betrayed them. Let the people in Ferryland look at the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power), who is not in his seat in this hon. House right now, a smart young man, and let the people down in Ferryland deal with his position on this bill. The same way in St. Mary's - The Capes; the hon. gentleman whom I thought had great moral principles, had a lot of scruples, Mr. Speaker, is selling out the people so that the administration there opposite can get their own way. It is pure ego, it is spite, it has nothing to do with toying with the lives of anybody, it is toying with the hon. gentleman's tiny brain, Mr. Speaker. That is what it is all about. It is an administration that is on an ego trip.

MR. TULK:  
They are never coming down from it either.

MR. NEARY:

And they are never coming down. They do not know how far to go, they do not know when to stop, they have gotten out of control, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

You might be wiped out totally next time.

MR. NEARY:

They are on a bad, bad trip. How can the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) ever go and face the plant workers down in Trepassey again? How can he do it? Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, drapes himself in such a pious flag, is such a pious individual, Mr. Speaker, is so self-righteous once he almost took the oath of poverty. Now, Mr. Speaker, where is he? Is he on the side of the ordinary people now? He is betraying his constituents, he is knifing his constituents in the back and going along with the tyrant, going along with the Emperor. Mr. Speaker, they have their own ode, they have their own army, they have their own flag, they have their own bravery awards. What is the next step? A total dictatorship, that is the next step.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is not debating the final form of the bill; the hon. gentleman is not debating the motion, which is the motion of the previous question here. We are not interested too much in the hon. gentleman's assessments of the members on this side of the

House. The hon. gentleman is out of order. He is in disarray, as a matter of fact.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I would submit to Your Honour that I am completely in order. I am debating how the bill got where it is, I am debating a closure motion and I am referring to the position that certain members opposite took on the various stages of debate of this bill. Everything is completely in order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I would remind the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that we are debating the final form of the bill at the present time.

MR. NEARY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So we have the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) who tries to profess that he is a real saint.

DR. COLLINS:

He is, too.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, he is a saint alright! Mr. Speaker, we are seeing more Judases on that side of the House in the last week or so! We saw the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) go up to Ottawa and sell out to Mrs. Carney.

MR. CARTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

On a point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER:  
We usually hear so much spite coming from the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that we do not pay too much attention to it, but, just for the record, I think I heard him say a little while ago that the member for St. Mary's was knifing his constituents. Now, I do not think that is parliamentary. I mean, just because the hon. member was elected by the riff-raff of his constituency -

MR. NEARY:  
What an insult to the people of LaPoile!

MR. CARTER:  
- does not give him any excuse to say that a member is knifing his constituents, and I think he should be brought to order.

MR. NEARY:  
I will send that Hansard out to the people in LaPoile, I can tell you.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:  
Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn), who always acts so self-righteously and is highly indignant when anybody abandons his principles. When anybody does things that he considers to be unscrupulous, he gets so pious. Why is he doing it? He has that angelic look and

tries to leave the impression that he is a saint. A saint alright, Mr. Speaker. More like Judas!

MR. TOBIN:  
Why are you picking on the hon. member?

MR. NEARY:  
Following the bad example set by the Premier and the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), the hon. gentleman is going along behind them, running along behind the Premier like a little lamb, scrabbling along, crawling along on his belly behind them.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Environment.

MR. ANDREWS:  
I do believe that in the vernacular, the word 'Judas' refers to a traitor and I believe the word 'traitor' is unparliamentary.

MR. NEARY:  
If I offended the hon. gentleman - I did not refer to him as 'Judas' - I withdraw, Mr. Speaker. I have too much to say for that. The hon. gentleman is Iscariot, that is perfectly in order, Mr. Speaker. Everybody knows what I am referring to.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The remark has been withdrawn.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:  
I am talking about that saintly-looking gentleman from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn), who did not raise one word of protest about the procedures that

were used in ramming this bill through the House. He did not lift his voice to protest the way that the House was treated, the contempt that was shown for the House and the people of this Province. How, in all conscience, can the hon. gentleman sit there and see the flag hauled down and democracy trampled on, the jackboot put in the face of his constituents? How can he sit there and tolerate that? The only reason you could give, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. gentleman is crawling along on his belly, trying to get into the Cabinet, that is all, that is the only reason for it. Sacrificing, selling his principles, selling his scruples for thirty pieces of silver is what the hon. gentleman is doing. He can see a Cabinet post. He is blinded with ambition. He is so blinded with ambition that he is satisfied to throw his principles aside, to abandon his principles, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond). Look at the hon. gentleman; a very intelligent-looking man, very vocal, very articulate, a gentleman, no doubt, who wants to make a career in public life. The hon. the member for St. Barbe, how can that hon. gentleman go back and face the people in Woody Point and Norris Point, Rocky Harbour and Cow Head, honest, hard-working, decent Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

I have drawn the hon. member's attention on two occasions to the fact we are debating the final form of this bill and he continues

to stray from that point. I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the final form of the bill.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the final form of the bill and how it has arrived at the stage it is now, the attitudes that members took towards it, their attitude towards closure and moving such things as the previous question, which is closure. The hon. gentleman supported all these things, and I am asking him how he can go back and look his constituents straight in the eye? How can he do it?

DR. COLLINS:

That is parliamentary. There is nothing wrong with that.

MR. NEARY:

There is nothing wrong with what?

DR. COLLINS:

There is nothing wrong with moving the previous question.

MR. NEARY:

There is nothing wrong with the previous question, nothing wrong with closure? The hon. gentleman must be sick, there must be something wrong with him when he does not think there is anything wrong with closure, that there is anything wrong with behaving like a dictatorship. The hon. gentleman thinks there is nothing wrong with it. There must be something wrong with the hon. gentleman.

DR. COLLINS:

Read Beauchesne. It is in Beauchesne.

MR. BUTT:

You will not go to Corner Brook again in broad daylight.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, do not worry, we have our finger on the pulse in Corner Brook. Some hon. gentleman over there a few moments ago said, 'You do not have the support of the working-class people in this Province.' Well, my answer to that is that if this administration stays in power very much longer, we will not have very many more working people left, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we have the United Nations, the ILO, the International Labour Organization, looking at Newfoundland, looking at this form of legislation. The ILO, the United Nations! What an embarrassment we are for Canada as a whole!

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman continues to debate the principle of this bill. Your Honour has already drawn the hon. gentleman to order on two or three occasions with respect to the way he is conducting debate. When he is talking about the ILO and his perceived attitude of certain people towards the bill, he is obviously talking about the principle of the bill. As I indicated in my opening remarks, it was accepted by the Chair that we are confined to the final form of the bill itself on this particular motion of the previous question. The hon. gentleman is out of order when he is debating the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker, and he is debating the principle of the bill.

MR. NEARY:

I certainly did not refer to the principle of the bill at all.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there are various forms of closure available under the rules of this House and members opposite have pulled them all out in the course of this debate.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, properly, under the rules.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, under the rules. Under the rules, Mr. Speaker, closure is permitted. And we have seen how often, Mr. Speaker, any reasonable, any fair-thinking government has invoked closure. In Canada, I think, we have had six such incidents raised going back to 1913, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

And some of them were during the war.

MR. BARRY:

I think four of them were during the war. From 1932 until 1956 I do not think there were any. I do not know if there were any apart from 1917 until 1956, except for 1932. And, Mr. Speaker, in this House of Assembly the member is pointing out how since 1971, despite many serious problems being faced by governments in this Province, they have never deemed it fit to invoke closure. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)

is reflecting the cavalier attitude of that government towards closure. Mr. Speaker, as the Opposition we are entitled to point out that the democratic rights and privileges of the members of this House of Assembly are being trampled upon, and that is what the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is saying. He is explaining why this is happening and he is relating it to the attitudes of members opposite. But we are talking about the fact that the rights and privileges of the members of this House are being trampled upon by the many forms of closure being hauled out of the trick bag of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

MR. NEARY:  
That is right.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:  
Just one point on that. I am sure that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) did not mean to cast aspersions on Your Honour, on the Chair when he says that the rights of members are being trampled on in this House. I am sure he did not mean that. Because I am sure that if anyone tried to trample on the parliamentary rights in this House, Your Honour would stop the proceedings there and then and bring that person to heel. I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition did not mean that. It must have been just a slip of the tongue. And perhaps he would have the good grace to get up and say that he did not mean that Your

Honour was allowing the members of this House to have their parliamentary rights trampled on.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
To that point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is straying away from debating the final form of this bill. We are in third reading. If he continues to stray from that I will have to rule him out of order.

MR. NEARY:  
Mr. Speaker, what hon. gentlemen are doing is making a mockery out of Parliament. They are making a mockery out of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, if the administration had been anyways reasonable no doubt this bill would have followed its natural course. It would have been brought into the House the same as any other bill. It would have gone through the various stages with very close scrutiny, with some debate, and eventually it would have become the law of the land.

But, Mr. Speaker, this bill, more than any other bill in the history of this Province, had the roughest trip through this House of any bill, certainly, that I have seen in my twenty-three years, and I doubt if any of the hon. gentlemen whose portraits are hanging on the wall of this House, Mr. Speaker, have ever seen. It was a very, very controversial piece of legislation, And the question we have to ask ourselves is do the people understand what is going on in this House? And, Mr. Speaker, if my judgment is any good at all, I would have to say, yes, they do understand what is happening in this House. They understand that the government is using its large majority to ram a piece of unpopular, immoral legislation



through the House. They are bullying the Opposition, they are bullying the House, Mr. Speaker, that is what is happening. They are treating the House of Assembly as if it were in Poland or in some other totalitarian country. People understand that, Mr. Speaker, because there has been an awful lot of publicity about this debate and about this particular bill.

And hon. gentlemen may think that people do not understand what the bill is all about, but they do, Mr. Speaker. They do. I know what is wrong with hon. gentlemen there opposite; they are smarting under the attacks, they are smarting under the criticism. They have no support in the Province, except for a handful of employers, for the retroactivity part of this bill. And the hon. gentleman is getting ready to leap up because I mentioned the word 'retroactivity'. Well, go ahead leap up.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is no support for this bill, no support at all, no support whatsoever, not even in Corner Brook, much to the hon. gentleman's dismay. As much as hon. gentlemen there opposite have tried to poison the atmosphere, muddy up the water, drag in red herrings, Mr. Speaker, they have been unsuccessful. The word has gone out from this House, because of the strenuous efforts of the Opposition, to the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, that democracy is no more, that any time they want to, they can bring in a rotten piece of legislation, an evil piece of legislation. Do you realize, Your Honour, they could bring in a piece of legislation tomorrow to take Your Honour down in front of Confederation Building and build a

scaffold, and have Your Honour hanged from the scaffold in front of Confederation Building? Do you realize that, Mr. Speaker? And they are so irresponsible they are likely to do it.

Look at what they have done to organizations and individuals who have dared to criticize Napoleon, the Emperor. Look at what he has done, and what his staff is doing, the propaganda machine that he has in his office.

MR. TULK:

He has vowed we will not forgive them.

MR. NEARY:

He has made statements that he will not forget, you are going to be punished, we will never forgive you. That is the kind of stuff we are hearing, Mr. Speaker. The same sort of thing that you will hear in Poland, the same sort of thing you hear from Gaddafi. Mr. Speaker, I tell you it is a sad day, it is a sad, sad day for Newfoundland. It is a sad day. The hon. gentleman cannot defend himself. The hon. gentleman cannot hide behind statements like we are toying with people's lives, because the hon. gentleman knows that that is not flying, it is not washing, people are not buying it. There is no excuse for rotten legislation, no excuse for it.

MR. TULK:

They have a credibility problem.

MR. NEARY:

They do have a credibility problem, and a bad one at the moment. And the hon. gentleman is trying to distract from this bill by making statements about the offshore agreement, about Air/Sea Rescue, using his old strategy, his old tactic of trying to

distract from the real issues in this Province, Mr. Speaker. And the real issue is the way that this Province is being governed, the type of leadership we have. I said it before and I will say it again, that up to about the past year and a half, I was observing the hon. gentleman very carefully, and I tell you he was a very tough man out there with the electorate, a pretty tough guy. He was a fighter. He was a man of scruples, of high moral principles, Mr. Speaker, but how the mighty have fallen! Oh, how they have fallen.

MR. TOBIN:

Look at yourself. You have moved down three seats.

MR. NEARY:

Oh, how they have fallen, Mr. Speaker. As I said last night, those the gods wish to destroy they first make mad. Mr. Speaker, I am not by nature the kind of a person who casts personal insults at people, but we are talking about an administration that has gone astray, we are talking about an administration that is on the road to a total dictatorship. The Premier knows he is wrong and that is why he is so emotionally uptight and upset every time he gets into the middle of the debate. He knows he is wrong. The message is coming back to the hon. gentleman and the next poll will show it. The hon. gentleman will pay the price for Bill 37 and his dictatorial strategy in this House. Where are the hon. gentleman's principles and all the things he, the great fighter, stood for. Where are they? The hon. gentleman now hides behind a smoke screen and says we are trying to save \$27 million for a handful of employers in this Province. Is that the hon.

gentleman's job? Is that what he was elected to do? Nobody is going to lose, not one person. The hon. gentleman has not proved to us that one single person would lose a job if this bill stayed on the books and we just amended it to look after Kruger, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) said when he provided the House with a formula to get the hon. gentleman off the hook, to get him out of the predicament he was in. But, Mr. Speaker, they did not have to go to the extreme of making it retroactive, something that flies in the face of natural justice here. It is morally wrong; the Premier knows he is wrong, the hon. gentlemen there opposite know they are wrong. Mr. Speaker, you should be sitting on this side of the House and see the looks on their faces when we stood to debate, or see the way they cringe when the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) invokes closure, not once but twice.

MR. TULK:

Four times counting this morning.

MR. NEARY:

This is four times in a row we have had closures, different forms of closures in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

I never thought you were like that, sizing up me.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we have heard some pretty low interruptions from hon. gentlemen there opposite this morning, and I hate to get down and roll in the mud with hon. gentlemen but if it is necessary I guarantee you I can do it. This is not a personal matter, it is nothing personal about this.

MR. TOBIN:

The only thing you know anything about is dirt and filth and personal attacks, that is all you are any good at. Sit down, boy, you are making a show of yourself.

MR. NEARY:

The Premier will never put you in the Cabinet. You are never going to worm your way into the Cabinet. The Premier knows better than that, he knows you are low class and low caliber. He has more respect for the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), who at least is not low and rotten and did not have to be brought to order thirty-seven times in this House in one day.

Mr. Speaker, we were talking about one last chance. I am going to give the administration one last chance: Withdraw the retroactivity aspects of this bill, that is your one last chance.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas):

Order, please! The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, in the last three or four days we have seen the Premier of this Province attempting to take away the rights of members who have been elected by the people of this Province. This is what has happened, Mr. Speaker. This morning the hon. Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) stopped us from presenting petitions on behalf of our constituents, who had not asked for any big thing, just a chance to have electrical rates stabilized and equalized in this Province. That was not a big request, Mr. Speaker, but, for the second day in a row, we were stopped this, in the people's House, from presenting petitions

because the minister invoked closure. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the Minister of Energy should go down in history in this Province as two individuals who muzzled members of the Opposition and prevented them from carrying out the duties they were elected to perform. Sometimes I have respect for the Premier, but I believe the Premier today sat by and allowed his lieutenant, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) - as he did yesterday with the Minister of Justice - to perpetrate a grave injustice in this Province. Mr. Speaker, the Orders of the Day are useless in this House if the government can change them when they want to. So I do not see why we have an Order Paper, Mr. Speaker. Today and yesterday we were partially through item (f) when the House Leader on the government side rose up and stopped us from presenting legal, proper petitions calling for government to take some action. Mr. Speaker, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is not a one party state, there is an official Opposition in this Province. There are members in this House who wish to stand up on behalf of people in the Province, for example, the people in Gray River. In fact, this morning, Mr. Speaker, one of our petitions was from the constituents of a Cabinet minister, and, the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) or the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), one of them said we should not be presenting the petition because it was in the minister's hands. Mr. Speaker, we had a proper petition to present. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we had more petitions to present but we are not allowed to because of closure. The member for Port au

Port (Mr. Hodder) had two or three petitions to present but he was not allowed to present them either. And, Mr. Speaker, furthermore, if we were allowed to continue today we still had petitions. We still have petitions ready to present, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Speaker in the Chair now made a ruling yesterday that we had to turn the clock back because we made a wrong procedure. Mr. Speaker, maybe we should turn the clock back now to let us present the petitions that we have. Why can we not go back and present the petitions that were given to us to present in this hon. House?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe the whole crunch of the matter of this Bill 37 is the letter or the correspondence, whether it was verbal or written correspondence, that the Premier had with the head of Kruger. That is the crunch of the whole matter. The Premier tabled a letter that was written to him from Kruger, but he deceived us when he failed to present the correspondence that he had with Kruger. Mr. Speaker, the first line of that letter shows that the Premier initiated the correspondence where he says, 'You have asked whether Kruger Incorporated would be prepared to complete this acquisition.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that was a request made by the Premier is why members on this side of the House are so determined, will use every means possible of stopping this government from running roughshod over the lives of the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) said the people in Corner Brook are concerned. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe the people in Corner Brook

are concerned because, as I saw on a TV programme from there last night, nine out of ten people interviewed said this government is taking the wrong approach. And, Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition has done anything in the last few days in this House it has showed Newfoundlanders and Labradorians what kind of a dictator we have in this Province. That is the one positive aspect of the whole process for the last week. It is really positive because the people finally realize that we have the same type of person, with the same type of attitude trying to run the Province for the last five years as we had from 1949 to 1971 - 'My way or no way.' Mr. Speaker, the people of the Province got sick and tired of it in 1971 and I am sure when the Premier decides to call an election they will show they are still sick and tired of it. We do not need this any longer, Mr. Speaker. A high school principal can no longer be a dictator but must rely upon his teachers, upon his lieutenants in the classroom, and, Mr. Speaker, the same thing should apply to the Premier.

