



Province of Newfoundland

THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XXXIX

Third Session

Number 48

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Monday, 19 November 1984

Speaker: Honourable James Russell

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have to point out before I state my point of privilege that Hansard for Friday is not yet available. I realize the difficulties so, therefore, I am not complaining about that. But I did send for Hansard on Friday and I sent for it again three or four times today. I realize it is not available and I do not want to sit on my rights concerning this very important point of privilege and I want your Honour to know that I will state what the point of privilege is and then I can only wait until I get Hansard to see exactly what was said on Friday by the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan).

I should like to draw Your Honour's attention to pages 22 and 23 of Beauchesne, under the heading, Influencing Members. Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to item 67 first: "It is generally accepted that any threat to a Member, attempting to influence his vote or his actions as a Member, is a breach of privilege. It seems probable that the extreme delegate theories of representation, favoured by minor parties in the west" and so forth and so on. Then section 71, Mr. Speaker: "Direct threats which attempt to influence Members' actions in the House are undoubtedly breaches of

privilege. They do, however, provide serious problems for the House. They are often made anonymously and it is rarely possible for the House to examine them satisfactorily. The common practice today is to turn the responsibility for investigating them over to the ordinary forces of the law."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think, if Hansard bears me out, there is any doubt at all that my privileges in this House have been violated by statements made by the member for Bonavista South, and I am only trusting to my memory on this, that within two months he is going to get me and one of my colleagues, unnamed, that in two months he is going to get us. And then, Mr. Speaker, the member went outside the House and repeated the same thing to the new media. That is a matter of public record, but I am more concerned with what was said inside the House. I am not going to elaborate at the moment but, I want to put Your Honour under notice that I do not intend to sit on my rights regarding this matter, and maybe we will have to wait to get the Hansard to see exactly what was said. I hope that is satisfactory to Your Honour.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on that point of privilege I can only say that there are many issues that this House should debate, and there are many issues that government are anxious that it debate, and the

hon. gentleman has a propensity for attempting to take the House on his back with his own circus attitudes.

Now, the fact of the matter is, if the hon. gentleman wants to quote Beauchesne, I will quote Beauchesne as well, on page 25, where it says: "A question of privilege must be brought to the attention of the House at the first possible opportunity. Even a gap of a few days may invalidate the claim for precedence in the House."

Now, the fact of the matter is, the hon. gentleman says he wants to send for Hansard. For the information of everybody, that is not a person, that is a record. The hon. gentleman was obviously here in the House when the alleged breach of privilege occurred. He could have risen at that particular time but he did not choose to. And if we allow this precedent of somebody raising a point of privilege on the basis of the records of the House, perhaps we could consume all our time going not just a day but a week and a year, or two or three years back to debate what should have been said and what should not have been said.

Now, the debate that occurred on Friday in this House was not, I might suggest to Your Honour, the most edifying that could have occurred. As I say, we have important business to transact and I would suggest the hon. gentleman who likes to bill himself as a dean of the House of Assembly might be more conversant with the rules of this House and see what he can do not to be raising these spurious points and occupying the time of the House unnecessarily and trying to turn it into a

circus, which I am sure the hon. gentleman would love to see the House turned into.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

The Chair has taken notice of the point raised by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and will certainly look at the transcripts of Hansard and the comments that have been made today and make a ruling as soon as possible as to whether or not the member for LaPoile has lost his opportunity to raise it and if, indeed, it should have been raised on Friday, and any other matters relating to it.

MR. NEARY:
Thank you, Your Honour.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
The hon. the member for Fogo on a point of privilege.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, under section 16 of Beauchesne one of the definitions of privilege is that is be absolutely necessary for this House to have privilege for the execution of its powers, and it says here, "enjoyed by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its functions without the unimpeded use of the services of its Members; and by each House for the protection of its members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity."

Mr. Speaker, on Friday night, News Final on CBC carried a news item that the Liberal caucus had

an agreement with the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) and had reneged on that agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I want to submit to this House that that is false and biased reporting and therefore impedes a member of this House, in particular myself as House Leader, in carrying out my duties. The Liberal caucus, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out, had no such agreement and CBC, therefore, had no reason to make the report without first ascertaining if, indeed, we did have such an agreement, or if we had reneged on any agreement with the member for Menihek.

As a matter of fact, if they had listened closely to the debate by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) on Friday afternoon, they would have heard that there was no agreement to allow prominence to the member for Menihek and therefore would not have carried the news items they carried on Friday night. It is therefore my opinion that the Speaker should investigate this matter with a view to having CBC either apologize or prove its statements.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I have not heard such a ridiculous point of privilege in my time in the House of Assembly. I am very glad the former Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hodder) is here in the House today, because he can, I am

sure, hang his head at the way in which his successor is carrying out his duties.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Hear, hear!

Bring back Jim Hodder.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

I realize just as, Mr. Speaker, it is rather difficult for the official Opposition to appreciate the imperatives of this Province, it is obviously also difficult for the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) and the members of the official Opposition to read more than one or two pages as a time. Because he quoted from page 11, Mr. Speaker, and if he had gone on to 19 (3) on page 12, which immediately follows, for the information of the hon. member, page 11, he would have seen: "Statements made outside the House by a Member may not be used as the base for a question of privilege."

So this, Mr. Speaker, obviously just does not answer the point of privilege, it shows a ridiculousness and a lack of understanding of the rules of this House by the official Opposition. If we get to the stage, Mr. Speaker, where Your Honour has to examine all the transcripts of CBC, and VOWM, and CJYQ, and VOWR, and VOAR, and perhaps even go farther afield, to outside of Canada, CFCB of Corner Brook, and I say to the hon. the Minister of Education (MS Verge) I fully realize that is in Newfoundland as well, Mr. Speaker, we will be consuming all your valuable time and not conducting any business in this House.

Now, I ask the hon. gentlemen

there opposite to be a little bit cognizant of the rules. I realize it is a big book for the hon. gentleman, but it is not too much to ask the hon. gentleman to read the page following the page which the hon. gentleman quoted and pay respect to the full traditions of this House and the British parliamentary system.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

Certainly I cannot rule that the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has raised a valid point of privilege. It is not incumbent upon the Chair to rule on matters that have been discussed outside the precincts of this House and in the media. Certainly, I suppose, it would be a matter of a difference of opinion between the hon. member and the members of the media.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would direct a question to the Premier. I would ask the Premier whether he has received or whether government officials have received information - which I will table in a moment - from Mobil with respect to their plans for the development of Hibernia; whether, Mr. Speaker, Mobil has informed government that the employment projections for the development of Hibernia would go something like this: Phase one, involving a floating platform production system, 1985 total employed, 200, Newfoundlanders employed zero; 1986 total employed 1,800,

Newfoundlanders employed 300; 1987 total employed 3,800, Newfoundlanders employed 800; 1988 total employed 4,200, Newfoundlanders employed 1,500, that being the peak, Mr. Speaker, and decreasing down to approximately 500 in 1997. Has the Premier received information that a floating platform production system would see the employment of Newfoundlanders peak at some 1,500 workers as of 1988? And with respect to a fixed concrete platform production system, has he received similar figures, which would indicate some 250 employees starting in 1991 and peaking at a total of 5,000 in 1995, some ten years from now? I should like to table these figures.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we have as a government a number of calculations as it relates to employment levels relevant to the mode of production that would be used offshore. 'There are lies, lies and damned statistics', as somebody said, but there are a number of different variations upon the employment levels based upon different modes that will be used. If the hon. member is referring to the environmental impact statement that both governments have asked to be delayed and asking if we have received that statement from Mobil, the answer is no, we have not.