So I think there has been a very positive aspect of the whole procedure, of the whole debate for the past six or seven days, and that is that we have finally gotten through to the people in Baie Verte, gotten through to the people in Corner Brook, gotten through to the people in Labrador City, gotten through to the people in Grey River, that this government is not standing up for the well-being and interests of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, that this government is standing up for the multi-nationals, standing up for Kruger, standing up for IOC. Mr. Speaker, the

reason this government is acting this way is it is controlled by those companies, which may employ a lot of people, but when people vote they vote what their consciences dictates not in the interests of companies. I can give an example, Mr. Speaker. In the last three elections, the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) won very narrowly, even though his opponent in those three elections directly or indirectly employed a majority of the people living in that district. You would think, Mr. Speaker, they would have voted for their employer, but they did not because they realized the general public they could not control a private company, but this is what this government is trying to do.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, I may be out of order but believe the December 4 Hansard shows the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) said, "It certainly would not be the desire or the intent of this government at this time to entertain any matter of closure," and he said also they would allow an adequate time to debate this bill. Mr. Speaker, the President of the Council misled the House then or he has done a complete reversal of what he said on December 4. He said on December 4 he would not bring in closure and now we have closure brought in. He is trying to muzzle the Opposition but he will not get away with it, Mr. Speaker, he will not get away with it. We will continue to debate. After being here until two-thirty this morning, I can see there are a lot of tired people on both sides of this House. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the President of the Council should adjourn the debate now and we could come back fresh Monday morning and continue it.

We can keep on going, but the Premier is yawning, the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) is yawning, the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook) went asleep last night and she is almost asleep again this morning. Mr. Speaker, everybody in this hon. House is tired because we have been continuously debating the issue, trying to let the people of the Province know that this government is doing something wrong.

Mr. Speaker, this is a coverup. This government created a phoney issue by claiming they have to get this bill through for the sake of Kruger.

MR. BAIRD:

You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not like to be interrupted, but since I was interrupted I will call a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Call in the members.

#### Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

There is a quorum present.

Is it agreed to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, our democratic rights have been taken away from us. I believe, Mr. Speaker, whenever the Premier calls the next election

one of his campaign promises should be that if you elect an Opposition member he will not be allowed to speak on your behalf in the House of Assembly. That should be one of the Premier's campaign promises. Mr. Speaker, even if he does not make it I am sure the people of Newfoundland and Labrador got the message that his government that will not allow members of the Opposition to speak in their turn as the Orders of the Day are called as the Order Paper dictates. I do not for the life of me, Mr. Speaker, understand why if we have a petition to present we are not allowed to present it.

DR. COLLINS:

You and your foolish petitions.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, there were no foolish petitions. What do you call this a foolish petition? Do you call this one here that says, "We, the undersigned, residents of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, request that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador reduce the sales tax from 12 per cent to 8 per cent," foolish?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Sometimes the Chair is compelled to speak about the rule of relevancy and I draw the attention of the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) to that rule.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about closure and I believe when the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) moved that the Orders of the Day be now read he prevented me, as an elected member in this House, from carrying out the duties I was elected to perform. Mr. Speaker, that is an

infringement on my rights as an elected representative in this House.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is what this government is all about, infringement on the rights of individuals. Look at the teachers' negotiations, look at the telephone workers' strike that is presently underway, the fishermen's strike, regardless where you look, Mr. Speaker, this government is infringing upon the rights of individuals.

DR. COLLINS:

What about the fog yesterday morning?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the fog yesterday morning was not caused by this government. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Mulroney caused the fog yesterday morning, Mr. Speaker, by the attitude they are showing the rest of Canada.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, you have made your ruling and the ruling is in accordance with Beauchesne. We are talking about the final form of the bill. The debate before the House is the matter of the previous question. The hon. gentleman talks about what he perceives Mr. Wilson is doing or what Mr. Wilson is not doing, which is obviously irrelevant.

There is another rule, Mr. Speaker. If hon. gentlemen persist in irrelevancy the Speaker

can direct them to take their seat. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman persists in his irrelevance I would suggest that that is the only course of action that Your Honour really has.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we are getting fed up with the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) standing up and trying to stifle the Opposition from debate in this House. The Government House Leader has drawn on every rule of closure in the Standing Orders of this House, in the Standing Orders of the House of Commons and he has stretched them, Mr. Speaker. He has gotten up and given Your Honour misleading advice. Whether it is deliberate or not let him say, but he has gotten up and misled Your Honour. He told Your Honour last night that the report of a committee was not debatable when it is clearly debatable, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour should check Erskine May because we will be raising that point at another time.

We saw him try to prevent Your Honour going to check Hansard to see whether a vote had been taken on closure. When they went and checked the vote they found they were wrong in the way they went about the closure rule and they had to go back and do it over again.

Mr. Speaker, this Opposition can only take so much. We are getting fed up with the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) abusing the

rules of this House to trample on the rights of members of the Opposition. Now, we can be pushed too far. We have been very patient so far, but the people of this Province shall know what is happening, the despicable conduct of this government on debate on this bill in bringing out every motion of closure and now trying to utilize the relevancy rule as another form of closure. Your Honour, I suggest the next time the Government House Leader gets up on such a spurious point of order he should be flung out and democracy in this Province would be promoted by so doing.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the only comment I make with respect to it is I am operating within the rules. I think it would probably be effective, if the hon. gentleman gets on like that in the future, if we had one of these tranquillizing guns they use on animals to tranquillize the hon. gentleman. I do not see why he is getting so upset about the matter, the rules are there. The rules have been set down. We are debating all of this in accordance with parliamentary procedure. Under Standing Orders you can move the previous question, we have moved the previous question, and the hon. gentleman need not get hot under the collar. The fact of the matter is that neither the hon. gentlemen there opposite nor the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) are going to take this House on their backs. There are

rules to be complied with. By all means he is entitled to debate as anyone else is, but debate must be within the rules, Mr. Speaker. If it is impossible for them to debate within the rules, let them sit down and let somebody else speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
To that point of order, again I must repeat that quite often the rule of relevancy is quite difficult to apply. It did appear, however, that the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was straying somewhat from the principle we are debating at the present time.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I believe what the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is making a malicious attempt to muzzle us and to stop our debating this issue.

MR. PATTERSON:  
He should exterminate you.

MR. WARREN:  
You can use the phrase 'exterminate' if you want to, he can try whatever tactics he likes, Mr. Speaker, but he is still a phoney individual using cover-up tactics to stop us from debating the issues the people in the Province want us to debate. Mr. Speaker, nobody in this Province wants this bill to go through in its present condition other than about ten members on that side of the House and the multinational companies in the Province. Those

are the only people who want this bill to go through.

DR. COLLINS:  
Where is your evidence for that?

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, there would be plenty of the evidence if the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) could convince the Premier to have a free vote on this closure. Let us have a free vote in this House on the closure and see what the evidence will show.

DR. COLLINS:  
A free vote?

MR. WARREN:  
Yes, have a free vote and then members opposite would not have to toe the party line. I tried to coax the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid) out of her seat last night two or three time but she would not move, she was nailed onto the seat. The member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) is almost nailed on; once in a while he would get up but he is almost nailed on. Mr. Speaker, why does not the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Collins) get up? Mr. Speaker, I believe if the member for Port de Grave was allowed a free vote on this closure he would not vote for it. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are other such members on that side of the Legislature.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:  
Again, we are very kind to the people opposite who are straying all over the place, but the hon.



member now has flights of fancy which have nothing to do with this issue whatsoever. I do not know, but he seems to be trying to read mind or he is trying to use ESP or something or other in regards to the members on this side of the House. I mean, that is just straying too far; I think he should be kept to some level of relevance and some level of intelligent discussion about this bill. He should not get on to these flights of fancy of his even though he was up late last night, even though he knows he is under tremendous pressure from the people out there who know that the Opposition have blown their tops over this thing, have lost contact with the people. They peaked a few days ago when they might have had a little bit going for them but it has been downhill ever since and they are very frustrated. We know all of these pressures are on them but, despite that, we cannot let him get away with flights of fancy.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the only flights of fancy that we see in this House are the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) budget and his financial reports. I believe he does them quarterly or whenever he gets a chance to do them and those are usually the flights of fancy that take place.

My friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was not debating the principle of this bill, he was talking about the shape of this

bill and how it got where it is, the form of it, what the form of bringing this bill through the House has been, and I submit to Your Honour, obviously, it is through this thing called closure. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) this morning in his opening remarks pointed out to us that we could not talk about retroactivity, that we could not talk about the definition of temporary layoff and permanent layoff. My friend from Torngat Mountains is not talking that, he is talking about how the bill got where it is and the shape of the bill as it now stands -

MR. WARREN:

And why it is going to go through.

MR. TULK:

- and why it is going to go through. It is going to go through as a result of closure, as a result of the dictatorial attitudes that exist on the other side, as a result of this government trying to force itself on the people of this Province, they are forcing a bill, that it does not even meet good taste let alone having any principles behind it. That is what my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was trying to point out. He is doing an excellent job of it. And as usual when he stands to speak in this House he gets to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), he gets to the Premier and finally he gets the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on his feet to protest. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no point of order and I would ask Your Honour to rule accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

To that point of order, again I can merely remind the hon. member for Torngat Mountain (Mr. Warren)

of the rule of relevancy. Although I must say one would need a vivid imagination to see whether some of the points he was making were relevant or not.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, for us on this side of the House to get our message across to members opposite. Now, Mr. Speaker, we must realize this bill got to the present stage that we are debating because of the dictatorial attitude of this government. And I believe it is a pretty fair assumption, Mr. Speaker, that if there were a free vote on this bill as it is in now, that the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Collins) would not vote for it. Now I think that is a fair assumption, Mr. Speaker, and there is only one way to prove it. It is not only the member for Port de Grave, but there are other members in this hon. House who would vote against closure on a bill of such magnitude. I believe that is fair ball, Mr. Speaker. I believe what we are discussing this morning is the third reading of this bill.

The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can cook the books, so I am sure that he can convince the Premier to allow his colleagues, when the vote is counted, to have a free vote. It would be interesting to note, I believe, I said last week, Mr. Speaker, to one of the news reporters asked me if I had any idea or any suspicion about members opposite who would probably vote against the bill, if they were allowed to do so. I told him then and I say again, there are members opposite who do not like this bill in its present stage. I probably should not

refer to the bill too often, Mr. Speaker, I know I will be out of order again, but I believe -

DR. COLLINS:

What you are saying is so foolish I am going to ignore it.

MR. WARREN:

I do not think that it is foolish, Mr. Speaker. Do you mean to tell me that because you are elected as a Conservative in this Province that you have to go against the wishes of your constituents to follow the Premier although he could be wrong? Is that the way it has to happen? I believe, Mr. Speaker, we have to show leadership in this Province. I believe the coalition formed on this side of the House whatever you call it - the socialist coalition? Liberals/Socialist coalition? -

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, people outside of the House should not be laughing at the hon. member's remarks.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, you know, it is amazing that this government has been so concerned and upset for the past three weeks with the coalition that have been formed on this side of the House that they are really concerned. Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, I only have a minute left, urgently request the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), who has just taken his seat now to get up as soon as I take my seat and say they are withdrawing the retroactive clause in Bill 37. That is all that would be needed. That is the only thing that would be needed and we could be out of this House in five minutes. Withdraw that retroactive part of the clause and the game is all

over, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):  
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, in the few remarks that I have to make on this bill I will try to be relevant, I will try not to talk about the principle of the bill. I will talk about another principle that is not a principle of the bill itself but certainly is a principle of democracy. It is the principle that closure is used only when it is absolutely necessary, and in this case it was not absolutely necessary-

MR. ANDREWS:  
In your opinion.

MR. TULK:  
- because the Premier had been given by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) various ways that he could have gotten out of putting forward the principles that are in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, what we on this side object to, what we have been objecting to for the past number of days is the method that the Premier of this Province and his government have used to ram a piece of legislation through this House. They have used every little parliamentary trick that they can use, and, I suppose, finally today they are going to get the bill.

MR. NEARY:  
The last gasp of a dictatorship.

MR. TULK:  
I am sure that the Brian of 1979, the Brian of 1978, even the Brian

of 1980 would not have used this kind of tactic, this kind of procedure in any circumstance.

MR. NEARY:  
Why do you think he has changed?

MR. TULK:  
I am going to get to that in that a few minutes.

MR. NEARY:  
All right.

MR. TULK:  
I want to talk about the Premier I saw in this Province in 1979 when I came in this House as a member, perhaps not so young in age but certainly very young in this House. Whatever differences one might have had with the Premier's approach to things, whatever differences one might have had about his beliefs, I honestly believed that the Premier of this Province was a man of principle, I think most people in this Province believed he operated on principle. But that has changed substantially.

Yesterday evening when I brought this up, the Premier was not in the House, I do not know whether he was listening or not, so I have to bring it up to the Premier's attention again. Yesterday I heard him stand in this House and talk about a concept that many people have talked about, the concept of peace. He intimated somehow that it would be all right to have the ideal of peace in this world, to have that in your mind, to have that as the principle to be fought for, but maybe at certain times you would have to sacrifice that for what I believed he called the real world.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier needs to be reminded, I believe, that it is

not enough for the Premier of this Province to stand in this House and spew out some Newfoundland language, which is probably the best language in North America, but that alone is not good enough. It is not good enough for the Premier to walk into this House and talk about going out and killing birds and moose and catching rabbits, pretending to be a good outstanding Newfoundlander. That is not good enough. The Premier has to operate in this Province on principles, principles, I would suggest to him that he perhaps in 1979. Instead, the multinationals and other people are manipulating the Premier and laughing at him behind his back. I believe they are. I have heard a number of his so-called friends -

MR. NEARY:

You should hear what Mobil says about him.

MR. TULK:

- whom the Premier thinks are behind him, whom the Premier thinks are great people. I have heard a number of them make fun of him. They regard him as somebody to be manipulated, somebody to be used, somebody to be pushed around.

MR. NEARY:

Mobil looks upon him as some kind of a joke.

MR. ANDREWS:

You are really close to Mobil, are you?

MR. NEARY:

I was not talking to you and your rose-coloured glasses but to the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird).

MR. SPEAKER (Alyward):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

The Premier painted out in this House yesterday evening that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was not living in the real world. Well, I want to suggest to the Premier that this bill that we are discussing here and how it got here shows very well that the Premier is trying to create his own world, his own little empire.

I have heard people call the Premier in this House Emperor Napoleon.

MR. NEARY:

Gaddafi.

MR. TULK:

No, that is the other fellow, the fellow that sits next to him, his lieutenant.

MR. NEARY:

No, that is the rotten stinker.

MR. TULK:

That is the rotten stinker, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the Government House Leader.

We have a new food in Newfoundland now, it is not chile con carne, it is Willie Con Carney or Carney conned Willie, I am not sure. We saw that happen the other day when he was up in Ottawa. We have that new kind of food called Carney conned Willie.

MR. BAIRD:

You must have been up all night thinking that one up.

MR. TULK:

Even the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) gets a little smile on his face about that one because he knows what this bill is doing is incorrect, he knows that the final form, the final shape of this bill

is incorrect. It is not what the member for Humber West would finally like to see. Is he still executive assistant to the Premier on the West Coast or some kind of special assistant? If that position were not in danger, if he were not in the Tory Party, then I suspect that the member for Humber West would stand in his place, if he could stand somewhere near the middle of this House, and say, "This bill is wrong."

MR. NEARY:

At least he can stand that is more than you can say about the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews).

MR. TULK:

The member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir just stays in his seat and keeps shouting insinuations and innuendoes across the House.

MR. NEARY:

Insults and obscenities.

MR. TULK:

That shows his capability.

MR. BAIRD:

Mr. Speaker. Relevancy, he has not spoken one word on the bill this morning, not a word.

MR. TULK:

We are talking about how this bill got where it is and it got here under the threat of closure. As a matter of fact we are again operating under a different form of closure. I am not sure how the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) this morning made his motion. I think he combined three or four into one and somehow finagled and got them past the Speaker and invoked closure under another name. You see, the thing is that they would not yesterday come into this House and give

notice that they were going to introduce closure on third reading because then they would have to use Standing Order 50 twice. So what did they do? They came in under Standing Order 40, moved another form of question called the previous question. So the thing that you have to ask about this bill, Mr. Speaker, is what does it say about the Premier of this Province, the government of this Province, and what has happened to them since 1979? To be quite frank with you I pity him. I believe that he was a young man who came into this House, as I said, with principle, and I believe that he has given it all up to keep holding on to the premiership of this Province, to power.

MR. NEARY:

He is in the pockets now of the multinationals.

MR. TULK:

And the best way that he sees to do that is the Tory way. I am going to be kind to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) but when you look across at the front benches and see the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) - I am going to skip around the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) because he is the best of the three - and see the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), and then see the Minister of Justice, and then go down in that corner and look at that great galoot from St. John's North (Mr. Carter), is it any wonder that with those three people sitting next to him, giving him advice, that the Premier has lost principles? I believe they were somewhat Liberal principles because he was a Liberal.

MR. NEARY:

His mind has become warped he is so power hungry.

MR. TULK:

Here comes the Premier now. Is it any wonder that his mind is so warped from wanting power? Is it any wonder, given the Tory putsch that is obviously coming, people who believe you can trample on the rights of people as the final form of this bill does, is it any wonder that the Premier of this Province and his government have deteriorated to the state where it will just grasp at power and try to hold onto it by whatever means possible?

MR. NEARY:

Who gives them the right? Dobbin, Ryan, Martin, and Marshall.

MR. TULK:

That is not so bad. It comes through. There is the final pipeline.

MR. NEARY:

He is afraid of him.

MR. TULK:

It is all poked up the line through him. The Premier has I think reached the stage where he is afraid if he does not follow the advice of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) that he is going to scuttle him in the same way he tried to scuttle Frank Moores. He believes that is what he is up to and he is scared of him. Because, you know, the gentleman is evil and cute and he has a method, he has an ability to tear down but not very much of an ability to build up.

MR. NEARY:

He would start a row in church.

MR. TULK:

He would try to start a row in

church.

MR. NEARY:

He did start a row in this House, by the way. and got a belt in the gob for insulting a member's mother.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

What we have now, Mr. Speaker, what this bill represents, is a government that is being told by Tory St. John's and the large corporations that you can go into the House and you can pass this bill or that bill but you cannot pass what is good for the people of this Province.

MR. NEARY:

And if you need a letter from us let us know.

MR. TULK:

Yes, we have seen all of those things happen. But I believe that in this case, the Premier once he had set his course, realized that he had to have something to try to at least save face, so he went back to Kruger and asked them for a letter.

MR. NEARY:

We asked him to produce it, he did not have it so then he went and go it to try to save face after the fact.

MR. TULK:

That is right. And of course Kruger were happy to give it to them because they were going to save \$5 million to \$6 million.

MR. NEARY:

He will get a pretty hefty donation for the next election for that, I suppose.

MR. BARRY:

What percentage do you figure?

MR. NEARY:

I would say that is good for \$50,000 or \$60,000 or \$100,000 for the next election. At least \$100,000.

MR. TULK:

Will he get \$100,000?

MR. NEARY:

Oh, yes, for the next election.

MR. TULK:

He got more than that from the Iron Ore Company of Canada.

MR. DINN:

It did not cost me as much for my election last time as it did for yours.

MR. NEARY:

\$150,000 from the Iron Ore Company of Canada.

MR. TULK:

I would bet that you did not report as much as I did because you probably did not report the whole thing. You did not report it all. That shows the ignorance of the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY:

\$150,000 from the Iron Ore Company of Canada, \$100,000 from Wabush. How much do you think he is going to get from the oil companies for giving up the back-in? I would say about \$500,000 they will contribute - \$500,000 from the oil companies.

MR. TULK:

They probably will get \$500,000.

MR. NEARY:

Five hundred thousand dollars from the oil companies, \$150,000 from IOC, \$100,000 from Kruger,

\$100,000 from Bowater, \$100,000 from Wabush mining company.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Their coffers will be bursting at the seams.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman is probably right. But what do we have?

MR. NEARY:

Election Expenses Act how are you! They will have the coffers stuffed before they bring it in.

MR. TULK:

We had the Premier of this Province, in the process of trying to get this bill passed, going out to Kruger and saying, "Give me a letter." And, of course, with \$5 million or \$6 million sitting on the table Kruger would have to be awfully, awfully silly not to give it. So that was another part of the process, that was another part of the cute little tricks in getting this bill through. But the Premier knows he is wrong.

MR. NEARY:

A \$1 million party fund, that is what they are going for, \$1 million -

MR. TULK:

They will want more than that to win this time.

MR. NEARY:

- in the party coffers before they bring in the Election Act.

MR. TULK:

They had \$1 million the last time. They will want more than

that this time.

MR. NEARY:

\$1 million? They will want \$2.5 million this time.

MR. TULK:

They will want \$2.5 million.

The Premier knows he is wrong otherwise you would not see him coming in here at three or four o'clock in the morning, standing up on his chair, his legs all around his chair and his desk, his eyes bulging out, arms waving. You would not see the Premier doing that if he knew he was right. Because when the Premier knows he is right he has the habit of standing up in this House and being very cool, being very calm, and saying the things that have to be said. But he knows he is wrong in this case.

The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), in spite of what I believe is somewhat of of a sadistic trait in the hon. gentleman, knows he is wrong. He knows he is wrong. That is the reason this morning when the member for Torngat Mountains was up on a petition the Government House Leader was over there yapping away at him, telling him to sit down, trying to revoke that right a member has to present a petition in this House. That is the reason this morning that he was not very pleased that he had to get up and call for Orders of the Day and cut off presentation of a petition from a community in Labrador with 200-odd names on it, a legitimate petition. That is the reason he tore up the Order Paper again this morning, the second day in a row, and invoked closure again, and got upset when he did it because he does have little pangs of conscience. But

he has been torn to shreds in the last week or so, he has been torn to shreds by Carney, PC, Pat Carney.

MR. NEARY:

Deal with their claim that we are toying with people's lives.

MR. PATTERSON:

Read The Globe and Mail on Marshall and Carney.

MR. TULK:

Oh, he enjoys that. He enjoys toying with people's lives.

MR. NEARY:

Making such wild irresponsible statements that we are toying with people's lives. How sanctimonious can you get?

MR. TULK:

The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) enjoys toying with people's lives. You cannot doubt that. You cannot doubt that for a minute.

MR. NEARY:

You dug a hole for yourself like the glory hole out in Buchans. You will never get up out of it again.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

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

MR. MARSHALL:

I do not think this is relevant. If the hon. gentleman persists in irrelevancy, why does he not entertain us by telling us how he, who is talking about people's principles, knifed the former Leader of the Opposition last year when he was talking in April with the then member for Mount Scio



(Mr. Barry) about taking over the leadership, and how he knifed the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and all the rest of it. If he wants to speak about irrelevancy, let us hear how he wielded the knife against his colleagues over there.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! To that point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order, that is just an opportunity for the ultimate in nastiness, for the biggest stinker we have in this House to make low, snide remarks, and when he makes these remarks and runs away like a coward, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! To that point of order, I would remind the hon. member that we are discussing third reading of Bill No. 37 and we are discussing the motion that the previous question be put and I could say that the hon. member's arguments were related to the previous motion.

MR. BARRY:

I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

I notice it is one o'clock, Mr. Speaker. There has been a motion, I believe, although I was out at the time I am so informed, not to

adjourn at one o'clock. Now I would like to ask whether it is the intention of members opposite to attempt to starve us out on this side now. Now that parliamentary procedure is not getting the business through the House, is it the intent of government to starve out members and force them to continue without any opportunities for food or drink? Is that the intent? Is that the new stratagen of members opposite?

The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) does a little brush burning, maybe they will try to burn us out eventually if it goes on any longer.

Mr. Speaker, we ask for the protection of the Chair. I move, seconded by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), that the House now adjourn so members can obtain the sustenance to provide the energy that is need to let them do the jobs for which they were elected, which is to provide effective opposition in this House of Assembly.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I suggest the hon. gentlemen opposite do as we did, and that is that somebody could go down to the cafeteria and bring up some sandwiches or phone out for some pizzas. There are any number of things.

MR. BARRY:

There is debate in the House here. We cannot eat in the House. We cannot eat inside in

the House of Assembly.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Take turns in your Common Room the same way we do.

MR. BARRY:

Shame on you! Food. I need food.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

The hon. Garf could go get you food. He is not sitting there now. He has already spoken.

DR. COLLINS:

Man does not live by bread and water alone.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Exactly.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! To the point of order raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), this is not the prerogative of the Chair. The motion that has been passed is that we do not rise at one o'clock. That has been put and passed. The Chair is responsible for keeping decorum in the House but is not responsible for feeding hon. members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

DR. COLLINS:

You could lose a couple of pounds there.

MR. TULK:

I lost a couple in the last week. This crowd, Mr. Speaker, would starve you to death. They are trying to get us in the position now where we will not have strength enough to stand in this House. The next thing we will see from members on the other side is

that we will be kept here and probably no food will be allowed to be brought into Confederation Building.

MR. BARRY:

They probably are not taking orders in the cafeteria now.

MR. TULK:

Yes, they will probably close down the cafeteria in the name of financial restraint when really all they want to do is starve the Opposition to death.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I would just remind the hon. member that he is straying somewhat from relevancy.

MR. TULK:

A small, wee bit, Your Honour, I would agree. I am straying a small, wee bit from this bill.

DR. COLLINS

The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), which restaurant is he in now?

MR. TULK:

The member for the Strait of Belle Isle, I want to inform the Finance Minister, does not eat a very big lunch. In fact, he eats a very light lunch and I believe he eats a good meal in the evening. I believe that covers the eating habits of the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

Mr. Speaker, if I could get back to this bill what it means to the people of this Province is their democratic rights have been taken away. It means that the Opposition, which is part of the legitimate form of government, has been blackmailed and threatened, has been bullied into passing a

piece of legislation that we believe is not right. We have not been allowed to debate the legislation in the way that we would like to have done. The government has torn up the Order Paper on two occasions. The Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) have used every little trick; the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has tried on several occasions but he always gets mixed up and messed up and the best he can do is get up on a point of order. They have used every little trick that they can find, every cute little move that they can find to stifle opposition to them. And I would warn them that this bill is very similar in the way it has been handled and the way it has been put, and perhaps even in its principle which I am not allowed to debate, with another bill that was passed in this House, the bill dealing with the IWA strike in this Province. Because what this bill shows is that the government is acting in a dictatorial manner, trying to tell the people of this Province what is good for them. I could not believe my ears when I heard the Premier yesterday evening stand in this House and say that the people of Corner Brook would not understand. What contempt! What contempt the Premier of this Province has for the people he is supposed to be governing!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Do you want somebody to stand on a point of order so you can eat?

MR. TULK:

Yes, I am getting hungry. I am being starved over here, they are starving me out!

MR. MATTHEWS:

You look like you are wasting away over there.

MR. TULK:

The member for Placentia wants to give me a ride somewhere?

MR. PATTERSON:

I will bring you out to Petland.

MR. TULK:

The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is upset and has been upset for the past week and a half. I have never seen him in such a condition in this House. He gets riled right up, his blood pressure rises, you can see the red in his face, and my advice to him is that a man of his age should not get upset about such things as are happening unless he is going to stand on his feet and vent his spleen on the Premier, which I know he feels. I know he feels terrible about what has happened in this Province about this bill because I believe that he is a very honourable gentleman and I know that he will regret to his dying day what he has done in this House and what he has been a party to in this House with respect to this bill. I know he will.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) tried to give the Liberal opposition in this House a kind little slap on the wrist. He said it was a kind little slap. The member for Menihek did not agree with the procedural ways in which we have tried to tie up debate in this House. That was the statement that me made yesterday evening. He said, "I do not agree with using some of the procedural regulations that the Liberal Party has used." Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting for some time for the member for Menihek to speak up.

As a representative for Labour in this Province, he obviously opposes this piece of legislation. The representative of the NDP Party in this House should oppose a labour standard such as we are now discussing.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Then at least we would have heard something.

MR. TULK:

We have been talking because we oppose the bill, but we have not heard too much from the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) on how this bill should be opposed and how you are going to stop it other than in the ways that we have tried to stop it in this House. I want to give him a kind little slap back by telling him he cannot have his cake and eat it too, and that seems to be what he has been trying to do for the past little while. Because I have a few little socialist leanings, a few leftist leanings myself, I am eager to forgive him. What irritates me sometimes is that even though the hon. the member for Menihek seems to be kind, I sometimes wonder if he is patronizing. The days are numbered that the member for Menihek is going to get away with that kind of thing, I can assure him of that.

MR. BARRETT:

You have made a very sensible observation.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, if the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett), is still in this House in a year's time he will probably stand and read another speech prepared for him by the Premier.

MR. BARRETT:

It really was not.

MR. TULK:

It really was not? Then it was prepared by one of his executive assistants.

MR. BARRETT:

It was somewhere in that area.

MR. TULK:

Yes, somewhere in that area. It was written by somebody, I can assure the hon. member of that, because otherwise it would never have gotten put together. If you had to trust the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) to put it together it would never have been done. Somebody said it was his maiden speech. No, it was not, it was his second speech.

MR. BARRETT:

It was not that either.

MR. TULK:

You have not gotten past three speeches in this House have you? We should do some research and see if he got to three or four. But, Mr. Speaker, before I was so rudely interrupted by the member for St. John's West -

MR. BARRETT:

I only agreed with what you were saying. I was not interrupting.

MR. TULK:

You were still interrupting.

MR. DINN:

Three minutes, thank God.

MR. TULK:

No, five. They have a little competition going over there now to see who is going to be the Wayne Gretzky of interruptions. It was formerly held by the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) but I believe the member

for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), who is not in his seat and has not been there this morning - I do not know why but that is his business - now has the record. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn), who is now going out the door, would have the record but his is a continual interruption and therefore you cannot count it. He is on the go all the time, his jaws are moving all the time.

MR. DINN:  
Continual or continuous?

MR. TULK:  
Continual. Your mouth is moving continual.

MR. DINN:  
Continually.

MR. TULK:  
What comes out of your mouth is continuous, a continuous lot of nonsense. Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude with these few remarks, but what has happened in this Province with this bill is shameful, it is a shame on Newfoundland. Newfoundlanders will live to see the day when they will turf this government out for this kind of legislation. Not only that, but we have another piece of legislation on the Order Paper which has the same shape, the same form as this legislation that we are now debating. They will probably withdraw it. I hope they do, I hope they have sense enough to withdraw that piece of legislation on student aid.

MR. BARRY:  
The same thing is going to happen on that one.

MR. TULK:  
Well, in many ways, from a political point of view I would hope that they keep it on the

Order Paper because it will enable us as an Opposition to again show what kind of dictatorship is being perpetrated on the people of this Province. But for the good of the students of Memorial University and other post-secondary institutions in the Province I would ask that great minister down there, the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) to see that the principles that are contained in this bill, in the Labour Standards Act, are taken out of any education act that comes into this Province.

MR. POWER:  
For what reason?

MR. BARRY:  
What reason? Its retroactive regulations.

MR. TULK:  
I said when we were debating the principle of the bill, I did not believe that minister meant what he was saying, that he would bring in the same kinds of principles in another bill such as are now before this House. I do not believe for a minute, Mr. Speaker, that he will. Politically it would be the best thing in the world he could do for us, to bring in retroactive legislations. But, Mr. Speaker, for the good of the students of this Province he should not do it, he should not do it.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):  
Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, can I go on some more?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Does the hon. member have leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave is not granted.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

This is going to be an interesting experience for me because, very frankly, the concept of what you can say and what you cannot say on third reading is a little bit foggy in my mind still. So if I exceed the bounds, Mr. Speaker, would you please indicate when I have exceeded them. We may end up with a lot of points of order before we are finished with this.

As I understand, the purpose of debate on third reading is to sort of go over the process in which the bill got to this stage. Is that correct? And to reflect on it and to comment on it. Am I sort of in the right ball park there?