But obviously we have internally, and in talking to numbers of companies, gotten data relative to employment levels for various modes of production, but we have not received the environmental impact statement from Mobil, nor

do we wish to receive it at this point in time because the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador wishes to have additional time to complete studies now in progress to determine what would be the most appropriate mode of development, especially for the first development, Hibernia, in line with our policy of trying to maximize employment opportunities in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. the Premier, and it concerns recent appointments made to board of FPI, Fishery Products International. I am referring specifically to a report carried in the weekend Evening Telegram which said that one member had been replaced in spite of the fact that he had been asked for a five year commitment when he was put on the board, and in spite of the fact that this member was probably one of the few people on the board who had any experience with the fisheries. I want to ask the Premier if the government itself was consulted on any of those decisions, any of those replacements? And if so, did they agree with the highhanded tactics that were used by, in particular, one Sinclair Stevens? Or was the reason for the firings, resignations and appointments purely partisan politics?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there are three shareholders involved in Fishery

Products International, the Government of Canada, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, and the Bank of Nova Scotia, and each shareholder has the right to appoint a number of members to the Board of Directors of the company. In discussions with the Government of Canada, as a result of the latest federal election, the Government of Canada wished to replace a director, one that they had appointed, which they were at liberty to do. We had not say or control over that decision. By the same token we did amend the by-laws and regulations to allow for additional joint members to be appointed, that would be members that were appointed jointly by the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland. So the only thing I can say to the hon. gentleman is that I think the person and the position to which he refers was an appointment made by the federal government and they had every right and power so to do and it was no concern of ours at all.

We submit the people we want to be on the board of directors, where we have a say, they submit the people they want to be on the board of directors, where they have a say, then, when there are joint appointments, which is now the case, we both have to agree on them. The person that the hon. member is referring to held a position which was not joint, which was not provincial, but which was a federal appointment completely.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier when he rises on this

supplementary to answer the previous question: Does he condone such highhanded tactics as were used by Mr. Stevens and the federal government? But a supplementary to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. He has built his reputation, especially in the fishing industry, on controlling our resources. In view of Mr. Tilley's assertions that Andrew Crosbie said Sinclair Stevens had informed him Tilley was no longer on the board, and in view of the fact there are a large number of Ontario and Quebec businessmen on the board of directors, is the Newfoundland fishery - and the Premier is famous for always wanting control - now under the control of the Province, the federal government, or it it indeed under the control of the Bay Street mentality of the present board of directors?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

On the hon. member's first point, all I can say is that the federal government has the right, as has the bank, as has the Government of Newfoundland, to appoint or replace directors which they have power to do. Each has so many that they have to appoint, and that is the right of the federal government. If that is the approach that they wanted to take in this particular instance, that is entirely their right and I have no other comment to make thereon.

Number two: On the larger question of control over the fishery, the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has a very short memory. It was the Liberal government of Canada who forced the Government of Newfoundland to get involved in Fishery Products

International in the beginning, who unilaterally decided that they wanted to go in a certain direction on the fishery in Newfoundland. We protested, we argued, and we did everything we could to prevent the present course of action from taking place because we thought there were other courses of action which were more preferable and at the same time would ensure that Newfoundland continued to have control. In order for us to have any control at all we had no choice but to enter into arrangements whereby we would have 25 per cent or 26 per cent of Fishery Products International. Not to go into it at all would have meant we would have had no say over the largest offshore company in our Province. We were forced into it, it was not by our own volition.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, this must be confession time, because of September 27 last year the Premier hailed this as the greatest agreement to be signed with the federal government since Confederation. Well, let me ask him another question. What instructions have been given the Board of Directors of FPI? As a shareholder, and the government of which the Premier is the head is a shareholder in this corporation, with regard to privatization can we look forward to privatization of this company earlier than was anticipated? Are there any proposals on the table at the present time to privatize the

company? If so, what are the details? If there are, is it Canadian or foreign interests that have put the proposals on the table?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the agreement that we signed last September was a good agreement not because it was the kind of agreement that the federal Liberal government wanted at the time, but because it was the kind of agreement the Government of Newfoundland wanted at the time. When the unilateral announcement was made by the federal Liberal government they wanted to close down Ramea, they wanted to close down Galtois, they wanted to close down Harbour Breton, they wanted to close down Grand Bank and they did not want to convert Burin into a secondary processing plant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It was the Government of Newfoundland that said to the federal Liberal government, you cannot do it even though you have more jurisdiction over this than we do. That is why I heralded it as a great agreement, because we were able to get Mr. Michael Kirby and the other people acting for the Liberal Prime Minister of the day (Mr. Trudeau) to change their minds, because we were not going to go along with it. Mr. Speaker, that is why that was a good agreement. And we had provision in there that all the plants would remain open. That is why it was a good agreement. And given the context of the times, if the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) remembers, there was a lot of

concern in these communities and other communities around Newfoundland that the federal Liberal government were going to have their way and all these fish plants would be closed down before they had a chance to prove themselves. Well, luckily we were able to change the minds of those people in Ottawa at the time and force upon them an agreement which, in the first instance, they did not want.

Now, as it relates to privatization, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) is the fisheries critic, why does he not read the terms and conditions of the agreement that had been signed with the federal government? And if the hon. member has read them, he understands - and we, Mr. Speaker, were the ones who forced this provision also - that we want to see this company, either in whole or in part, depending upon the evolution of the situation, we want to see this company put back into private hands as quickly as is possible. Now, as quickly as is possible can be interpreted to be one day to ten years. And I cannot answer, as one shareholder, for the company, that is a decision that will be made in the future, based upon recommendations that come from the board of directors to the shareholders, namely, the Bank of Nova Scotia, the federal government and the Province. And until such time as we have proposals on the table, until such time as the board of directors and the new management get in place and manage this company and then bring forward suggestions as to the nature of its privatization, any further such comments upon it would be completely academic and would be just guesstimates on my part.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I was going to ask another question, but I am intrigued with the dialogue that is going on here so I would like to ask a question of the Premier. I too saw the accounts there, and I read an interview by the new Chief Executive Officer of Fishery Products International and that interview in *The Globe and Mail* today indicated that the interest was in privatization and it did not matter to him one iota whether it was a Canadian or a foreign corporation. My question to the Premier is, since we do have a number of people on the board of directors, what instructions will be given to them in terms of us selling off what is virtually the largest part of our fishing industry to foreign interests? What is his position on that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, you cannot answer that in black and white. That is not a black and white question, that is very gray question. Unlike the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), we do not believe in having government run everything. I know where the hon. the member for Menihek is coming from; if he had his way, everything in Newfoundland would now be under the government and the government would be running everything. This is not a socialist government, Mr. Speaker. It is not a socialist government.

Now, if the Liberal Opposition want to associate themselves with the member for Menihek and put

forward a proposal that the fishing industry and the forest industry and the mining industry and all the rest of it has to be socialized and the government has to own everything, that is fine and dandy, we will let the people of Newfoundland and Labrador decide what they would like to have when the time is right so to do.

You cannot answer that question clearly. Obviously, I think the Canadian Government, the Bank of Nova Scotia, which is a Canadian bank, and the Government of Newfoundland would prefer if, in fact, there were investors around. At the time, as you know, when the two governments got involved, and we were forced to get involved, and the bank, to bring these various bankrupt companies together, it was our desire to see that Canadian interests came forward to invest in this company, or these companies at the time, but no Canadian investors came forward. So it will depend. There may be three or four different proposals: There may be a Canadian proposal, there may be an American proposal, there could be a hybrid, there could be an American/Canadian proposal or a West German and a Canadian proposal, or a Japanese and a Canadian or American proposal, I do not know.

Obviously, as Canadians we would all prefer to see Canadians being able to invest in it, but very often in Canada, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, there is not the capital for the major industrial and economic projects that we want to do available in Canada and very often we have to depend on outside interests. And that is not bad in itself. Some people get the thing

confused, that you have to own something to control it. We would like to think that you can control, this legislature and the Government of Canada, the Parliament of Canada as well as the various provincial legislatures and provincial governments can negotiate good deals for the people of Canada using using foreign capital. You do not have to own it to control it, and that is so of the fishing industry and of this company. So whether it is foreign capital or domestic capital will depend upon how things proceed from here over the next few years and what proposals come forward. Obviously we would like to see enough Canadian entrepreneurs and bankers and financiers get together and invest in the Canadian fishing industry. Up to this point in time they have been extremely reluctant to do so. But it would be the preference, I am sure, of all three shareholders to see a good group of Canadian entrepreneurs come together and invest in the Canadian fishing industry to the extent that will be needed at that time. Whether that will be so or not we do not know, but we do not want to close the door to foreign interest. There is a lot of foreign capital out there that can be very beneficial not only to the fishing industry but to the forest industry, the mining industry and other industries throughout Canada.

It is very often that you can strike good deals to protect Canadians and jobs, to protect the Canadian economy, and, at the same time, use foreign capital. What it will come down to I do not know. Obviously, as I say, I am sure as Canadians all our preference is for Canadian capital, but, at the same time, if

that capital is not available then, obviously, American capital, or European capital, or Asian capital is welcome to come to Canada and contribute in the development of the fishing industry.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

It is not a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, it is the question I originally rose to ask.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A number of members have indicated they would like to ask a question. It is certainly the policy in this House that when a member is recognized for a first question he is given the opportunity to ask two or three supplementaries. It might be a little unfair for the Chair to recognize an hon. member with two or three original questions as opposed to supplementaries, so the Chair will have to try to be fair in that respect. The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. FENWICK:

May I raise a point of order, please?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

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

MR. FENWICK:

The point of order is that I rose to ask a supplementary question on Friday and was denied asking it when someone else asked a preliminary question. At that time the Chair ruled that the first person to stand up would be the person recognized.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Member for LaPoile to that point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I realize that my friend probably does not want to challenge Your Honour's ruling but indirectly that is what my colleague is doing. There is a procedure for doing that: If my colleagues wishes to appeal the ruling, he just gets up and makes the motion that he is appealing the Speaker's ruling. I do not know if that is what the hon. gentleman intended to do or not.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council to that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

I think it is quite obvious now that the official Opposition has sicked the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on the new member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) to prevent, Mr. Speaker, the new member for Menihek swallowing up the official Opposition. But the fact of the matters is as far as the government is concerned, whatever the rules are, the hon. gentleman has been on his feet, he is new to the House, surely all members of the House can respect the fact that the hon. gentleman is new and does not know the rules and we can allow him one or two questions in the Question Period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sure! Sure! Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Menihek rose on a point of order and the

Chair attempted to, at least in the Chair's opinion, be fair to all members and give them the opportunity to ask original questions with some supplementaries. The hon. the member for Menihek referred to Friday when he attempted to ask a supplementary question and sort of inferred that he was not allowed to do so. I think, if the hon. member will recall, that the Chair at that time said that it was the responsibility of the Chair to recognize the member who catches the Speaker's eye first and that is exactly what happened on Friday. In order to try to be fair, I will now recognize the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Social Services. Across the Province at the present time we see indications of government's job creation projects in the form of signs. Would the minister tell me why it is that a married woman with a husband and family on social assistance cannot be considered for work on a project unless her husband is disabled? In other words, where a job exists and a woman is qualified, and neither she nor her husband are working, she is not considered for placement on one of those projects unless her husband is disabled. Is the minister aware that this is the practice across the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not aware of any such practice. I will be glad to look into it. Where a person is in receipt of social assistance it is an

accepted fact in this Province, as it is in many other jurisdictions, that the male, the man is the breadwinner. And I have not changed that. I did not create it, but, of course, I have not changed it either. If for some reason or other there is a position for which the father and husband is not qualified and the wife and mother is eminently qualified, then, certainly, the wife and mother would be given that opportunity. We do not discriminate against women, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, is well aware this government has gone many, many yards to demonstrate that we do not discriminate against female versus male.

MR. HODDER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the minister and he confirmed what I just said. He said the man is considered to be the breadwinner. I can tell the minister that in a number of offices across this Province, and in a variety of areas of this Province, women who are qualified are told, no, if your husband is able-bodied you are not qualified to go on those projects. I would ask the minister if this policy is consistent with this government's policy on the equality of women?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to repeat it, I will just say this,

that we do not make any distinction between male and female. We accept the long-standing tradition that the man, the father, the husband is the breadwinner and it is his prime responsibility to provide for the family. Given a situation where there is not a job available for a man but there is one for his wife, the mother of the children, and the mother of the children, that man's wife is also the recipient of social assistance, one of the prerequisites to getting on one of those projects is that the family or the individual be on social assistance, so as far as I am concerned, it is quite proper, indeed, and quite just to consider the mother of a family, the wife of a husband for a position given the fact that her husband is not able to qualify for a particular type of job that might be available. I will look into the matter that the hon. gentleman has referred to.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I will yield if my colleague has a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port au Port on a final supplementary.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I just had one other question. This philosophy of the male being the breadwinner in any given family as just enunciated by the minister, is this practice consistent with the new Charter of Rights and Freedoms? I think that the minister's department is in violation of the new Charter of

Rights and Freedoms which is the law of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into a legal debate. I must say I have never been referred to as one of the learned gentlemen or members of this House, I am not a lawyer. I will say to the hon. gentleman that it is a long-standing tradition. I am not aware that that tradition violates the Charter of Rights. I will say this, however, one has to slice the cake to suit both sides. If a family is deemed to have done something which is in breach of the law and the head of the home is charged, the wife is not charged equally because of that, it is the male in that instance. I am not, as I said, and my department is not in any way discriminating against women versus men. I am very much in favour of equality when it comes to that. It has been a long-stated fact by me, Mr. Speaker, not only since I have been on this side of the House as an individual, but when I sat in the Opposition. You can go back through Hansards and you will find my comments on equal pay for equal work back in 1966. So it is nothing new to me. I am glad to be part of an administration that has finally recognized some of those discrepancies and has corrected them.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Labour and Manpower. Would the

minister tell the House if any representation has been made to the administration, either to his department or to the Premier, in connection with the anti-labour legislation in this Province, the legislation that discriminates against public service employees? Has the minister been approached by anybody from the United Nations in that regard, from the International Labour Organization, the ILO?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any anti-labour legislation in the Province. Number two, I have not been contacted by the United Nations, but there was communication between the International Labour Organization and Labour Canada with respect to a commission to come to Newfoundland to have a look at or investigate Bill 59. Labour Canada's response to the International Labour Organization was that if they required further information, more information, or elaboration on existing information that they would be happy to request that from the Province and the Province would supply it. As a result they informed the International Labour Organization that they did not see any need for the commission.