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member is looking for direction, I might suggest to him that he can discuss not to the principle of the bill, but how the bill got here and things like that. Under the motion that is put here now, that the previous question be put, he could object to that or support it.

MR. FENWICK:

That sounds good.

The interesting thing about putting the question is that, although I am quite used to seeing it other meetings, I was not really aware it is a procedure

used with frequency in the House of Assembly or in the House of Commons. As a matter of fact, I got the distinct impression that it really was not used that frequently considering the amount of procedural wrangling that occurred when it was first introduced. It seems to me that it does a very significant amount of damage to the overall process of getting the bill in. One of the things that I was hoping to do on second reading, which was curtailed by the use of this device, was to propose substantive reasoned amendments to the particular bill itself. As I have said before, I have objections to the principle of the bill, to the retroactivity of it, but I was hoping to be able, at least in a rational process, to ask if indeed all the members in this House but myself felt that sixteen weeks was too long a period for notice in terms of a temporary layoff, and maybe there would have been a chance to introduce an amendment to find out if twelve weeks is too long or eight weeks too long and so on. I find it unfortunate that the government really cut back the debate on the principle of the bill to really very, very few speakers. I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) got a chance to speak for a period of time on it, then we went into a discussion on an amendment and that is really all we got to discuss for any length of time. So we really have not looked at the bill with the idea of seeing could it have been improved or could it have been modified so that it would not be as onerous or not so all-encompassing in the way in which it took away those benefits. I think that is unfortunate. I did not expect that particular procedure would be used in the debate and I think

that it is an unfortunate thing to do because I think we should pay more attention to exactly what we are doing here in terms of looking at the actual wording and making suggestions for how it should be improved and so on. So in a sense I think that that was a form of closure that was used there. I think it is unfortunate that the government is resorting to those kind of techniques in this debate that has been going on. I think at this point that the general impression in the mind of the general public about what is going on here is that they are wondering why it is being dragged out so long and so on. But I think at the same time they realize down deep in their own subconscious, so to speak, that what is being done here is not really the kind of thing you look back on ten years from now and say this was the best shining moment that this House of Assembly had. This is really a day that I am hoping members opposite would love to forget in the future because I think that in subsequent elections, where they will have to be accountable for their actions, they may find that a lot of people did remember this particular debate and did remember that there was frequent usage of closure and closure-like techniques in order to force through the legislation and that it was very clearly a dividing point in the direction that this government administration has taken. In the past I think it had a respectable claim to represent the interests of all the Province both workers and employers and people who were not in the work force and so on, but I think now there is a change in the sense that the government now is perceived to be more in one particular camp, so to speak, and working in that particular

direction, for its own reasons and they are legitimate reasons and so on, but it is unfortunate that these techniques had to be used in order to bring this question to a head like that. I would have really liked to have seen the government more open to looking at the legislation, Bill 37, and being receptive to discussions substantively modifying it in this legislature. I know that may not be a normal course of event for the government, that they are open to suggestions from the Opposition in terms of how to approve legislation but I think that that would have at least made me feel - I am not sure how the official Liberal Opposition would have felt about it - that at least we are part of the process of trying to produce legislation that ultimately is in the best interests of everybody in the Province. In a sense I really resented that initial motion to move the previous question because, as I said, it cut off any chance to be able to do much in that particular area.

As for the overall way in which we have come down this particularly bumpy road to this particular point, I think we must comment that some of the tactics have been less than edifying, particularly those tactics by the government to lash, so as to speak, this particular piece of legislation to another piece of legislation which nobody in this House has any objection to, and that is, of course, Bill 52, the one that provides for the transfer of the assets of the Corner Brook mill over to a new operator.

And I find that a very distasteful tactic. I think what it tends to do is sugarcoat an extremely bitter pill, which is probably the

best analogy I can think of at this moment. Really we should have been able to discuss the amendments to the Labour Standards Act on their own merits without clouding the issue with something that was not part of the initial debate and only became part of the debate when it became opportunistic on the part of the government to actually dump it into the hopper by requesting a piece of correspondence in order to support its particular position.

And that I think is a tragic mistake for the government to make. I understand that there is a degree of desperation here, but I did not really think it was really necessary to drag this third party, so as to speak, which had only a peripheral interest in what was going on here at that point, directly into the melee. I think it is a bad precedent. If those tactics can be used in the future, I think, they establish a kind of connection between the government and these large corporations that, in my mind at least, is extremely worrisome. I think of all of the things that occurred the letter was perhaps the most offensive, although I must say there was an advertising campaign last weekend which I found pretty close to being as offensive as the letter. I was looking through the rules of order when it occurred and it almost seemed to me an insult to this House that the government would so disregard our rights and prerogatives that it would enlarge the debate by paying for advertisements in order to get its particular point of view across. That is an abuse, I think, of the public purse in the first instance, but it is also I think an abuse of fair play in the democratic process. It is

obvious, just looking at the seating arrangement here, and the number of members on the other side and the number of members on this particular side that really it does not seem that those members should need much more help in order to put forward their particular point of view, outnumbering, as they do, the combined strength of the Opposition party is four or five to one.

So for the government to have stooped to buying newspaper and radio advertisements in order to put forward their point of view, to me is an extremely unfair way of approaching the whole system and I think that we should continue to protest that. And if I knew the rules of order better than I do, and I apologize for not knowing them as well as I perhaps should I would have ransacked the references in order to find something that we could have pointed to as a violation of the privilege of this House, which I feel intuitively that it is, but I have no way of figuring out exactly which particular section we could hang that particular accusation on.

To feel, as the government obviously did, that it was not getting its message across when it has upwards of forty spokespersons whom it could have used to broadcast its message in here - after all, the House is covered by most of the media in the Province and their message then could have been rebroadcast, could have been taken down and printed up and so on - to feel that somehow those forty-odd members were incapable of matching the eloquence of this side, however limited it may be is sort of disconcerting, as it is disconcerting to see them willing



to spend all this money in order to put forward their message in a fixed format. There was no chance of responding to it available. I think that is a very surprising thing to see, especially with the masses over there. When I listen to some of the enthusiastic applause for some of the more violent tirades by the Premier and others, it sounded to me almost like a herd of elephants coming thumping down the road.

It is not that I object to enthusiastic applause, I think there are occasions when that is perfectly permissible, but the time at which the applause came was in response to statements which were clearly of a nature that one can only classify as blackmail, when we were being told that we were putting the future of the mill and the entire West Coast of the Province in jeopardy by what we were doing. And, of course, we know, and I think the members opposite in their own hearts know that no such thing was being done. The mill deal has never been in jeopardy, first, last or ever. It was a sham, a charade on the part of the government to try and give some justification for their triple invoking of closure over this bill, twice with the movement to put the previous motion and once with the Standing Order 50 itself.

That is really what got the applause. So it was not applause for saving a mill, it was an applause because the government was willing to be heavy-handed enough to try and hammer what is obviously a very small opposition into the ground and, in my opinion, the over-kill is quite obvious to the people of this Province. I know that there is a feeling among the people of our

Province that they do not like to see that kind of abuse of power which clearly taking place in this particular debate.

So I do not really have a lot more to say than that, other than I think the last word in this debate or the last speech in this debate has not been made. The final verdict on this debate and on what we have done here this last week and a half will not become apparent until the next provincial election. Then I think there is a possibility, of course, in the next election that people will buy that kind of intimidation and blackmailing tactics that have been used by the government. That is always possible. Unfortunately, we the electorate are not always as astute as they should be perhaps.

But generally speaking I think they can see through that kind of bluff, they can see through that kind of intimidation tactics. I think it will be interesting to see in the future whether this indeed is a watershed for the government opposite, that they have so grossly abused their power and the power of the public purse that the people will hold them responsible.

DR. COLLINS:

It will be a watershed but not for you.

MR. FENWICK:

I am glad that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) injected a comment there. After I had discussed this particular piece of legislation yesterday I believe, or last night - now the hours tend to meld into each other - is the Minister of Finance expressed grave disappointment in the quality of the debate coming from

myself. Unfortunately, I have not had an opportunity to respond to those particular comments, but since they did occur in the debate in the Committee of the Whole I think they are an indication of what went on in it. And if I recall correctly his comments were he was disappointed in the level of debate, yet nowhere did he produce any evidence to support his contention. But then I think that is consistent with the fact that the government has consistently put forward things like a bill costing \$27 million bill or \$60 million or \$100 million and it has never put forth any evidence for them either.

What I am trying to say is that since the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) does not seem to be able to debate anything other than in terms of personalities and in accusations against people's characters and so on and never substantively on the issues, I was not surprised to hear how low his tenor of debate had sunk as well. I just thought I would take the opportunity now to at least respond to that particular comment. I do not want to go into too much more than that because I think the minister does realize that we do not share a similar philosophy. I admit that freely. I am not a Tory, I am not a conservative, I happen to be a Social Democrat and there are certain things that I believe in. I do not think I am a socialist, by the way, although I find a lot of the kinds of things that socialists do put forward to be reasonably attractive. I say that because I have been accused of being a socialist here continuously. If I were I would admit it, but I really do not think that I could be put into that classic mould, but anyway

that is neither here nor there.

Just going back over the debate, I think that it is unfortunate that the kinds of comments we got out of such ministers as the Minister of Finance were just poisoning the well, telling people that they were not doing the job that they should be and so on, and substantively never answering any of the particular issues that were brought up. Because there were substantive issues in these bills which I think got really mangled under the hoofs of those forty-two members opposite. Obviously there is a Speaker in the Chair but I am not bringing the Speaker into that position at all. I think when we see an election we can go and talk to people and say, 'Our rights as the Opposition were badly distorted, badly damaged, by the processes that were used in the House. Your rights as workers and citizens of this Province were diminished by the legislation that was brought forward but never effectively justified', at least in my opinion, and we will ask the people to pay back this arrogant government for the insensitive kind of legislation that it has brought in and for the techniques used to get it passed.

DR. COLLINS:

You can say whatever you want but it will not be accurate because you will just give your perceptions of what happened.

MR. FENWICK:

Whenever we get clear to the truth it is obviously the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who must interrupt to try to change our trend of thought. The fact of the matter is they will make a judgment on it. I think the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are intelligent enough to

make the right judgment, that these kinds of bullying tactics should never ever be rewarded and that they will respond by making sure that we will have less members on the opposite side after the next election.

I will just finish by mentioning I was giving a speech to a group of people several days ago and one of the people in the crowd asked, 'What did you think was the major difference between being a teacher and being a member of the House of Assembly?' The first comment I made, which usually is well received, was that the kids were a lot bigger in the House of Assembly and the other one was that they very rarely listen, and hopefully when we have the next election that we will see quite a few drop-outs.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, in the ten years that I have been here in the House this is the first time we have ever had a closure motion.

MR. PATTERSON:

You do not spend time on that side of the House.

MR. HODDER:

The hon. member knows that I could stack my time up over the last ten years with his at any time at all. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here continuously for the past three weeks. But that again is the type of comment, the type of low debate that we have been hearing from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), from the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), who I understand is

retiring because his constituents have so ordered. I understand that the administration is looking for a suitable replacement. So I am sure, Mr. Speaker, when we sit over there and they sit over here, he will not be one of the people who will then be in the Opposition. But, Mr. Speaker, I will not waste my time trying to debate with someone like him. What is it the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) says? 'The hon. gentleman comes to a battle of wits half armed.'

MR. PATTERSON:

The man you quoted does not come in here at all.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, if the member for the Strait of Belle Isle were here five minutes a year he contributes more to this House than the hon. member contributes in the whole year.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time we have seen closure and it is the first time we have seen it four times over. When I first came and sat in the House of Assembly there were sixteen, four and one, there were in excess of twenty members in the Opposition. At that time the public's perception was that there was a much stronger Opposition, certainly in numbers, but never did the government, in our worst days invoke closure. I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), who was then in the Chair, can remember the nights that we sat all night, we went around the clock. I believe we were here until 10:00 o'clock one morning having sat continuously all night. I also remember when we sat at ten o'clock in the morning until one o'clock, came back at three o'clock, and then

came back again three nights a week at 8:00 p.m. until eleven o'clock. Members debated all the issues thoroughly. There have been times, Mr. Speaker, when we have held up Interim Supply for long periods of time but yet we have never seen the government bring in closure. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that what will get through in this Province is the fact that the government used this power which has been so rarely used in this House of Assembly. It is interesting to note that the power of closure was used back in 1971 and that was never forgotten. Hon. members opposite should reflect on the fact that closure is very rarely brought into this House. This time it came in on four different occasions within forty-eight hours. I believe the last time it was brought in in the House of Commons was for the pipeline debate. I do not think they have brought it in since although I have not researched it. Certainly this is the first time it has come in since 1971 which means it is almost fourteen years, Mr. Speaker. We have to ask what has happened to the government? There are many, many mechanisms that this government could have used instead of closure.

Closure, Mr. Speaker, is abhorrent to a democratic system. It is in the rules and I believe it should stay in the rules, but I think it should be used very rarely.

Mr. Speaker, we are looking at a bill that stood as law of this Province for six years and suddenly the government decide to retroactively bring in this particular piece of legislation which amends the bill back to 1978. We have to ask, Mr. Speaker, why it is that the

government has done it at this particular time? Why is it being done now? Hon. members should reflect on that. They should think about it because this particular bill could have been amended at any time. Obviously the government had some reason, it could not have been all of those companies. If the legislation was so abhorrent that it had to be forced through in the way that the government members have forced it through, I would like to know why it is that they brought it in at this particular time?

MR. NEARY:

They did not get their party donation until lately.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, normally that type of comment from the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I would regard with some suspicion, but, although I am not a suspicious person, after watching the debate in this House for the past three or four days I can hear that remark from the member for LaPoile and say to him, 'I think so, too.' I think there may be something right about what he says. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we have watched -

DR. COLLINS:

Oh my!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how he became the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), I do not know how he maintains his portfolio, but out in my district, which is a high unemployment area, they put the blame where it belongs, on the government, but even more than their dislike of the Premier is their dislike of the Minister of Finance. They see him as a bumbling fellow who always makes wrong predictions time after time

after time.

MR. TULK:

It is only a matter of doing his sums properly.

MR. HODDER:

You know, Mr. Speaker, I have lost my trend of thought.

DR. COLLINS:

He is on a hate trip.

MR. HODDER:

There have never been as many low remarks, Mr. Speaker, come from this side of the House as has come from that side, but this government is getting old and feeble. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) typifies that. The Premier has become arrogant and dictatorial. I would not call the Premier old and feeble but I would certainly call the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the Minister of Finance old and feeble. They have been here for too long, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, to get back to closure, members should reflect on this because it has something to do with what I just said about a government being in power too long, that at this particular time, after six years, the government decides to bring in closure on a bill of this nature. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we arrived in the House of Assembly back five weeks ago, we debated legislation all throughout that particular time. This particular bill was not the first on the Order Paper and we debated all sorts of little piddling housekeeping bills up to this particular time, none of which were very important, but suddenly, at the end of a session, nearing Christmas, the government brings this bill before us and invokes closure.

To get back to what I was saying, which ties in with that, the fact is we have for a number of years operated in this House without closure being brought in. Now I do not like the idea of closure but I believe it should be in the Standing Orders, in the rules, because there may be times when it should be used. Mr. Speaker, what closure does is snuff out democracy. That is why it was last brought in in the pipeline debate, that is why it has not come in here since 1971, when the government, by the way, was falling, had become dictatorial, had been in office for a long time and instead of following the normal rules of debate, as has happened in this House, they decided to bring in closure. Now what does closure actually do? Well, I do not know if hon. members know but they do not govern by divine right; an election that has to be held every five years.

MR. NEARY:

No more elections.

MR. HODDER:

Yes, that is what closure smells of. It smells of stamping on the rights of the House of Assembly. Because the House of Assembly, I might remind hon. members, includes an Opposition. If any members opposite have ever taken the trouble to read Beauchesne - I recommend you do just that, read it from cover to cover; you may not remember it all, neither did I - one thing that comes through very clearly there and very clearly in our own Standing Orders, which are slim but by which we are governed, is that this is the House of the Opposition, not the government. For what other reason would we be here, Mr. Speaker. Why is Mr.