Subsequent to that Labour Canada contacted the officials of my department and wondered if we concurred with what they had sent to the ILO. The Deputy Minister was in touch with me, I confirmed that that was our feeling also, that it seemed to me that the International Labour Organization, with all the problems there are in

this world, would have something better to do than to come to Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

Is the hon. gentleman aware - I know he is aware, because I saw him being handed this green pamphlet on the way in - that the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees are protesting a piece of regressive, anti-union legislation? This pamphlet says, 'Passed in the House of Assembly, this piece of legislation is known as Bill 59.' Now, is the hon. gentleman prepared to table in the House correspondence between his department and Labour Canada and the correspondence that has been sent by Labour Canada and received from the ILO? The information when it was sent to the hon. gentleman to ask if he was in agreement with it, would the hon. gentleman be prepared to table these pieces of correspondence here in the House?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said that he saw, and indeed he did, obviously it certainly happened, that on my way out of Confederation Building I received an information sheet from members of NAPE and, indeed, on my way in I got another sheet which was identical. I received both and talked to the people down there. I do not agree with some of the items on the sheet. I believe that Bill 59 is a perfectly good piece of legislation. Bill 59 makes it a law in this Province

that in the event of a strike in the health sector in this Province essential employees be provided. We think that that is fair and reasonable for one to expect. We do not want to see people dying in their beds because they are not being attended to. As a matter of fact, the legislation that we are talking about here is an elaboration on legislation that was brought into the House in 1974 and was frustrated in its operation by actions before the Labour Relations Board. So to clarify that piece of legislation we had to bring in Bill 59 which now makes it fairly clear that essential employees should be provided before strike action is taken, especially with respect to the health sector. We think that is good legislation, not retrogressive or bad legislation.

MR. NEARY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

A final supplementary the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman now a double-barreled question. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House in the event that the ILO, which is a branch of the United Nations, the International Labour Organization, if it does send an investigator to Newfoundland, or a commission to Newfoundland, would the hon. gentleman be prepared to give records, to open the books to the ILO regarding this matter? Would the hon. gentleman open up his department to the ILO? Would the hon. gentleman also indicate if he is contemplating changes, a repeal of that act or any part of that act in the foreseeable future?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, there may be amendments to the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act or other pieces of legislation in the Province, but with respect to changes as were brought in in Bill 59, I am certainly not contemplating any right now. As a matter of fact, when the bill was brought in, because of some clauses in the bill that some labour organizations in the Province had some problem with, I indicated to them that I would be willing to meet with them any time during the Summer, between then and September, and do I did. Any representations that were made to me for meetings I met with them and I was delighted to meet with them, and I understand my officials met with people from the different labour organizations. Unfortunately, there were no recommendations or suggestions whereby we would have the capability of providing essential employees in the event of a strike in the health sector; there were no recommendations that could make that legislation work or make it better and as a result we could not make amendments to that legislation, and as a result of that we had to proclaim the -

MR. NEARY:

You would not meet with them.

MR. DINN:

I say right now, Mr. Speaker, to any labour leader in this Province, anyone who wants a meeting with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) has never called the Minister of Labour and been refused a meeting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

And, Mr. Speaker, that open-door policy on my behalf will continue for as long as I am Minister of Labour in this Province.

NEARY:

But there will be no meeting on Bill 59.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The time for Question Period has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report for the Gander Development Corporation. This will be the final report of the Corporation, since on June 1 past the corporation was replaced by a regional office of the Department of Development.

Over the past years the Corporation has continued to liaise with government agencies and the private sector and, I think, has succeeded in a number of areas.

The concept of air freighting fresh fish from Gander's International Airport, which the Corporation has spearheaded since 1979, is anticipated to become a reality in the Fall of this year. They were successful as well in

facilitating a business arrangement for shipping fresh fish to South America between British Forces in Belize and Happy Adventure Sea Products Limited.

The Air Related Industrial Park proposed in 1978 marked a beginning on its first phase development this year. It is anticipated that serviced building lots will be available either later this Fall or early in the Spring. The Department's Regional Office will now fulfil the marketing and promotional role in connection with the park, on behalf of the Province, and, of course, in conjunction with Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and local community groups.

The Corporation has worked through its marketing and promotional efforts to ensure that Gander remains competitive in the air-oriented business in the North Atlantic. As part of development efforts, the Corporation has recommended to Transport Canada that the Instrument Landing System be upgraded to Category II as well as the installation of a passenger coverage ramp.

In 1982-83 the Corporation began promoting Gander as a landing base for the executive jet business, through promotion and advertising, and these efforts resulted in a 37 per cent increase in executive jet landings this year from previous years. The Corporation's encouraging the use of Gander by the U.S.S.R. has also been rewarded. With the signing of the memorandum of understanding between Canada and the Soviet Union, arrangements have been made to transport and store Soviet aviation fuel at Gander. Aeroflot landings will then resume to about

600 flights per year.

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:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the hon. gentleman is tabling a report or making a Ministerial Statement? It sounds more to me like a Ministerial Statement. I believe Your Honour ruled last session, or before we adjourned in the Spring on the same matter, that when you table a report your remarks are just, Your Honour, I wish to table the annual report of so-and-so. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the council to that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that is a very picayune point. The hon. gentleman is tabling a report in this House, the last one for the Corporation. All he is doing is giving details of it. We realize that members of the official Opposition need guidance and this is all that the minister is doing when he is tabling the report.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL):

To that point of order, the matter was raised, I think, in the Spring session of this Legislature when one hon. member went on for some time in presenting a report. It has usually been the custom in

this House that when hon. ministers or members are tabling reports they are allowed a couple of minutes to have a few brief comments pertaining to the report. The hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) is drawing near the end of his two minutes.

MR. WINDSOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your ruling, and let me say to Your Honour that had I not been interrupted I would have been finished long before this.

Mr. Speaker, there were many other promotional and development oriented activities undertaken by the Corporation over the past year, some of which include: Helping to determine the viability of setting up an Aviation Museum in Gander; working with a local business on the prospects of establishing a retail fish outlet at the Gander Airport; participation at trade shows, seminars and workshops promoting Gander as an international/commercial centre; providing information to more than fifty companies requesting site location information; continuing to support the expansion and enhancement of Gander's existing business community; and maintaining close liaison with other development groups and communities where areas of mutual concern exist.

Mr. Speaker, since its formation in 1975 we feel the Corporation has had great success in achieving its mandate as well as being a great benefit to the community. However, circumstances have changed significantly over the years and we feel it is now appropriate to develop plans on a regional basis. To this end we

have established a regional office now of the Department of Development replacing the Development Corporation.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I pay tribute to all those persons who have acted as Chairpersons and members of the Boards of Directors of the Gander Corporation over the years, to the staff of the Corporation, the latest ones now have become members of the staff of the Department of Development and, as well, to express appreciation to the support from various community groups that have worked closely with the Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

I should like to take this opportunity to welcome to the Speaker's Gallery the hon. Walter McLean, Secretary of State, who is responsible for women's issues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

NOTICE OF MOTION

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt Certain Agreements Entered Into Between The Government Of The Province, Kruger Incorporated And Other Parties Respecting The Future Operation And Modernization Of The Corner Brook Newsprint Mill."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Agreement Entered Into Between The Government Of Canada And The Government Of The Province And St. Lawrence Fluorspar Limited."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of a number of women throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I understand that during the weekend there was a Conference on Women's Issues in this Province, and I further understand they met with the three political parties this morning on the eleventh floor. One of the questions raised during this meeting resulted in this petition being passed along to me a few moments ago.

Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition is as follows: "Whereas pregnant women in Newfoundland and Labrador have to undergo extreme hardship at the time of childbirth, specifically that most women must travel long distances from home, often for months, thus leaving their family and support

structure to have their children."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the women have asked that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador through this petition return to the provincial health system the practice of midwifery in all nursing stations or clinics in isolated communities.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, before this government came to power, and before they brought in their local preference policy, many of the nurses throughout Newfoundland and coastal Labrador had courses in midwifery and subsequently many of the women who were ready for childbirth were probably cared for in the various isolated communities. Years ago many of the nurses, particularly in the IGA stations throughout coastal Labrador and Northern Newfoundland were of European descent and many of them, because it had been mandatory in the European countries, had practiced midwifery. Now this is gradually disappearing because we have fewer and fewer European nurses on the Labrador coast and in Northern Newfoundland.

Now, I support the government in its local preference policy, but, this is another example of bringing in a policy when we are not prepared for it and as a result in the remote areas of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador much hardship is borne by individual ladies who have to travel sometimes as far as 200 miles or 300 miles to a central hospital.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, this petition has been signed by women from Nain to St. John's and all other areas of the Province who attended that conference this

weekend.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it should be up to the individual woman who is giving birth whether she wants to avail of the means of midwifery or to take the opportunity of travelling to larger communities where there would be doctors available. Again I would say on behalf of these women that this government has dropped this component from their health programme and I would suggest to the new Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), who is only a few months in that portfolio, that he seriously look at this and assure the population of the various isolated communities throughout Newfoundland and Labrador that his department is concerned about this hardship these women have to bear and hopefully he can reinstate this component into the provincial health system.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I want to support the prayer of the petition so ably presented on short notice by my colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). Before I do I want to congratulate all the ladies who attended the conference on women's rights over the weekend in this Province. They discussed such matters as wife battering, pornography, employment, education, alcohol, health, family planning, housing, divorce and the constitution. I believe both sides of the House had the privilege to meet with the ladies this morning on the eleventh floor of this building, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, both sides of the House, and we were all I think very much enlightened by what they had to say, and we will be hearing more

about some of the matters raised by the ladies this morning. I must say that I personally was given a great insight into how knowledgeable they are in matters concerning women's rights and the economy and so forth in this Province. And we will be asking a lot of questions in the days ahead.

But I do want to commend my colleague for the way in which he presented the petition. I am sure that the new Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) was impressed with the presentation, a gentleman who is very familiar with medicine in rural Newfoundland, who started out as a young man in the rural parts of this Province. And I believe when the hon. gentleman was practicing medicine in rural Newfoundland that midwifery, by the way, which is the proper pronunciation, was then widespread. I, myself, was born by a midwife and I am sure there are a good many members of the House who were born by a midwife. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a profession, it is an honourable profession, it is a profession that could die away, that could fade away unless adequate training is provided for this profession. I understand that all the nurses that come from Great Britain and European countries are trained in midwifery and, Mr. Speaker, that is why they are so well-qualified when they go in the rural parts of this Province. I think we should return to this practice.

We do have a lot of remote communities. I have three in my own district of LaPoile that are remote communities, that are isolated, and in the event that you cannot get the woman to a doctor or to a nurse, Mr. Speaker, I believe a midwife should be there to look after these

emergencies. Even with all the technology and with all the trained personnel that we have throughout the Province, armies of doctors and nurses, but the weather, the elements, are bound sometimes to interfere in these matters and then I think we should provide midwives to look after these emergencies. And I am sure the hon. gentleman would like to say a few words on this and I believe that he might even agree that we do have a point, that it is a valid petition and I invite my hon. colleague to participate in the debate.

It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to support the petition and to also support all the other matters that were raised both this morning and over the weekend by the ladies who attended this conference. I think it was a very worthwhile conference, Mr. Speaker, and as a result of our meeting this morning I know that we have a raft of questions to ask the administration there opposite who has been negligent in these matters, and they will have to answer in the days and weeks ahead for the matters that were raised this morning, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:

I wish to compliment the presenter of the petition and the hon. member who supported the petition. I quite agree with you that there are many, many problems that I would wish to be able to answer at this particular moment

but first of all I have to look back on the history. And that is a history of vital statistics and maternal and child care. Without looking back on that I do not think that we could add much to this debate. It so happens that in the last ten years infant mortality in this Province has dropped from 12.7 per thousand live births to 5.1 per cent per thousand live births in 1982, and that is a remarkable drop. It is not based on the number of children per family or anything else like that, it is based on live births per thousand deliveries. Then if we go back a little further, as I can from practical knowledge and experience, if we go back to 1961 the number of maternal deaths in that particular year was 7.1 per ten thousand live births. You know what it has been the last two years? Zero to my knowledge, although I have not got the report for this year. I think we have to look at your petition in that respect. I know that there are many competent people who practice midwifery or obstetrics out in the remote areas of this Province. I know they have given yeoman service. They have helped a tremendous amount of people and have in many cases, I am sure, been safe protectors of women in labour in these remote areas. However, as far as I know at the present time there are not courses that specifically zero in on the training of people for obstetrics in the remote areas of this Province or any other province in Canada. Still training goes on in Britain and the diploma is called the SRN, State Registered Nurse. To my knowledge it has been not too easy to recruit these people within the last few years. And one of the reasons that it has not been easy is because they are in

isolated areas and obstetrics and all facets of medicine have advanced so much during that period of time that these ladies, many of them, are taking a strong second look. And it is in the interest of maternal and child care that they are not going to remote areas. I admit it would be excellent and fine if you had people with all the skills to treat the emergency cases no matter how distant it is from a primary or a secondary care institution. I certainly will look into it and I will get back to the member. But I am quite sorry, also, that I cannot give you an answer that you would really like to receive at this particular time.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition quite dissimilar from the one that was presented by my colleague from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). But I hope, even though it is dissimilar, that it will be greeted by somebody on the government benches. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is not here but I hope that whoever speaks to it on the government benches will speak with the same dignity and the same sensibility that the hon. member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey), the new Minister of Health spoke on that petition. My petition, Mr. Speaker, has to do with dirt roads, unpaved roads. Just over a week ago I presented a petition from the good people in Markland concerning the deplorable

condition of their roads. After many, many times being promised that their roads would be paved they still have seven miles of dirt road. Today, Mr. Speaker, this petition comes from the people in the town of Hillview. It is quite easy to find Hillview. As you drive the Trans-Canada, Mr. Speaker, just before you get to Clarendville, about a dozen miles or so, there is Hillview, just off the Trans-Canada. The first dozen or so houses are no more than 500 yards off the TCH. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, goes as follows: "We the undersigned, residents of Hillview, do hereby protest the condition of our road. We feel neglected by the government of this Province to which we pay our fair share of taxes. We humbly request that funding be made available in next Spring's budget." They are asking that money to be made available in next Spring's budget to start the paving, Mr. Speaker. Let me repeat, to start the paving, not to lay down a dozen miles of pavement, but to start the paving of the section of highway leading from the TCH through Hillview on to Hatchet Cove, which ends at the dead end in St. Jones Within. So that is the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker. It is signed by forty-three people, including myself.