Speaker sitting in the Chair, why are we over here? Because without an Opposition the government rules by divine right. We have a two-party or three-party system, what you will; in some countries they have many parties who go into coalition with each other and they oppose the government. But in the Western world, in the Commonwealth countries, as Your Honour well knows since he has attended a lot of Commonwealth conferences and seen people from all over the Commonwealth, basically this is an Opposition's House. And it is here that we, the Opposition, are charged, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, with being the people who bring government to task on any issue that we feel the government has gone wrong on. That is what we are about. I heard the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) speak a few minutes ago, talking about large children in the House of Assembly. I do not subscribe to that rule by the way. I believe that the House of Assembly has to be this way. We are not the debating forum that people perceive us to be. Sometimes when they come and see what is happening here in the House they say, 'Oh, they are a bunch of children.' There is some sort of perception out there that we all sit around a table and we behave, but the House is not set up that way. If hon. members ever have a chance to go to the House of Commons in Westminster or any other legislature in the country they will find that this House is very well behaved. We are set up to do it this way and I for one would hate to see the spirit of debate go out of the House and we would have to sit here like a bunch of businessmen around a table making decisions, because the very set up of the House of Assembly is to debate. Mr.

Speaker, what has happened here is that the right to debate has been taken away from the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, it should -

MR. STAGG:

Your forced it on us. You know you got up and spoke for the maximum time allowed.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ignore the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). His constituents have been ignoring him now for some time. I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, whether the member for Stephenville will run in the next election.

MR. TULK:

He calls the Premier J. R. Peckford.

MR. HODDER:

Yes, he coined that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG:

I was considering running in Port au Port again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I would welcome the member for Stephenville in Port au Port. But, it is a sacrifice for me to run in Port au Port because I can get elected in either seat, either Stephenville or Port au Port, and it would be so easy to go into Stephenville and defeat the hon. member. But, Mr. Speaker, I will go back to Port au Port because anyone can defeat the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker, to get back to what I was saying about closure, if hon. gentlemen should reflect on as to why it is that closure came in at this particular time when there have been so many controversial bills that came before this House and were proposed. I saw a paper

one time which was written about the government opposite and I think it used the expression 'group think'. It has become such now with the majority that the Premier has that there is a dynamic within the Tory party in this Province whereby everybody has to follow the leader. Mr. Speaker, I saw an example of that here one time in private session. I should not talk about what the issue was because when we have a private session it is usually about something important. But during the last session of the House I raised a question in private session when every member could speak. Certainly in the days before the present Premier, in the days of Premier Moores, whenever there was an open session regarding something to do with the running of the House or whatever it might be members spoke as they wished; Cabinet ministers would speak against each other. But when I raised my question last session, and the backbenchers were the most upset about it, but suddenly everyone on that side looked at each other and then the Premier got up and answered for them. I could not believe what I was seeing. Hon. members remember that day if they were in the House, because the Premier, even in private session has to answer for them. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the backbenchers should reflect on why this particular motion of closure has been brought in at this particular time and wonder about their leaders, backbenches, like the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond) - I know the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is a lost cause anyway - the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid), even the member for Gander, the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mrs. Newhook) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

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

MR. HODDER:  
Mr. Speaker, it is a waste of time actually trying to talk to the members on the other side because they do not understand. I often wonder if members opposite wonder where their leaders are taking them, where the Premier and the House Leader are taking them. They have had some nasty jolts recently with their showing in the polls which Mr. Speaker, are better for us now than for them.

MR. DINN:  
There is only one poll that counts and you might be facing it soon.

MR. HODDER:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker, and we look forward to it.

The wishy-washy Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) is in his seat, the minister who is an enemy of labour.

MR. NEARY:  
Everybody is demanding his resignation.

MR. HODDER:  
Yes, everyone in the Province wants his resignation.

He has been the hatchet man.

MR. DINN:  
They said that before the last election.

Do you know how many votes the NDP got in the last election in my district? 256 votes and they are still on their way down.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, that is the type of arrogance that will defeat this government.

I will tell the hon. minister - I believe he came in at the same time I did, in 1975 - that in total I have not gotten as many votes as he got in one election. But I can tell the hon. minister that when he goes down the drain he can lose these votes very quickly, and he should realize that and he should be a little cautious about what he is doing for labour because labour now are making dartboards with the minister's likeness.

MR. DINN:

I do not mind that.

MR. HODDER:

The Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power), I am sad to see him demoted. We have not been asking questions of the Minister of Career Development because he has been doing nothing. There is only one question: What are you and what are you doing?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance on a point of order.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the member is completely off the subject. I think he has gone off into outer space somewhere. He seems to want to be doing an analysis of all the various departments of government. If he wants to do that I am sure that he can go to the hon. minister's department and learn about it, but this House is not the place to do that sort of

thing.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, in Canada we have two or three outstanding constitutional experts that I know of, people who understand parliament and how the system works. We have Stanley Knowles and we have Professor Scott and we have a gentleman from Grand Bank, Senator Forsey. I would not put the hon. gentleman in that category, Mr. Speaker, but I would suggest that before the hon. gentleman stands up in this House in future to make a fool of himself and show how ignorant he is of the rules of this House, that the hon. gentleman should go and do a course in parliamentary procedure, go out and buy a Roberts Rules of Order, Mr. Speaker, and try to learn a few simple basic rules of the House.

MR. TULK:

You can get them in big print.

MR. NEARY:

Before he gets up making a fool of himself.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

To that point of order, I just remind the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) of the rule of relevancy pertaining to third reading of this bill.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, if I have strayed by referring to the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) I apologize.



MR. POWER:

What were you going to say?

MR. HODDER:

Since the question has been asked, I was saying I hate to see a person being demoted, and a minister who held such a fine portfolio as the minister did, and did such a fine job, being relegated to the background. When the Premier issued his press release he put the minister up front, and that is a sure sign of a demotion.

MR. POWER:

I am in the same seat.

MR. HODDER:

The minister may be sitting in his same seat but he has been demoted and he is now second string to the first, or level one I think it is, Minister of Education. But as for the Minister of Labour -

MR. POWER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies on a point of order.

MR. POWER:

I would just like a clarification from the member who is speaking to find out why it is more important to spray spruce budworms and grow trees than it is to educate the young people of this Province.

MR. HODDER:

I could answer that one.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, you will notice again that we have an hon. gentleman there opposite who does not

understand the rules. He got up on a point of order and then said it is a point of clarification. Now I think Your Honour will agree it is merely a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen and I hope that that is the way Your Honour will rule.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no valid point of order.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I should tell the minister yes it is important to have career development, but I want to see the minister produce and I would like to see something concrete happening. I have not heard a Ministerial Statement from the hon. gentleman yet. I would like to see what the minister is doing. You cannot ask questions of a minister unless he is doing something. The ministers who do nothing are unknown, are never asked questions. The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews) does nothing.

MR. POWER:

I was asked two questions on forestry in four years.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister has to show the people of this Province some action. There are courses in this Province which should be thrown out, courses for which there are no jobs. Mr. Speaker, that is another story and that is one I will bring up later, but I will try not to stray from the bill, Mr. Speaker, but speak to it and to talk about the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn). Mr. Speaker, we should always listen to ministers. When they emphasize something, that is when

we on this side of the House must be most diligent and careful. Because when the Minister of Labour introduced Bill 37 he stressed that there was no pressure applied by corporations. Mr. Speaker, the words of the hon. gentlemen, when they introduced this bill back some time ago, would cause anyone who cared to research them to condemn them. In fact, they have condemned themselves because their story has changed, Mr. Speaker, from time to time until finally in the end we saw the Premier contacting the president of Kruger to ask him to send a letter saying that they would not take over the mill. I mean, that is basically what happened in this Province. And it was a slow process, the story came out little bit by little bit by little bit. But, Mr. Speaker, as the pressure went on, from the people and through this House, the story changed until the Premier finally did his old hat trick by taking one important situation and linking it with something else he wanted to get done, as he has done consistently since he has been Premier; as we saw with the constitutional debate, as we saw with everything that this Premier has done is to link something with something else so as to -

DR. COLLINS:

You only mentioned two things and a hat trick implies three.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would like to reflect on this, the fact is we sat in this House of Assembly for the past eight years and we went through the Day of Mourning, we went through day after day after day, whatever happened, and we even saw the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) carry out

his own demonstration down in Shoe Cove. The people were speaking then when the minister took his own henchmen and lackies and organized a demonstration down there for the cameras, no doubt on the instructions of the Premier, and that says something about the thinking of this administration. I mean, that should not be forgotten, how low they are willing to stoop. And now, Mr. Speaker, it is a process of consultation. We saw it on Search and Rescue. When the federal Tory party is cutting back viciously on this Province, there are no days of mourning, Mr. Speaker, no black arm bands, no firey Ministerial Statements, but the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), who spent his entire life on the West Coast, went on CFXS radio complaining about the postal service.

Now that was his big issue last year right across the Province, complaining about the postal service.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the rule of relevancy.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, this is relevant because this all comes back to Bill 37 and the arrogance of this government which would bring it in to trample on the rights of this House of Assembly for the first time since 1971. Yes, it is very relevant. But the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), his big issue was the post office, the post office was going to be in North Sydney rather than in Stephenville. Now, Mr. Speaker, all the little post offices that serve the rural areas are being closed and what does the member for Stephenville do about that? The member for Stephenville has

not said a word.

MR. STAGG:

About what?

MR. HODDER:

The closing of the rural post offices. There we go, Mr. Speaker! The member does not even know about the shortening of time in all those rural, class three post offices.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. Minister of Finance on a point of order.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I know there is a love/hate relationship between the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), and it is very interesting. They usually are very good at repartee and it is very enjoyable. However, we are on a very restricted type of debate here. The hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) is wandering all over the shop. Would Your Honour bring him to order?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, again I have to point out to Your Honour that is not a point of order. The fact of the matter is that the members there opposite are gagged, they are not allowed to participate in this debate, they have been silenced. The hon. member for Stephenville does not need the Minister of Finance to come to his rescue.

The trouble is that he is frustrated down there because he is not allowed to get up to speak - the Premier has them all gagged, they have their own closure on that side of the House now. Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. My colleague is making a very valid point and is relevant to the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, for the third or fourth time I remind hon. members speaking to this bill that they should be relevant to it.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

To end my sermon, Mr. speaker, since I only have a couple of minutes left, I would like to go back to how I started and to emphasize to hon. members what is being done in this House of Assembly, to tell hon. members that this is an Opposition's forum. Why did government bring in such stringent measures as closure on Bill 37 at this time? Bill 37 could have been brought up before, could have been brought before this House last year or earlier this year. We could have had special sessions, we could have had night sittings, we could have had a longer period for debate, we could have met in the mornings as we have done back two or three years ago, but the government has chosen to trample on the rights of this House of Assembly, which in turn, Mr. Speaker, is trampling on the rights of the people of this Province who sent us here. This is an Opposition forum and this is heavy-handed medicine that the Premier has dished out. And, Mr. Speaker, it does show an arrogance that we have not seen in this Province for many, many years.

And, Mr. Speaker, I believe in the maxim that when governments are forced to bring in closure they are on their last legs.

MR. STAGG:

Is that a maxim?

MR. HODDER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is a political maxim. Mr. Speaker, when governments become so arrogant that they trample on the rights of the House of Assembly and on the rights of the people, then, Mr. Speaker, that shows that their mind set, their mind frame has become such that they have forgotten why they were sent to govern in the first place. I keep hearing the words of the Premier that there is wisdom in the crowd. Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is wisdom in the crowd and I think that this administration and the Premier will find out what the crowd will be saying in a very short time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. NEARY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before my colleague speaks.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a debate in this House is usually back and forth. What is wrong? Have hon. gentlemen over there been muzzled, are they not allowed to participate in the debate? Does the gag rule apply to such hon. gentlemen as the members for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) and

Ferryland (Mr. Power)? Have they all been told by the Premier of this Province not to open their mouths or what?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Finance, to that point of order.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, it only goes to show what nonsense we hear from the other side. Now the hon. members over there keep complaining that we are trying to muzzle them as we go through this bill. Nevertheless when we allow them the courtesy of having full range of debate they complain about it. And, Mr. Speaker, to accentuate my point, I would just like to point this out; to date we have had twenty-two hours of debate on this bill.

Normally speaking the length of time that we have for debate in any one day is usually from 4:00 o'clock to 6:00 o'clock, because other procedures go on between 3:00 o'clock and 4:00 o'clock. So two hours a day is the normal debating time in this House. So that means that we have given the equivalent of eleven days to debate this bill already, yet the hon. members over there say that we are muzzling them. Not only ridiculous on that score, but now when we do not take up the time of the House and leave it all to them, they are complaining about it. Mr. Speaker, not only should they be told there is no point of order here, they should be taken and spanked for being naughty little boys.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is exactly twelve hours ago, 2:00 o'clock this morning, that I took my seat.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Bring it back.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I continue where I left off this morning because I had not finished allotted time and my discourse, as the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) says.

A couple of nights ago I was watching a programme on television called *The Fifth Estate*. The story I found interesting, which was televised across Canada, was about funeral homes. The member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) will be very interested in this, I am sure. It showed that funeral homes across Canada, even though they maintain their local names, are being bought up by conglomerates, so what is happening is a monopoly is being created across the country. It is a very interesting story, Mr. Speaker, and it ties in very well with the point I want to make.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, buying democracy.

MR. CALLAN:

Yes, it has to do with buying democracy, even though I had not thought about it.

MR. STAGG:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

A point of order, the hon. member

for Stephenville.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I knew that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) did not want to hear the story.

MR. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker, I was assaulted verbally many times by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) when he had the floor, when he had command of the microphone. I said in response, although it was out of order that the hon. members have too much time to speak. They have too much time to speak, they have run out of things to say, but they must occupy the time allotted to them. It is a parliamentary example of Parkinson's law, 'Speech expands to take the time allotted to it,' and this is what hon. gentlemen are attempting to do here now. We are now talking about morticians and mortuaries in Canada, and this is Bill 37. Now, Mr. Speaker, unless there is something relevant that hon. members have to say, I suggest that we all should go home.

MR. CALLAN:

You should have waited to hear what I am saying.

MR. STAGG:

I am here in St. John's where I do not want to be. I want to be on the West Coast with my constituents. I want to be over there revelling with them on the passing of Bill 37. I want to get this over with, and I want to get Bowater back in operation just like the rest of the people on the West Coast do. We are tired, as Mr. Anstey said yesterday, of these tactics by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and his cohorts.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to enforce the rule of relevancy and to draw the member for Bellevue's (Mr. Callan) to task, because it is just wasting our time. This is Friday afternoon, we do live in the real world, and I want to get home to my constituents who are clamouring for me out there.

MR. NEARY:

Go home. You are not allowed to speak anyway, so go on home.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

To that point of order, I would remind the hon. member for Bellevue that we are discussing third reading of Bill 37 and we are also discussing the motion that the previous question be put. I find it very difficult to see what relevance funeral homes or television shows might have to do with this Bill 37. I would ask the hon. member for Bellevue to restrict his remarks to the motions before the House.

DR. COLLINS:

In about twenty seconds, what is the end of the story.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) did not want to hear the end of the story.

MR. TULK:

Does it have a punch line?

MR. CALLAN:

Yes, it has. A humorous punch line actually. The story has a humorous punch line for those members on the both sides who saw The Fifth Estate. Mr. Speaker, apparently in an effort to try and drum up some business, the owners of these various funeral homes

were using aggressive tactics, tactics that we have seen used in recent days by this government, pressure tactics. One old lady interviewed on the programme, Mr. Speaker, had been contacted about forty times by a funeral home owner who wanted to get her signed up and to get her as a client upon her dying. And one day, Mr. Speaker, the old gentleman happened to be home and he said to the fellow on the other end of the line, 'You have caused us so much harrassment, me and my wife have decided not to die'.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the Opposition, those of us on this side of the House of Assembly, have decided to do: We have decided not to lie down and die on this closure. Four times, Mr. Speaker, closure has been invoked. Mr. Speaker, as the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) who has just took his seat reminded us, that what we see here in recent days and today is a government of desperation -

DR. COLLINS:

How do you know you are not dead, by the way?

MR. CALLAN:

I can hear you, that is one reason, and see you, unfortunately.

MR. NEARY:

If you are, you are certainly not in heaven when you look across the House.

MR. CALLAN:

This morning, as I was saying at 2:00 o'clock, Mr. Speaker, we are on the verge now in January 1985, this party will have been in power for thirteen years. The Triple-T Years is what we have seen in this Province, Mr. Speaker. We have seen the Thirteen Terrible Tory

Years. No advancement, nothing happening, just government by knee-jerk reaction.

MR. NEARY:

Lurching from crisis to crisis.

MR. CALLAN:

That is right, a government lurching from one crisis to another, not doing anything to create new industry and new jobs, but just reacting to one crisis after another. And sometimes, Mr. Speaker, they have been successful, and sometimes they have not.

In Come By Chance, when the refinery closed in 1976, Mr. Speaker, the government decided they did not want to work very hard to try and save that particular industry, and so they gave up on it.

MR. NEARY:

Then they closed down the hospital.