Now the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) from Humber East, who during the Bellevue by-election of 1981 knocked on an awful lot of doors in Hillview, knows that there are a lot more people in Hillview than forty-three. However, as I said in connection with the Markland petition, people from Hillview and other parts of the district of Bellevue who still do not have paved roads and who

have given me petitions to present in the House, are sick and tired of going from door to door, house to house trying to collect 200 and 300 and 400 names on a petition. And so, Mr. Speaker, the fact that somebody had interest enough in the community to get forty-three names is a feat in itself.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is not here. It does not really matter, he was here when I presented the petition from Markland and he did not speak on that, so I rather doubt that he would speak if he were here today.

Mr. Speaker, the people in Hillview are not asking for very much. They are asking for their fair share of their tax dollars to be returned to the community in which they live.

Mr. Speaker, I see the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) is present in the Legislature. The member for St. Mary's-The Capes has 145 or 150 miles of dirt road in his district, which is right on the Avalon Peninsula. My district is on the Isthmus for the most part and there are approximately 40 miles of dirt road left in the district of Bellevue. St. Mary's-The Capes, a district once represented by the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and then by Walter Carter for a number of years when he was a minister in this same government, still has 145 or 150 miles left to be paved and I am sure that the present member wants that done.

Mr. Speaker, the people who live in the town of Hillview are asking for perhaps a couple of miles of pavement. And if they had the couple of miles of pavement, then

the trucks that drive through Hillview on the way to St. Jones Within and Hatchet Cove or the people who travel from Hatchet Cove and St. Jones Within to Clarenville to go to work would not be raising dust.

MR. MORGAN:
Raising what?

MR. CALLAN:
Raising dust. The member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) does not know too much about dust because he has his district all paved.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

The time for the hon. member has expired.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I say that I support the people in their endeavours to try and get this road paved. I ask that the petition be laid upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) in supporting this petition. It is a wonder that the residents of Hillview have not applied to the Department of Municipal Affairs for a change of name to change it to Dustview in light of the conditions of that road. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that the prayer of these voters, these taxpayers of Newfoundland and Labrador were heard. And I hope that the reason they have been ignored for so long is not because they happen to be

represented by a member, and I might say very well represented by a member from this side of the House.

MR. MORGAN:

They will all be voting PC in the next election.

MR. BARRY

The Minister of Fisheries, I am sorry the former Minister of Fisheries, the member for Bonavista (Mr. Morgan) says that they will all be voting PC in the next election. Mr. Speaker, I believe the member should have found out by now that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador do not believe in blackmail, do not believe in having to change their vote in order to get what they are entitled to have as taxpayers of this Province. And it is regrettable that, obviously, as the member points out, members opposite still seem to adhere to the view set out by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) that he would prefer to give road money to his colleagues in the PC caucus.

MR. MORGAN:

I certainly hope so.

MR. BARRY:

Are we progressing in government, Mr. Speaker, when we have that approach taken to the appeals and the prayers and the requests of the taxpayers of this Province? Is this not a shame for any member opposite to say that the way in which the tax dollars would be spent would depend upon the political persuasion of the district? Surely other members do not agree with the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) that this is the case. Surely the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) does not ascribe

to this process of discrimination against the taxpayers in this Province. And surely the prayer of the good people of Hillview will not only be heard but will be listened to and will be acted upon.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), who asked me to keep an eye open for any petitions or any matters of that nature that might be tabled in the House for his attention, I indicate, first of all, that the government acknowledges and accepts any petitions presented and will give them due consideration. So I assure the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) that will be done.

I did not intend to make any further comment until the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) got up to speak in the debate. He was clearly out of order. I am a bit surprised that he was not ruled out of order because he knows full well that you are not allowed to debate a matter when a petition is raised. You are suppose to keep your comment strictly to the prayer of the petition and the names and the numbers of people who signed the petition. However, obviously there has been some leeway allowed so I presume the same leeway would be allowed for a speaker on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition are really kind of unusual, especially when you realize that a year ago he was in the caucus advocating

the very policies that he is criticizing the Minister of Transportation for taking. And he knows full well that that is not the position of this government and the members of this government do not treat districts represented by Conservative members on this side of the House any differently than they treat districts represented by members on that side of the House. Every district in this Province is treated with equal and fair representation. That is evident, Mr. Speaker, if anybody wanted to take the time to look at the work that has been done in this Province. I think if they looked at all the activities that have been undertaken in Liberal districts as well as in Tory districts, they will see that members on the opposite side have no reason to complain, they received their fair share, as well as the people on this side of the House have received fair shares for their particular constituencies.

I only say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the petition presented by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) will receive due serious consideration as all petitions presented in this hon. House receive on every occasion from members of the ministry on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL:
Motion 4.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) to introduce a bill, "An Act To

Incorporate The Certified General Accountants Association Of Newfoundland," carried. (Bill No. 47).

On motion, Bill No. 47 read a first time ordered read a second time tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:
Motion 3.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Chairman, I was calling for the question a moment ago. In the effort to expedite public business, perhaps I should take the ten minutes available to me to explain once again to the members of the official Opposition - I emphasize the official Opposition, the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) understands - the official Opposition as to what we are about in this particular debate. This is supplementary supply, Mr. Chairman. This is extra supply that the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is asking for the year ending March 31, 1984 and the net amount of extra supply that the hon. gentleman is looking for is some \$44 million. The bill reads, Mr.

Chairman, \$134 million, but as the hon. gentlemen there opposite fully realize \$90 million of that is purely and simply for -

MR. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure if the hon. gentleman is confused or he does not understand what is happening, but the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) brought a bill into this House asking the House to approve \$134 million of supplementary supply. Now the hon. gentleman can play with the figures all he wants, but the fact of the matter is if the hon. gentleman wants the bill reduced then the hon. gentleman should make a motion, with which we would agree, that the bill be reduced down to \$40 million and we would be glad to vote for it. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is out of order to stand up in this House, when we have the bill in front of us in black and white stating \$134 million, and claim it is for \$40-odd million as the hon. gentleman is trying to say it is.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

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

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is explaining what the hon. the member opposite needs explained; by his very remarks he needs an explanation and that is what the