MR. CALLAN:

They gave up on the industry at Come By Chance. This same government and Premier watched an oil refinery die at Come By Chance while talking about the huge wealth that this Province has in store on the Grand Banks. Mr. Speaker, we saw this government try to save Baie Verte, we saw them try to save Stephenville, we saw the same administration spend \$100 million on both sides of the Strait of Belle Isle in an effort to win an election, which really is what it amounted to.

MR. NEARY:

They nationalized BRINCO.

MR. CALLAN:

That is right, they nationalized BRINCO and nationalized the Stephenville linerboard mill.

MR. NEARY:

They torn down the steel mill and now they having a feasibility study to see if they need one.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, as the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) reminded us, it was thirteen years ago, back in 1971, the last time that we saw closure used in the House of Assembly. We saw then an administration, a government in its final days, desperate, tyrannical, dictatorial and we see it here repeated, Mr. Speaker, thirteen years later. The Premier was in the Moores Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, in 1974 and he was just as dictatorial and nasty then as he is now. Mr. Speaker, in 1974 we were trying to build a stadium at Whitbourne and we had to come in and see the then Minister of Municipal Affairs, now the Premier, and those of us who were at the meeting went away amazed. We were not jackasses. The administrator of the Markland Hospital, where the Premier was born, was there, and these were social workers and school teachers but the Premier even then, Mr. Speaker, back in 1974, treated us like a bunch of nobodies who did not know what we were talking about. We built the stadium at Whitbourne in spite of the Premier, Mr. Speaker. We should all recognize that the Premier has been a part of this government, this Tory administration, for thirteen years, the terrible thirteen Tory years.

As I was saying at 2:00 a.m. this morning, and I repeat it now, Premier J.R. Smallwood lasted for twenty-three years for several reasons. Of course, he was building up the Province, he was building roads and bringing in industry. So he lasted for

twenty-three years, Mr. Speaker. But this present administration can knock a decade off that because it is plain for anybody to see now, Mr. Speaker, that this government is on its last legs. A government that has to bring in closure the way this government did is a prime example of a government-

MR. NEARY:

You can hear the death rattle.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, because I am bored to death listening to you.

MR. CALLAN:

Well, I hope the minister does not die. He may be bored to death but if he does get sick I hope that there is a doctor in the house, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

There is and a good one too.

MR. CALLAN:

Actually we have two, but one delivers babies.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to retain your trend of thought with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) interjecting bits of humour.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to repeat what other speakers have said over and over and over.

DR. COLLINS:

What do you think of agriculture, by the way?

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, what I think is that this Province can be self-sufficient in potatoes and all the other vegetables that we now import from places like PEI.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!  
Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of the invitation of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Obviously, Mr. Speaker, he needs some help in trying to balance his budget to give us a better state of financial affairs than we have been getting in the last three or four years.

MR. PATTERSON:

What about the experiment with buffalo on Brunette Island?

MR. CALLAN:

That experiment has fallen off now because the buffalo on Brunette Island fell off the cliffs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!  
Order, please!

I think the Chair has been very lenient with the hon. member. I find it very hard to see how the buffalo on Brunette Island or the agricultural policy on potato growing in Newfoundland has anything at all to do with this bill. Since the hon. member might have been interrupted by hon. members to my left, I remind them that the hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. STAGG:

May I ask the hon. member -

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not



in his own seat, he should not be talking at all. Mr. Speaker, you did ask that I be heard in silence.

MR. STAGG:

I apologize to the hon. member. Could the hon. member read the sports page, because some of us over here have not heard last night's hockey scores.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, that is an unnecessary and unwarranted interference and very rude. He is not even in his own seat. He should be down sitting next to the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) if he wants to participate in the debate.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying at 2:00 a.m. this morning, and I repeat it -

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Could we take it as read?

MR. CALLAN:

You probably were not awake at 2:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, this closure tactic the Premier is using is not new to me. The member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) made an observation earlier this morning that I have wondered about myself. I have wondered about it in 1982.

MR. BARRETT:

Are you still thinking about it?

MR. CALLAN:

Yes, I am.

The member for Menihek made the observation earlier. That the electorate are sometimes not as astute as they should be. In

other words, what the member for Menihek was saying is that sometimes it takes some of the people out there, the voting public, a while to see through the tactics that are being used against them.

MR. ANDREWS:

I agree with that. It took twenty-three years in Newfoundland.

MR. CALLAN:

Well, it took thirteen this time around.

I agree, of course, with the member for Menihek because, Mr. Speaker, I watched the Premier in my own backyard in April, 1982, turn to his good friend and buddy, Bas Jamieson, and say, 'Bas, you have \$150,000 in your pocket now, do you not, for the new clinic at Markland? The clinic was supposed to be built next to the hospital there and the hospital retained. I was not there myself but I heard about it the next day or later that night -

MR. HEARN:

How come you were not there?

MR. CALLAN:

I was knocking on doors in Sunnyside. There were nineteen buses hired that night, Mr. Speaker, to bring in people from outside of the district of Bellevue from as far away as Placentia and Brigus. Of course, people learning of the rally in the media, who heard about how one school gymnasium in Norman's Cove was over-crowded and they had to flow into the next auditorium, figured that they all came from a little pocket of people in Norman's Cove and Chapel Arm, but the truth of the matter is nineteen buses transported them in from all over. These are the

sorts of pressure tactics that the Premier uses. And, of course, once he got there -

DR. COLLINS:

You must have been some scared about it..

MR. CALLAN:

I was not scared at all, actually.

DR. COLLINS:

You must at least have been scared you would be run over.

MR. CALLAN:

By a bus?

DR. COLLINS:

Right.

MR. CALLAN:

But as I said, Mr. Speaker, the Premier was just as dictatorial in 1972 when he was first elected. It is only now, of course, that we really see the Premier and see what he is capable of doing. And he uses, of course, Kruger. He brings in this nasty piece of legislation, Bill 37, and he uses Kruger as the scapegoat.

Mr. Speaker, I also repeat now what I said a couple of nights ago, that the Premier knows nothing about negotiating, he knows nothing about trying to do things fair and square. He has to use pressure tactics, like closure.

We saw what the Premier did in Corner Brook with Kruger. The Premier was in a pinch with Kruger, and, of course, Kruger was in a pinch as well because the mill unions and people who work in the woods voted to reject Kruger, even though a few days earlier the Premier had more or less told the people out there, 'Now you have to accept Kruger because I and my colleagues have decided that

Kruger are the people to take over the mill.' So the Premier tried to prejudge what these mill workers, these mill unions were going to do. And he told them, 'Here is what you should do. You must accept Kruger.' But the mill unions and the workers in the woods did not accept Kruger, they voted against them.

So the Premier got on the phone to Montreal and he said to the Kruger head, 'I am in a bit of a bind, you are in a bit of a bind, here is a way that can get both of us out of this bind. I have the Tory Annual Convention coming up in St. John's next week,' he said, 'and here is what I want you to do, I want you to take all of your people out of the Glynmill in Corner Brook and go back to Montreal. That will scare the mill workers into believing that you are really serious and that you may be gone forever. In the meantime, of course, I want to be a little bit of a hero on the eve of the Tory Convention in St. John's', so what I will do is tell the media I convinced your officials to come back again. That will make me a hero and, of course, once your officials get back in Corner Brook the mill workers will be a lot more receptive to your offers.' I have heard that from many sources. Mr. Speaker, this sort of a tactic, it made the Premier look good on the eve of his convention that he had convinced Kruger to come back to Corner Brook, but it also made things good for Kruger because now they could be seen as people who had come back Corner Brook to give the workers one more chance to accept the offer.

Friends and supporters of the Premier might say that was a good negotiating tactic for the Premier

to use but, Mr. Speaker, I call it treachery. And it is the same kind of treachery that has been used in this House, Mr. Speaker, to try and ram through this piece of unsavoury legislation, this retroactive Bill 37, this regressive legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, with these few comments I am going to take my seat. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, we have seen since the first day that this debate started the threat of closure hanging over the heads of members in this House. We had the Labour Minister (Mr. Dinn) last Thursday evening, when not a speaker had been heard from on this side of the House and only the Premier had spoken on the bill, go on television and bring up the matter of closure. Then we had the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) come in with his usual sanctimonious attitude and say, 'Oh, no! Who? Us? Closure? No, no, Mr. Speaker, we would not bring in closure. We believe in democracy.' And what have we seen? How long did the Government House Leader's brave words stand up? You know something? I think that the Government House Leader probably believed in what he was saying at the time.

MR. TULK:  
Oh, yes. I believe that.

MR. BARRY:

But it is a sign of what is happening over there, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier has become so desperate that he is willing to reject the advice of one of his closest advisors. Now a lot of the advice he should reject. A lot of the advice received from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) should be rejected, but not advice dealing with the preservation of the traditions and privileges of this House of Assembly. The member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the Government House Leader, has had a distinguished career in parliament, and up to now, by and large, up to this day, Mr. Speaker, he has been seen as a protector of the privileges of the people of this Province and members of the House of Assembly.

MR. ANDREWS:  
A Lord Protector.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, he has turned into a Lord Protector, regrettably, and he is pulling a Cromwell in this House. It is a wonder we did not see him come charging in on his horse and say, "For the love of God, out."

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way of describing the Premier after this exercise that we have seen this week and that is the Premier is the new undertaker of democracy and with him we have its forty-two pallbearers, democracy's undertaker and its forty-two pallbearers on the other side of the House. Because let there be no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, democracy is what is at stake here and it is a question, Mr. Speaker, of which is going to expire first. We have heard the government's death rattle this week. Now will they be foolish

enough to call an election while there are still a few remnants of democracy still left? Will they go first? Will they expire while there is still a chance of saving democracy in this Province?

Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) last night made a few very valid points. He mentioned the criticisms that have been made of a filibuster which had been carried out by the Conservative Party in the House of Commons, friends of members opposite, and the Prime Minister at the time, Prime Minister Trudeau, was critical of this.

MR. DINN:

All genuflect.

MR. PATTERSON:

Tell us the story about the first piece of legislation he brought in dealing with what you do in the privacy of the bedroom. Tell us about that. Do you support that kind of legislation? I guess you must because you moved over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

I yield to the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) for a moment, Mr. Speaker. I would like to hear from him.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! The hon. member for Placentia by leave.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order. I think one of the first pieces of legislation that Mr. Trudeau brought in was an Act Respecting X Between Consenting Males. Now do you support that kind of legislation? Do you support Naziism like you

did last night?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I wanted to make sure that that illuminating comment and contribution by the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) was properly recorded, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to make sure that that illuminating comment, the only comment by the member for Placentia on this bill, was properly recorded by Hansard for posterity because I am sure all his constituents in Placentia are going to be very proud, Mr. Speaker, of that contribution. That is a great contribution that the member has made now. Mr. Speaker, normally the member for Placentia is able to restrain himself and I think it is a guilty conscience, Mr. Speaker, that is getting him going during the course of this debate. It is a guilty conscience.

MR. PATTERSON:

No no. I wanted your professional opinion. I cannot afford to go down on Duckworth Street and ask it because you would charge me \$1,200.

MR. BARRY:

For the hon. member seeking that type of opinion, Mr. Speaker, I am sure Legal Aid would be provided. For such an important public question I am sure that the member would be provided Legal Aid.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it perhaps gives some explanation as to why the member for Placentia is interjecting at this stage if we consider that he also, Mr.

Speaker, has been very outspoken on protection of the rights and privileges of the ordinary Newfoundlander, and of members of the House of Assembly up until this debate, and it is probably his guilty conscience, Mr. Speaker, that is now motivating him to interject.

Mr. Speaker, at the time when the Conservative Party of Canada was criticized for its approach taken in the House of Commons in 1981, it was quite properly pointed out that it is the duty of the Opposition to provide extensive debate, informed debate on legislation which is repugnant to the principles of parliamentary democracy, and Mr. Speaker, one of the checks and balances in our system is the ability of the Opposition to get up and to debate for as long as is necessary the type of legislation that is being put forth by members opposite during this week. And when closure is invoked, Mr. Speaker, we then have the first crack in the democratic process. We then see a government that is at liberty to impose whatever decisions, however good or bad they might be, however destructive or arbitrary, on the citizens of this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, it is when the parliamentary rules which are there to ensure that the right of the Opposition to properly debate, when these rules are twisted and distorted as we have seen the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) twist and distort them -

DR. COLLINS:

You have had twenty-two hours of debate on it.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and if it were twenty-two months it still would

not be long enough for this repugnant legislation.

DR. COLLINS:

The people will not understand that.

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the problems that the minister and members opposite have. As we heard out of the Premier's mouth last night, they do not give the people of this Province enough credit for understanding, Mr. Speaker. They have contempt for the people of this Province. They will not give them the opportunity to express their views on retroactive legislation or the need therefor. That is why they will not consult with the workers of this Province who will be affected. That is why we see the Premier get up and say, "Oh, I bet if we took a poll in Corner Brook 75 per cent would say that Bowater's was profitable." What contempt for the men and women of Corner Brook. And it is the same contempt that we see coming from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) now.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women of this Province are smarter than the Minister of Finance gives them credit for or the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) gives them credit for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we see when closure is invoked is the establishment, for brief a time though it may be, of a one-party state. A one-party state is the result of the imposition of closure because it is then only that party, the arbitrariness of that party which finds expression and we have seen, Mr. Speaker, all of the elements of a one-party state this week. We have seen the

great propaganda blitz, the taxpayers' dollars being utilized to blitz this Province in a Goebbels style propaganda blitz, at a time of restraint wasting the taxpayers' dollar. And why, Mr. Speaker, did they find it necessary to engage in that type of propaganda blitz? They felt they had to engage in that propaganda blitz because they knew, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province would not accept closure, that the people of this Province would not accept retroactive legislation and they had to try to smoke screen it with the Kruger deal. But, Mr. Speaker, fortunately the wisdom of the crowd has prevailed. We have been in touch with the people of Corner Brook and the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) would do well to watch his bobber in the next election, and the member for Humber East (Ms. Verge) too, because the people of Corner Brook are telling us that they see this as the fraud which it is, a fraud perpetrated by members opposite. I can understand to a certain extent the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and the Premier being prepared to play with the emotions and the anxieties of the people of Corner Brook, but shame on the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) for playing games with the lives of her constituents, shame for the fraud.

MR. MARSHALL:  
A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):  
Order, please! A point of order, the hon. President of the council.

MR. MARSHALL:  
The hon. member is making a speech which is supposed to be the wind-up of this big debate and there is only his henchmen, his

friend there to listen. All the rest of the members on the opposite side have left and gone home. Now what the hon. gentleman is doing, Mr. Speaker, is referring to the principle of the bill. What we are doing here in third reading is we are discussing the framework of that bill. It is on page 221 of Beauchesne and I will read it again for the hon. member. "The purpose of third reading is to review the bill in its final form after the shaping it has received in its earlier stages." Now what that says and says quite clearly is that the principle of the bill is not open for debate. It has already been debated and decided in second reading.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):  
Order, please! To that point of order I would remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) that we are discussing third reading of the bill plus we are discussing the motion that the previous question be put.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I think it is necessary for us to point out that the form of this bill has arisen and this imposition of closure has arisen because the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), as was the Premier, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) prepared to play upon the anxieties and the fears.

MR. DINN:  
That is not closure.

MR. BARRY:  
It is closure. 'A rose is a rose is a rose.' The Government House Leader has cut off debate. The

fact that it is not cut off under Standing Order 50, Mr. Speaker, does not in any way lessen the fact that the Government House Leader has put the jackboots on the floor of this Assembly and has cut off the debate to which members of the Opposition would have been entitled. Had the previous question not been moved, members on this side of the House would have had the opportunity to bring in certain amendments, Mr. Speaker, and if the Government House Leader is prepared to have us do this by leave now I will be glad to propose one. Would the Government House Leader agree? Do I have leave for an amendment at this point?

DR. COLLINS:

If you could not think of any on second reading you cannot expect us to accept one on third reading.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

No leave, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason this bill is in the form that it is now at third reading is because of this cynical deception, this cynical fraud perpetrated by the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) and other members opposite, that Bill 37 is necessary in order for the Kruger deal to go through. Now I do not know about the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) but I have not heard one word to explain why Bill 37 would be necessary if Kruger were given a guarantee against liability. I have not heard one word to explain why Bill 37 would be necessary under those circumstances. And maybe the member for Humber East (Mr. Verge) would be kind enough to stand in her place to debate this bill and

explain why Bill 37 is necessary if Kruger were given a guarantee against any potential liabilities and there are no liabilities to be incurred.

MR. TULK:

Or if we could amend the amendment to the legislation exempting Kruger.

MR. BARRY:

Or if this particular legislation was amended to exempt Kruger from the Labour Standards Act provisions that might subject it to liability. Mr. Speaker, we will be delighted to hear from the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) why then would Bill 37 be necessary. Mr. Speaker, that was the question which they could not answer, that was why they embarked upon their propanganda blitz to try and develop the smokescreen, to engage in the typical Fascist tactics of any government that in its dying days resorts to the most desperate, despicable tactics, the desperate despicability of dying days. And, Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province are aware. Historically it has been shown that every time a government in Canada has brought in closure it is the last gasp of that government, it is the government's death rattle because, Mr. Speaker, there has not been a government that has survived the next election after attempting to impose closure, after it has interfered with the democratic principles and privileges of the House of Commons or the House of Assembly.

MR. PATTERSON:

How many elections did C.D. Howe and Pearson win after the pipeline debate, after 1956?

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Diefenbaker cleaned their clock in the next election if the member wants to know. Mr. Diefenbaker cleaned their clock after the pipeline debate as members opposite are going to have theirs cleaned.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I move that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word, 'that', and substituting the following therefore: Bill 37, An Act To Amend The Labour Standards Act be not now read a third time but that it be read a third time this day six months hence. That is seconded by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! I have to rule that amendment out of order. There are no amendments allowed when the previous question has been moved.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see the extensive research that went into that ruling.

MR. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) on a point of order.

MR. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that since the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has made an amendment which has been disallowed he must now sit down, his speech, such as it is, is over.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the member's understanding surpasses all understanding. To that point of order the member does not have a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

It is not a valid point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is not valid, I do not think, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had a number of procedural motions that have come before this House, we have had a number of undesirable precedents established by government in its mad scramble for power, in its dying desperation, with its despicable attempts to stifle debate.

MR. PATTERSON:

We are not dying, we are strong. Do you remember, 'The Land is Strong?'

MR. BARRY:

The giggles of the Minister of Education (Ms Verge), Mr. Speaker, are the only things that should be stifled and that will be, I suspect, after the next election.

MS VERGE:

You should have a sense of humour.

MR. BARRY:

That is a sense of humour? Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) is going to find out how funny the people of Humber East think her playing with the emotions, the anxieties and the uncertainties of her constituents is and how funny it will be considered in the next election. Mr. Speaker, the opposition has attempted to speak out and object



to a piece of legislation which is abhorrent, which, as my colleague for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has said, is contrary to principles of natural justice. And we had a learned statement, a dissertation pointing out how the principles of natural justice, while more directly related to the notions of British fair play, in fact is a concept which dates back to the times of the Greeks.

Mr. Speaker, one of the basic elements of the principles of natural justice is that a person who is about to lose something has a right to be heard. Now it is bad enough that government did not show enough faith in the people of this Province, did not show enough faith in the common sense of the workers who will be affected by this law to consult with them; it is bad enough, Mr. Speaker, that the government did not show enough confidence in the people of this Province to consult with them before bringing in this type of legislation, but it is even worse, Mr. Speaker, that they now attempt to cut off the representations made on their behalf, and on behalf of all of the people of the Province, in the House of Assembly by elected representatives representing constituents who will be affected by this legislation. So we have, Mr. Speaker, a double rejection of this basic element of natural justice that a person has a right to be heard on any matter where his rights will be affected. Whether you call it substantial justice, the essence of justice, fundamental justice, universal justice, rational justice, the principles of British justice, fair play in action, fair play writ large or just basic fairness, Mr. Speaker, we see a government now that has rejected all pretence of being fair, we see

a government that has rejected all pretence of being democratic, a government which has rejected all pretence of consulting or listening to the people of this Province and we see a government that is so desperate to cover up its own incompetence - because, remember, if the legislation had been amended in 1981 there would be no need now to have retroactive clauses in a bill in this House of Assembly and it is because of their own incompetence, Mr. Speaker - that we here are asked to participate in that disgusting task of imposing retroactive legislation and taking away the rights of men and women in this Province after they have believed for six years that they had been given certain rights and certain protection by a statute of this House.

DR. COLLINS:

They did not believe that.

MR. BARRY:

The minister said they did not believe that.

Now we are told, despite our pointing out to the government that there was another bill on this Order Paper with a similar clause but even worse, the Student Allowances Act, which attempts to give Cabinet the power, in secrecy, behind closed doors, to pass regulations retroactively, despite the fact we have raised this to the attention of government, we hear the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) stand up today and say, 'Oh, there is a real good reason for that.' Well, let members opposite be put on notice; we have had twenty-one hours of debate on this bill and I think with the experience we have had on this debate, Mr. Speaker, with the procedural points that we

have come upon in the course of researching for this debate, members opposite can anticipate another twenty-one hours minimum if that other disgusting piece of legislation is put on the table of this House.

DR. COLLINS:

Is that a threat?

MR. BARRY:

No, that is not a threat, that is a statement of fact. Members can bring their Christmas turkey in and have it here on the table of the House because there will be no Student Allowances Act with a retroactive clause permitting retroactive regulations to be put in place in secret in the Cabinet room. There will be no such piece of legislation passed before Christmas, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

You should read one of the other acts.

MR. BARRY:

Oh, we have a couple of others here, do we? Mr. Speaker, we have not had time to sit down we have been too busy. I guess there are a few other dandies there as well.

MR. NEARY:

They let the Auditor General have the retail sales tax information and other information, but he has to have somebody looking over his shoulder all the time he is looking at them.

MR. BARRY:

Would the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) give us a hint?

DR. COLLINS:

It is on the Order Paper.

MR. BARRY:

There is another piece of

retroactive legislation on the Order Paper says the minister. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are in a situation now where government has decided to adopt a practice and a trend with respect to the implementation of retroactive legislation.

DR. COLLINS:

There is very good reason.

MR. BARRY:

The Minister says there is very good reason. We have it from their mouths that they accept this is going to be the normal practice, Mr. Speaker, another Newfie joke. The legislation of this Province is now going to be like shifting sand, it is going to be like last Winter's snowfall; there will be as much security for individuals living in this Province or moving to this Province as the whim of the next government allows, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

You will never again be able to have faith in any of the laws they pass.

MR. BARRY:

Whenever anybody ever again looks at a piece of legislation coming from this House of Assembly, if this despicable bill is passed, he will either throw up or break into laughter if somebody tries to point out that it is a law that he is supposed to be looking at. Mr. Speaker, I must say there are a lot of members on the other side of the House who know that we are right, who believe that we are right, who are embarrassed and shamed, Mr. Speaker, to have to participate. I am sure they go home at night and they wash their hands after being involved in such a dirty business.

MR. NEARY:

They should get Listerine and gargle out their mouths.

MR. BARRY:

I do not know if they need to gargle with Listerine because we are not hearing very much from them, their vocal cords are not being strained very much. Hansard, Mr. Speaker, will reveal that not one of them participated in debate on third reading and a few participated in debate in Committee of the Whole merely to take up some of the limited time which had been allotted for debate because they knew debate would end at 2:00 a.m. so they wanted to cut into the time that would be available to the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, not only do they want to grind us down by keeping the House open night and day, today they decided they would not break for lunch any more so they are going to try and starve us out as well.

MR. NEARY:

If you were down in the pen you would get something to eat.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, if you were brought to the penitentiary you would be given a meal. Mr. Speaker, they will not even feed us, they have the doors locked here, no food or drink until this bill is rammed through. The latest tactic is to try and starve out the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, do you know something? It was very interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that it was when the polls turned that they decided they had to resort to this type of tactic. Do you know what happens, Mr. Speaker, when a government gets under pressure, when a Premier gets under pressure from the polls? Their judgment, Mr. Speaker, starts to go. There is

so much pressure on them they start making other mistakes, they start cracking under the strain. All that happens then is they make more mistakes and the polls get worse and there is more pressure and they make more mistakes. And, Mr. Speaker, when the slide starts, when first they embark upon that slide down that slippery slope to political oblivion, there is no stopping us. They shoot out, Mr. Speaker, into the darkness and are seen and heard from no more, like a falling star, flashing through the firmament, except we have not seen too much in the way of flashiness or light or stariness from this group, Mr. Speaker, in this session of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again all we need do is look back historical and we will see that closure most often is raised by governments in those last desperate days when they are trying to cling onto power.

MR. TULK:

All their principles gone.

MR. BARRY:

Their principles are gone. Expediency is the order of the day, as we heard the Premier say. Principles are mere theoretical ramblings, expediency is the order of the day. The means, Mr. Speaker, justify the ends. Political expediency at its worst is what we are seeing here. Now, Mr. Speaker, it might be a little understandable if they were doing it for anybody else except themselves.

MR. NEARY:

You know how the people feel in Poland now.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Jarulzelski, Mr. Speaker, has moved over. I suppose the next time the session opens we will see members opposite moving in with their army fatigues and stars on the epaulettes, a little hero medal on the lapel, Mr. Speaker, as heroes of the Province.

MR. NEARY:

Saviours of democracy.

MR. BARRY:

And speaking of heroes reminds me of a hero sandwich, and I am starting to get hungry. Mr. Speaker, they are starving us out but we are determined to see the end of this debate. The end is regrettably fast arriving because of the procedural bars and blocks, the closure measures that had been put in place. Any Opposition, however large it might be does not matter, could not have done better I think we fought the good fight here. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province recognize that there is a matter of principle involved in this debate. There is a matter of principle that the statutes of this Province not be swept aside so flippantly, so cavalierly as members opposite are trying to do in this case; that we should not show such disrespect for this House of Assembly as to go back six years later and retroactively change the laws that were put in place; that the laws are suppose to be guides to human conduct. The law, Mr. Speaker, is supposed to be something that a person can look to and get an indication as to how he should act. A trend now developed, Mr. Speaker, I think two statutes will be sufficient to develop trend. Out of two points you can get a straight line. I think you only need two points to get a straight line, from my mathematics days.

Now we have those two points, Mr. Speaker. We have the point of the amendment to The Labour Standards Act and we have the point of the attempted amendment to The Student Allowances Act, again retroactive. And we see where that line is pointing. That line is pointing inextricably to continuing retroactive legislation and laws for this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, that is something that has to be fought with every power at the disposal of the Opposition in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we also see another line fortunately that is developing.

MR. NEARY:

Parallel or what?

MR. BARRY:

I do not know if it is parallel, Mr. Speaker, but it is a line which is indicating what direction members opposite are going, indicating what direction the government of this Province is going in its dealing with workers of this Province. I think, Mr. Speaker, with respect to consultation with the people of this Province and the workers of this Province, we have one point where the freeze was imposed, and we saw the consultation that was involved there. We saw the Premier call in labour leaders, a few minutes before he went on television, to tell them, 'Zap, you are frozen.' That is one point. And, Mr. Speaker, we saw the point of the Premier sending out letters to Abitibi-Price negotiators, including Mr. Kelley, and saying 'Do not dare ask for too much money,' before they had ever

placed a wage demand on the table. That is point number two.

MR. NEARY:

Remember what he told fishermen and plant workers?.

MR. BARRY:

What did he tell the fishermen and plant workers?

MR. NEARY:

He took to the airwaves and told them they had to tighten their belts and make sacrifices..

MR. BARRY:

Yes, that is point number three: He told the fishermen and plant workers that they were not getting any more money. Point number four, Mr. Speaker, is I am sure there is a whole series of other points that can all be linked up in a straight line, and that straight line is further and further away, Mr. Speaker, from the direction of consultation from the direction of democracy, in this Province. We had members opposite elected by promising their constituents that they would remain in touch, that there would be feedback, that there would be open government, that they would consult, that there would be honesty and integrity and openness.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. BARRY:

Openness? Yes, we see a lot of openness, Mr. Speaker! When a government has to result to propagand, when a government has to result to taking to the airwaves of the Province and implement closure four times in the course of keeping up a propagand blitz on the outside whirl trying to blitz the

Opposition with closure on the inside, then democracy has come to a great stage in Newfoundland. It is a very proud day, Mr. Speaker, for the Premier, a very proud day for members opposite, and you can see how overjoyed they are that they have brought this House of Assembly and they brought the democratic process in this Province to this point. Such despicable tactics, Mr. Speaker!

MR. STAGG:

The hon. gentleman 'struts and frets his hour upon the stage, and then is heard no more.'

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is one that I am disappointed in. He is a member who also went into politics with some principles. He was a person, Mr. Speaker, who was known to speak out from time to time. He was a person, Mr. Speaker, who generally would not be muzzled. He was a person who would be prepared to stand up and give his point of view, but today, Mr. Speaker, he has been told to stay quiet, not open his mouth, not say a word. Now, Mr. Speaker, he has had his direction. The jackboots have gone up and down his back, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

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

MR. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker, again I come to the rescue of a member of the Opposition who has run out of things to say. You will notice that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is looking in this direction. He is not looking at

the people in the galleries, Mr. Speaker, he is looking at the clock to see that the time is running out. Last night, Mr. Speaker, I spoke in the debate, I guess it was around 1:00 o'clock or so, and as soon as I began to speak members of the Opposition rushed into the House to prevent me from speaking. There were spurious points of order. As a matter of fact, of my half hour allocation, I think I spoke for five minutes. Granted there was a little bit of help from the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) who got all of the headlines from my speaking time last night, Mr. Speaker. But you do not have to worry about the jackboots on this side of the House. What the hon. member is going to have to watch out for is the hobnail boots of the people of Corner Brook when he goes over there and tries to explain to them what he has been trying to do to them.

MR. BUTT:

When he sneaks in there under the cover of darkness.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

To that point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. All the hon. gentleman did was take advantage of the situation to try to weasel his way out of being told to shut up, keep quiet, that he is not allowed to speak, he is muzzled. And the hon. gentleman is embarrassed about it so he tries to get up on a point of order to justify his not being able to exercise his

democratic right in this House.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we saw the Mayor of Corner Brook indicate, I believe very clearly, what his view was and his opinion of what the view of the people of Corner Brook was, and we saw the Mayor, Mr. Hutchings, come out and say that he did not think there was any necessity for Bill 37. He did not see any connection between Bill 37 and the Kruger deal. And he said, Mr. Speaker, the people of Corner Brook know that the Kruger deal is going ahead regardless of what happens with respect to Bill 37. He said, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Corner Brook do not like retroactive legislation.

MR. DINN:

He also thought there was another purchaser in the wings. He also said that.

MR. NEARY:

He also thought the Tory Party was a great party until about a year ago.

MR. DINN:

Of course, he is not working at the mill. What did the mill unions say?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Mayor of Corner Brook is at least speaking to the people of Corner Brook, which is more than members opposite are doing, more than the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) has done. How

many meetings has the Minister of Labour had and how many times has he consulted with the workers at Corner Brook before bringing in this legislation? And did they approve of his bringing in this legislation?

MR. DINN:

No problem with it at all, they said.

MR. BARRY:

No problem! No problem with the minister because they know he is a nonentity, they know he is going the next time. They know that this is the final nail in his coffin.

MR. DINN:

You will see what happens in the next election.

MR. NEARY:

They demanded your resignation.

MR. BARRY:

The only time the workers of this Province speak to the minister is to demand his resignation. They have no confidence in him, Mr. Speaker, no confidence whatsoever -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

- because they know that he has sold out the workers of this Province. They know that instead of fighting to protect the workers of this Province, time after time he has sided against them. Time after time he has worked to harm the workers of this Province instead of protect them, and if he had the courage of his convictions, Mr. Speaker, he would resign.

MR. NEARY:

Right on!

MR. DINN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I will resign tomorrow if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) will resign and run against me in any district in St. John's, any district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman should get one of the medals that the Premier has for bravery for making a statement like that! How ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, and how low! The hon. gentleman cannot take it. Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. The trouble is that the hon. gentleman has been interrupting my colleague because my colleague gave him a few flicks and he cannot take it. That is what he got up on, Mr. Speaker, not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The last time the Minister of Labour and Manpower brought a bill like this to the House, his own Premier got up and told him to take it off the Order Paper. He was shattered, he was a broken man. His own colleagues turned on him like dogs for the trouble he had gotten them in. And, Mr. Speaker, do you know they wanted to do the same thing to him this time but he had carried it too far and it is too obvious, Mr. Speaker? They want to turn on him like dogs for the embarrassment that he has caused this government.

MR. DINN:

That shows the guts of the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY:

Go play with your telephone, boy!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I thought he was getting up on another point of order. Come on over to Mount Scio and we will do it, alright? Come on! Come on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think maybe it should be Pleasantville, because anybody can win Mount Scio for our party now.

MR. NEARY:

That is right! Right on!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we see the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) show the same bravado on his point of order as he showed when he introduced this legislation which, Mr. Speaker, he thinks will not affect him even though he is going to have more than a temporary layoff. I guess that is why he is not concerned about it, because his is not going to be a temporary layoff, it is going to be a permanent layoff after the next election and this bill only deals with temporary layoffs. Well, Mr. Speaker, we might as well give the minister his sixteen weeks notice now prior to his permanent layoff, because that minister is gone. And the only thing, Mr. Speaker, that will see him last longer than the sixteen weeks notice we are giving him is if the Premier does not call an election in the meantime.