President of the Council is doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To that point of order, I rule there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, the only thing I will say in response to those comments and the only thing I would ever fault the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for, that really he is such an efficient person, he perhaps should have brought in two supplementary supply bills: One for \$44 million and the other for the \$90,500,000, which is the grant necessary for the Department of Education, because that amount was really already a debt of this government because the government was really responsible for the debts accumulated by the school boards in school construction. As a policy decision this year, Mr. Chairman, what the government decided to do was to adopt that merely as a direct debt. So what we really have is just a book entry. That is all it amounts to. The other supplementary supply bill could have been brought to this House and should have gone through without any debate at all. But this \$90 million really amounts to a book entry. Therefore, if the hon. gentleman knows anything about arithmetic, if he can get out his calculator which he will need to do his subtraction, \$90,500,000 from \$134,651,700 gives you a net result of \$44,151,000. So all the minister is asking for in new spending - and this is the point I am making - is \$44 million which is merely just slightly 2 per cent of the budget. The hon. gentleman

will elucidate this through his notes, but if you wish to go through the various headings you will see in the Department of Justice that there is some \$4 million or \$5 million that is provided here that is an advanced payment, this is something that we were committed to anyway. So, in effect, what you are doing in new expenditure is you are bringing it down below 2 per cent. Now I say in these troubled times, Mr. Chairman, if a family or any organization can estimate their expenditures within one year with less than 2 per cent error, then I would say that family or organization is doing a magnificent job. Even moreso, Mr. Chairman, when you consider the Government of this Province, the size of the expenditures in excess of \$2 billion and the fact that we are in such a disadvantageous position in this Province economically, where we have such a problem in getting the wherewithal to meet our commitments, I would think that this supplementary supply bill, Mr. Chairman, should be greeted as a monument to the hon. the minister as to the efficiency with which he is conducting affairs in the Department of Finance. We debated it for two or three days and I would like to ask the Committee is it the intention of the Committee to continue on and on? If it is, that is their prerogative. But I can say to the House that we have some bills that are before this House that should be debated and are of great importance to this Province, such as the one the Premier gave notice of today with respect to Kruger. And we have other bills that are there on the Order Paper that, as the hon. gentleman can see, merit debate and should be debated, like the Labour Standards Act. But be that

as it may, it is obviously the prerogative of the hon. gentlemen to debate supplementary supply as long as they wish, but I would say to the hon. gentleman let us be relevant,, first of all, to the matters before the House, let us realize that we are effectively talking about less than 2 per cent of the total budget. And let us realize and be fair to the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), man-fashion or person fashion or whichever way you want to put it, and accept the fact that it is the result of his management and during his management of the financial affairs of this Province the credit rating of this Province has been protected and safeguarded. In very difficult and arduous times over the past five or six years there has not been any movement downward in our credit rating, and that is something that I think is a real accomplishment when you consider the position that we are in, when we you consider the neighbouring provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and Quebec Hydro, have all had downgradings in their credit rating, but this man here, two seats to my right, has managed to safeguard the credit rating of this Province.

So that is really what this bill reveals. Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentlemen there opposite want to ask questions of any of the ministry as to the reasons for the additional expenditures, by all means do and we will be quite happy to answer them. But in the meantime I would like to emphasize to the Committee and to the House that we have a very important legislative docket to deal with and the hon. gentlemen there opposite will be the first to cry out if we get near the end of the allotted time and we do not deal

with it.

MR. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is trying to say, only he will not come right out and say it, that we are delaying somehow or other certain important pieces of legislation from coming before this House. That is misleading, Mr. Chairman, because it is the Government House Leader who calls the order of business in this House. And the hon. gentleman need not have called Supplementary Supply today; that Supplementary Supply Bill has been on the Order Paper since sometime early Spring. He could have called any order of business today other than the Supplementary Supply Bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe Your Honour should direct the Government House Leader to be a little more factual. If he is going to be the Government House Leader, Mr. Chairman, let him lead. And if he wants to call the Kruger bill now, I presume my colleague and I and our colleagues on this side, are prepared to postpone debate on the Supplementary Supply Bill. Let us have the Kruger Bill. Let us have the other pieces of legislation that he is talking about that are so important, and let us get on with the people's business. Put the Supplementary Supply Bill aside and we will come back to it later. We do not have to pass it today.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please! To that point of

order, the hon. the President of Council.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, I do wish the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) would stop embarrassing the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) by usurping his role all the time. Every time a point comes up in this House the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House gets up and presumes to try to usurp the position of the duly elected Leader of the official Opposition -

MR. SIMMS:

They all want Hodder's job.

MR. MARSHALL:

- and that is really what the hon. gentleman is doing.

Mr. Chairman, look, while the government has the duty to bring bills into the House, the government also has the duty to try to prevail upon the Opposition to deal with the business of the House expeditiously, and supplementary supply is a measure that has to go through, obviously in the Assembly, it has to get the approval of the Committee and of the House, and that is what we are seeking to do.

So all that I am doing, Mr. Chairman, in this debate and in these few remarks, is to try to prevail upon the hon. gentlemen to be relevant. Now if they want to be relevant and debate it until next year, that is their prerogative. But I am just pointing out, Mr. Chairman, that it would be in the best interests of everybody if the hon. gentleman could be relevant.

MR. NEARY:

Sure, we would allow you to bully us around.

MR. MARSHALL:

I am not bullying you around. Mr. Chairman, I urge the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) to exercise his real position as Leader of the Opposition and not have it usurped by his predecessor so that we can perhaps get the business of the House conducted in a more orderly fashion. I will have accomplished my purpose if that happens. But what happens is when the former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is not obsessed with being eaten up by the new member for Menihok (Mr. Fenwick), he is obsessed with trying to outshine his successor.

So I would just ask that there be a certain amount of sanity shown in this House, a certain amount of effectiveness in our dealings here. Let us 'Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and give praise to the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for conducting the affairs of this Province so efficiently and effectively as shown so vividly in this particular act.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):
Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to start off by thanking the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) for that very informative lecture on House procedure and House etiquette. I think it is the fifteenth time he has given it in this session. And that seems to be the sum total of answers given by the minister and other ministers to the questions

which are being put, the very able questions, I might suggest, being put by my colleagues such as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). And, Mr. Chairman, unlike members on the other side of the House there is no paranoia over here. We believe, Mr. Chairman, in utilizing the accumulated wisdom which exists on the part of the colleagues that I have with me here and their many years of experience. Mr. Chairman, I wish to apologize to the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) because I had a note made but in the heat of the matters of privilege that were raised and so forth I forgot, and I do not believe that it should go unnoticed by this House - I meant to raise it before Question Period, I will raise it now - that today, I believe, is the 23rd anniversary of the member's election.

MR. NEARY:

I am starting my 23rd. year.

MR. BARRY:

He is starting his 23rd year in the House of Assembly today. I think that is a matter that deserves some recognition on the part of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

And, Mr. Chairman, if members opposite think that I am going to forsake the accumulated wisdom of 22 years in this House of Assembly they are wrong. I am going to draw upon to the fullest every one of those years. I am going to squeeze every bit of parliamentary deviousness, I am going to utilize every stratagem that has been devised over those 22 years to make sure that we bring to the attention of the people of this

Province the terrible job that members opposite are doing, particularly, I have to say the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms).

MR. SIMMS:

Go sit down!

MR. BARRY:

And I am a little disappointed, Mr. Chairman, because I still have a few friends who feed me a little bit of information from the other side and I understood that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands and the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) were the heirs apparent, now that I have left, of course. I understood that both of those ministers were the heirs apparent and that when the current Leader of the Tory Party resigns a month or so before he has to call the next election, because he finds himself in a position of being totally unable to win -

MR. NEARY:

That is what he will do.

MR. BARRY:

- as gathered by the polls which he will be carrying out on the Eighth Floor, when he resigns there is going to be a vicious dogfight for the leadership of the party opposite and the two key players - this is the information that is being fed by members opposite to me - are going to be the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) and the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor).