MR. NEARY:

There is no honour or decency left.

MR. BARRY:

Decency is something unknown to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). Decency is a word that does not belong in that man's vocabulary. Honour, Mr. Speaker, cannot be found on the other side of the House when members sit quietly and permit the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) to break his oath of office, which was to look after the workers of this Province, Mr. Speaker. Is there honour between parliamentary thieves? Because that is what has happened here. Democracy has been stolen, Mr. Speaker, by members opposite. Democracy has been stolen, because the time of this Opposition to debate has been stolen.

DR. COLLINS:

How long do you want?



MR. BARRY:

And it was not, Mr. Speaker, a thief breaking in in the dead of night. They wanted to break in in the dead of night and do it, they wanted to break in in the dead of night and take away the rights of workers but, Mr. Speaker, we exposed them to the cold, pitiless glare of publicity. The people of this Province know that what they are trying to do is wrong; and Mr. Speaker, members opposite know what they are trying to do is wrong, because the only reason they resorted to that propaganda blitz was to try to cover up the fact that what they are doing is despicable and they should be ashamed of themselves. They should, Mr. Speaker, turn on the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and get rid of him. It is probably too late. It does not matter, one more millstone around their necks is not going to make that much difference now, Mr. Speaker. They are going down for the third time anyhow, so what is another millstone? I guess that is the only small sense of satisfaction that members on this side of the House can obtain from this sad, sad experience this past week. The only small sense of satisfaction is that we know, Mr. Speaker, that the course on which this government has embarked leads in one direction and one direction only, and that is in the direction of defeat at the polls for members opposite in the next election. Mr. Speaker, we do not put ourselves first like the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson). We do not put ourselves first, we put the people of this Province first, and we are sad. Even though, Mr. Speaker, we know that this is helping us politically, we are sad at what members opposite are doing to the people of this Province and to this House of Assembly.

MR. PATTERSON:

It is only another ten minutes, boy, and you are gone.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is enough to make the very stones weep to see what members opposite are doing to the rights of the people of this Province and to the proud and honourable traditions and privileges of this House. Mr. Speaker, Solidarity did not have the difficulties with Jarulzelski that the Opposition has had with these members opposite during this past week.

MR. PATTERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON:

There is a letter here in the Telegram, Mr. Speaker, from the hon. member over there and he is talking about equality. I have been listening to him now for going on two months and yet he is asking the federal Minister of Transport to give work to the Marystown Shipyard without tender, that is what you are asking. You are always prating over there about getting jobs without tenders.

MR. NEARY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

It is just that the hon. gentleman had something on his mind that he wanted to get off and he used the

technique of a point of order to do it. What the hon. gentleman should do is go down and see if there are any buffalo left on Brunette Island, or have they all jumped over the cliff since the hon. gentleman became the member?

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

MR. PATTERSON:  
To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

It was the hon. gentleman and his friends who put the buffalo down there. The hon. gentleman and his friend, Mr. Smallwood, herded hundreds of head of cattle down to Marystown and left them to perish.

MR. NEARY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for LaPoile to that point of order.

MR. NEARY:  
To that point of order, there is no point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman should go now and have a count of heads and see how many people are on Merasheen Island. He has been trying to get the people to go back to the islands in Placentia Bay. He should go now and see if we still need a teacher on Merasheen Island, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):  
Order, please!

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, who has about five minutes left.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, speaking of Burnette

Island and speaking of buffalo, when I look at members opposite that is the picture that comes to mind as they run one by one for the cliff and leap over.

MR. TULK:  
They are like lemmings.

MR. BARRY:  
No, the lemmings slide gently into the sea whereas these are going to fall off the cliff, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:  
Which one is it?

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, the name of Pleasantville district should be changed because there can be nothing pleasant about having a member (Mr. Dinn) like that down there. There can be nothing pleasant in that district with a member with a shameful record in this House, a shameful record of having his own caucus and Cabinet turn on him because of the embarrassment he causes with the legislation he brings before this House. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it is only because it has been carried too far, they cannot gracefully get out of it now, that they have not turned on him like dogs again because we saw that the minister was a shattered man and I know internally, with all of this bravado, all he is trying to do is cover up the fact that he is a shattered man again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I think the problem with the minister is he does not understand when he brings in these

atrocious assaults upon the basic rights and principles of workers, I think he just does not understand. And he is well into it, he has his foot well into it and he has his government well into it before it finally penetrates, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has blown it again. The minister has created more embarrassment for himself and for his government, he has made one more assault upon the rights of the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the minister is going to get a few questions answered now on his next visit to Wabush Mines, on his next visit to Corner Brook, on his next visit to the fish plants of Fishery Products, and on his next visit to Baie Verte. Mr. Dwyer is going to want to have a chat with that gentleman; Mr. Art Kelly is going to want to have a chat with him. And, Mr. Speaker, the minister continues to have the face to get up and pretend to be a minister who has the interest of the workers of this Province at heart.

MR. DINN:

I will be in Corner Brook next week. Will you be there?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister is a disgrace to his government and a disgrace to his Province. He is assaulting the workers of this Province by the legislation -

DR. COLLINS:

You cannot say that.

MR. BARRY:

I can say that and I just did, Mr. Speaker. He is a disgrace, d-i-s-g-r-a-c-e, and the minister should resign -

MR. DINN:

I will if you will.

MR. BARRY:

- Mr. Speaker, as should the government for the way in which they have shamefully treated the House of Assembly, the people's House with this charade, this farce, where they have cut off debate, where they have brought in closure, where they have blocked the Opposition from debating fully this atrocious, repugnant, abhorrent, despicable legislation which is an assault on everything that we hold dear in the parliamentary democracy, which undermines the very foundations of the law, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my time has run out. Let me just say that we, after much agonizing and much consideration - and I might say, Mr. Speaker, it was with great reluctance that we participated in this debate but we felt that we owed a responsibility to the men and women of this Province to make sure that the limited time that they gave us we used as fully as possible - want to inform you, Your Honour, that we will not see this charade carried through to the end, we have utilized the time that we had for debate, but, Mr. Speaker, we will not be participating in the vote on this repugnant legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there is the

intestinal fortitude of the Leader of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland (Mr. Barry) just went out the door.

Mr. Speaker, I will not keep the vote very long, I just want to say a few words for the record before the vote is called.

The first thing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say is that one of the allegations that the Opposition has been throwing across the floor of the House over the last number of hours is that they have not had enough time to debate this bill. Mr. Speaker, we have done a cursory research of debates in this House since this administration took office. The flag debate took twelve days; the Matrimonial Property Act, seven days; the Municipalities Act, thirteen days; Workers' Compensation Amendment re the Ocean Ranger, which was a retroactive piece of legislation, by the way, to help the victims and families of the Ocean Ranger disaster - something like, I think, the bill the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) to help the students of this Province - there was nothing said about the concept of retroactivity then, Mr. Speaker, the concept of retroactivity somehow or other was okay at that point in time. The Environmental Assessment Act, five days; Financial Administration Act Amendment, five days; an act to amend the Department of Forest Resources Act - it was really called the budworm debate - five days. Now a day in debate of a bill is around two hours, because you have the Question Period, Petitions and the like, and we usually start debate around four o'clock on a given day and then adjourn at six o'clock, and Friday mornings the same applies - eleven

o'clock to one o'clock. So if you look at the hours, then, the longest debate was thirteen days, which was on the Municipalities Act, and if you multiply that by two you have twenty-six hours. The next one is the flag debate - twelve days or twenty-four hours. We are now at exactly twenty-three hours for the debate on Bill 37. So we have two bills only since 1979 that have been debated longer than Bill 37 and the difference is only three hours or an hour between them. Now how can the Opposition make that allegation, Mr. Speaker? It is the third most debated bill since 1979. They have had ample opportunity under the rules of this House to debate Bill 37. So the allegation that somehow or other the Opposition have not had the opportunity to debate this bill is simply spurious, Mr. Speaker.

We were forced to bring in closure because, Mr. Speaker, we wanted to get the signing of the Kruger deal in Corner Brook done before Christmas, especially before December 31, because if we do not get it signed by December 31 in all likelihood we would have to start negotiations all over again and it is highly risky business whether in fact this corporation would be satisfied to come to Corner Brook and invest the kind of money that they want to. Mr. Speaker, let the record show that the speed with which we are doing it relates to Corner Brook, but the concept of what is in this bill is being done not just for Corner Brook, it is being done for the fishermen and the fish plant workers and trawlermen and everybody else in this Province, every fish plant, every fish company, we are doing it not only for Bowater -

MR. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I believe Your Honour ruled earlier that the debate on this particular motion is a very narrow debate, that the principle of the bill had been debated in second reading and the hon. gentleman is now involved in debating the principle of the bill. The same rules should apply to that side of the House that applied to this side of the House.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is refuting not only the arguments of his colleagues but the speeches of his colleagues. What the hon. the Premier is doing is speaking specifically to the motion which is before the Chair now which is the previous question and the reason why the previous question was put, the purpose of putting the previous question and why we had to do it in this timely fashion. So it is obviously very much in order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order raised by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), several times during this debate the Chair has had to remind hon. members about the rule of relevancy. The Chair is not entirely satisfied that any of them listened, so I suppose the

Chair can only remind the hon. the Premier about the rule of relevancy.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on the question of retroactivity, the concept of retroactivity that has been mentioned so often during the debate in the last several days, let me just say, as I said last night, and reiterate for the record, as a concept void of any attachment to reality, obviously everybody on this side of the House does not like retroactivity as a concept. As an intellectual concept it is not the preferred course of action that any government or any person or any organization wants to take.

MR. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for LaPoile on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

We are back to the principle of the bill again. I am not sure if Your Honour was in the Chair or the Deputy Speaker, but earlier we had two or three rulings today on that particular matter. The hon. gentleman is now getting into debating the principle of the bill and that is not permitted under the rules that we are now operating under, Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order the hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Your Honour will recall that during the debate speeches of hon. members opposite referred to the reasons they did not like retroactivity, the reasons they did not like the previous question being put, the reasons they did not like any time constraints on the debate. Those were arguments put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite and certainly it is in order for the hon. the Premier in speaking to the same motion to refer to and refute the arguments which have come up on debate on the same motion half an hour, twenty minutes or an hour ago.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

To that point order, the hon. the Premier is in the Chair's opinion referring to the same kinds of arguments that have already taken place over several hours in this Legislature.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying retroactivity as a concept, void of any reality, is one that we do not particularly like any more than the Opposition or anybody else likes it, albeit that was not mentioned when we did it a few years ago as the Minister of Labour has pointed out so accurately. But given the economic realities that we face in Newfoundland and Labrador, given that we know a lot of these industries are either bankrupt or very, very fragile and that we know we are talking about \$27 million and that it could go to \$50 million or \$60 million that would have to be paid either from the public chest or by those companies which are fragile or bankrupt, we think that the economic realities of the situation that face this Province

right now are so important that it overrides our abhorrence intellectually to the concept of retroactivity. That is the point and there is no other point, and to deny and try to blind yourself to that very harsh reality that we face with 20 per cent unemployment is to do an injustice to the present economic realities that we face.

Thirdly, just let me say, Mr. Speaker, we hear the Opposition in this debate talking about an assault on the worker. I wish somebody would report some of the other parts of that bill. That bill puts in notice for temporary layoffs which will make it the best in Canada. How can somebody accuse us of assaulting the workers and trying to do something to destroy the workers and working people of this Province when we will have the best temporary layoff notice in Canada?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Somehow nobody wants to carry some of the aspects of this bill, everybody is just hooked on the retroactivity regardless if it will hurt the workers of Corner Brook or hurt the fishermen or the fish plant workers or the loggers or the miners. Why is it not carried that we are bringing in a law which will be the best in Canada? As far as permanent layoff goes in this bill, we are still keeping the sixteen weeks for any permanent layoff. An employer will have to give sixteen weeks or four months notice of any permanent layoff for over 500 layoffs. Then it goes to twelve, I think, for another group of workers below 500, and then down to eight weeks for a smaller

number of workers. That is about number two or number three in Canada as far as being progressive as a government in trying to protect the rights of workers when they are laid off, Mr. Speaker. So, yes, there is an assault here, Mr. Speaker, on workers, an assault to make the laws better than they are now.

MR. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for LaPoile on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

I submit to Your Honour that no other member - and all the members have spoken on this side of the House - were given the leeway that the hon. gentleman is being given now, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is now debating again the principle of that bill. We were not allowed to do it, we had to stick to the motion before the House, and I would submit that the hon. gentleman is out of order, Mr. Speaker. The same rules should apply to both sides of this hon. House.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the same rules should apply. What we heard for hours were references to there being an assault on labour throughout this debate and all the Premier is doing is just responding to the arguments that were made in this

House and were allowed to be made in this House. So surely if the hon. gentlemen there opposite can make these arguments, it is certainly competent for the Premier to respond.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

To that point of order, at least while I was sitting in the Chair the Premier appears to be as relevant to the bill as most other members were.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, just me let summarize. On the question of closure, I think this Bill 37 is the second not the third. There was one bill that was debated more than this bill since this administration took office. So to try to allege that somehow the Opposition were muzzled only demonstrates to me is that the Opposition could not have been doing their job on all of the other bills that have been put before this House since 1979, because by what they are saying they accuse themselves of not having enough time to debate all those other bills in which there was no closure motion or no other thing done to try to prevent them from saying what they wanted to say. So we have a bill here that has been before the House for twenty-three hours, one which every member opposite has spoken on on a number of occasions. The whole question of retroactivity, Mr. Speaker, has to be related to the economic realities that we face in this Province, which are so important and so overriding that in this particular instance, in the same way as the circumstances were so overriding

as it related to the Ocean Ranger disaster, which overrode anybody talking about retroactivity because the circumstances of the time were so important everybody felt bad, everybody felt tragic about what happened in the Ocean Ranger disaster so it was alright for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) to bring in that type of retroactive legislation; therefore, Mr. Speaker, since we can prove and substantiate that we have 20 per cent unemployment, that we have a pulp and paper operation in Corner Brook which is in jeopardy that we have spent sixteen months trying to negotiate a new owner for, when we have a fish company that is bankrupt that we are trying to put more money in and save thousands and thousands of jobs, that we are trying to save Baie Verte and Wabush and IOC and St. Lawrence and the mining industry generally; therefore, if you can substantiate that by economic facts then that too should be just as valid in its way as was the Ocean Ranger retroactivity that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) brought in a few years ago. And that is the point of the matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
And as far as an assault on the workers is concerned, yes, Mr. Speaker, we are making assault on the workers all right, to provide them with some of the best labour laws that Canada has in existence today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
The question is that the previous question be now put? Those in

favour "Aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Aye.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
Those against "Nay"?

MR. FENWICK:  
Nay.

Motion, carried.

MR. FENWICK:  
Divide.

MR. SPEAKER:  
You have to have three members present for a division.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):  
Order, please! Order, please!  
Three members or more have to rise for a division.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has called for a division. There have to be three, but if he wants a division we will say 'by leave' and we will have one, we will stand for it. If he wants a division, that is his right.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Call in the members.

### Division

MR. SPEAKER:  
Is the House ready for the vote?



SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Is the House agreed to the vote?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is that the previous question be now read. Those in favour please stand: The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), Mr. Reid, Mr. Brett, the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Rideout), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn), Mr. Barrett, the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews), Mr. Carter, Mr. Baird, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Aylward, Mr. Hearn, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Butt, Mr. Stagg, Mr. Osmond.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Those against the motion, please stand: Mr. Fenwick.

The vote is 25 for and 1 against.

Motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Question.

Shall the said Bill 37 be read a third time?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. FENWICK:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is carried.

MR. FENWICK:

I again ask for a division.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Is it agreed for a division?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Agreed.

### Division

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Is it agreed to put the question on division?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Agreed.

Those in favour of the motion, please stand: The hon. the Premier, the hon. Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), Mr. Reid, Mr. Brett, the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister

of Culture Recreation and Youth (Mr. Rideout), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn), Mr. Barrett, the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews), Mr. Carter, Mr. Baird, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Aylward, Mr. Hearn, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Butt, Mr. Stagg, Mr. Osmond.

MR. SPEAKER :

Those against the motion, please stand: Mr. Fenwick.

Order, please!

The vote was 25 for and 1 against.

Motion carried.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Standards Act", read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 37).

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising to adjourn until tomorrow, Monday at 3:00 p.m.

On motion the House adjourned until Monday, December 17, at 3:00 p.m.