I have to say the Minister for Development seems to be off to a head start. I see in a press release issued on November 9 that that minister has been out soliciting support quite

actively. On the 9th. we had a press release issued from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. I can only assume that it the pawn shop in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania that the member was visiting at the time because we have not seen any development proceed from that particular visit. But I have to warn the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, that minister has also been to San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, St. Louis, Boston, Buffalo, and Huston, all of that in a time of restraint, I might note. But although it is a time of restraint, the minister explains why he is taking these many trips. And it is because he is promoting the Province as a unique tourist destination. While he says not a word about the increased fares on the Gulf Ferry, he is promoting the Province as a unique tourist destination. He is also familiarizing businessmen and corporate executives with our other national resource areas including the fishery, mining, forestry, and hydro electricity. And the hotels are blocked, you cannot get a room, Mr. Chairman, as a result of this trip for the businessmen flocking into this Province. You cannot get a taxicab for the fact that they are all out at the airport waiting for those developers to come in from San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, St. Louis, Boston, Buffalo, Huston and the pawn shop in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Now I have to say to the minister, I do not really think that this particular tour has the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) all that far ahead of him.

MR. WINDSOR:

What did you do when you were a

minister?

MR. BARRY:

Oh, welcome, welcome, welcome! I notice there is a nice colour there, too. Is that from Los Angeles or San Francisco? But I will deal with the minister in a minute. I wanted to say that I do not think the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) is all that far ahead of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). At least he was not until the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands went up and visited the federal Forestry Minister a few days ago, Mr. Merithew. After the minister indicating that the plans to move the Forestry Centre from St. John's to Corner Brook have not been cancelled they have only been deferred, lo and behold, when the Newfoundland minister walks out of the federal minister's office what do we hear? A reporter asks him, 'And is Mr. Merithew now prepared to indicate how long that Forestry Centre is deferred? Is it going to be moved or is it not going to be moved?' What was the reply of the Newfoundland minister? "I did not want to put the federal Minister of Forestry (Mr. Merithew) on the spot so I did not ask him." Now, Mr. Chairman, that is what I call consultation. That is the consummate consultation. I would like when ministers opposite get up, and I am sure the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) will be putting the federal Minister responsible for Transportation (Mr. Mazankowski) on the spot when he sees how the increase in the Gulf ferry rates are going to impact upon his tourism industry. I know that the Minister responsible for Development is going to put that minister on the spot, but I wonder if other ministers are going to take the same approach when they

go to visit their federal counterparts in this era of co-operation and consultation that has been promised? Will all ministers opposite take the same approach? Will the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Goudie) whoever he might be, the acting Minister I presume for the next little while, will he go up and will he be afraid to put the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Fraser) on the spot with respect to asking him whether he might put off these slashes to the fisheries programmes?

Now, I know that the Newfoundland Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has gone up today, I think, to meet with the hon. Donald Mazankowski, the federal Transport Minister, and just in case the Newfoundland minister acts the same way as the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands and is afraid to put the federal Transportation Minister on the spot, I sent a telegram or a telex, I am not sure which, whichever is the cheapest, Mr. Chairman, off to the federal minister today asking the minister

MR. WARREN:

Read it to them.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, I think we should read it: 'To the hon. Donald Mazankowski: We wish to protest planned cutbacks by CN Marine at their terminal at Port aux Basques, Newfoundland. We also wish to object to other layoffs and cutbacks planned by CN Marine in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador that are designed to help implement recent Michael Wilson policy statement on the economy. Instead of cutting these services and laying off Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, we urge you to

improve all CN Marine services in this Province. We believe that the Gulf ferry service is an extension of the Trans-Canada Highway system and should be treated as such, with upgrading instead of downgrading.'

Now, I felt we had to do that and send that telegram just in case the Newfoundland Transportation Minister (Mr. Dawe) took the same approach as the Newfoundland Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) and did not want to ruffle the feelings or the feathers of his counterpart in Ottawa and not put him on the spot. I say shame to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands opposite, shame! It is the responsibility, it is the job of the Newfoundland Minister of Forest Resources and Lands to put the federal minister on the spot. It is the responsibility of the minister opposite to put his federal counterpart on the spot and ask him why he is not living up to his federal election promise, or why Mr. Mulroney is not living up his promise.

MR. SIMMS:

The press has left. There is nobody listening.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, the people of this Province are listening. They have eyes and they have ears, they are listening, they are looking, and they are watching the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands. And I have to say that as a result of that statement, perhaps combined with the trips that the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) has been taking to lobby support, I have to say that the recent poll taken during the Liberal caucus would indicate that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands has

slipped a little behind and that the Minister of Development might have the edge right now in the leadership race that is shaping up in the party opposite. I think that right now we would have to say that the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) is the front runner and the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) has slipped badly in his campaign.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had not intended to engage in this debate right at this particular point in time, but the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), as he somehow is capable of doing, managed to get my dander up. He made certain allegations, of course, that are inaccurate. They are totally inaccurate.

MR. BARRY:

But they were in the paper.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) believes everything he reads in the paper, that I do not doubt.

MR. NEARY:

Well, you did not deny it.

MR. SIMMS:

I am about to deny it now, if the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will give me the opportunity. I mean, he somehow

twisted it all around. The Leader of the Opposition twisted everything. He took one little quote totally out of context.

First of all, I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition that I did, indeed, go to Ottawa and did, indeed, meet with Mr. Merithew on two occasions, by the way, not one occasion, and that is something that we are very much not used to. With the other regime in Ottawa you could not get a meeting in Ottawa let alone two meetings within a matter of three weeks. And I did put the question to him about why they deferred their decision with respect to the Forestry Centre. But I did not say that I did not ask him to change his mind. The question was, after Mr. Wilson's statement on Thursday was, I going up Friday to get him to change his mind and I said, no, that was not my intention, because the matter had been deferred, I was going to Ottawa to try to get them to speed up their decision with respect to a deferral in the hope that we would get a response more quickly than has been anticipated, maybe. What I said was, 'Following my discussions with Mr. Merithew, I had the impression that it was going to be quite some time yet before they might be in a position to make a positive decision with respect to the Forestry Centre.'

But, indeed, I did meet with Merithew in Ottawa and presented to him a number of issues with respect to our government's position. The federal Forestry Centre, of course, was only one, but more important issues had to do with seeking an amendment to the current forestry subsidiary agreement which was about to expire in March. Had it expired in March we would have lost about a

\$6 million expenditure. As a result of the meetings that we held on the first occasion, when I went back three weeks later, I am pleased to say, he responded very quickly to our request for an amendment to that particular agreement and we signed that amendment the second time that I was up there.

MR. BARRY:

When is the Forestry Centre moving?

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) obviously was not listening to what I said.

MR. BARRY:

I could not understand it.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, it was fairly straightforward. I did answer it, straightforwardly and clearly. The impression I got from speaking to Mr. Merithew was that it would be some time before they are in a position to make a decision. They made the decision to defer because of the financial situation they found themselves in, and the federal -

MR. NEARY:

They did not defer the two in New Brunswick.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, but the one in New Brunswick was one of those projects that was already underway, the steel was there on the ground.

MR. NEARY:

Oh, no, it was not.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, yes, it was. And it was a cost-shared project between all the three Maritime Provinces and it was a building to house not

only forestry activities but other government activities. The Council of Maritime Premiers, in fact, were involved in that particular project. But there were three categories of projects, Mr. Chairman, that the federal government reviewed when Mr. Wilson prepared his statement: One, projects which had already gotten underway or had legal, binding cost-shared agreements involved with them, were given the go-ahead. The one in New Brunswick was one of the ones in that category. Then there was a category of total cancellation of which there were many, by the way, dozens, in fact, that were absolutely cancelled. Then there were a number of projects in a category that they put on deferral, or on hold, in which the project here in Newfoundland was included. So I indicated that hopefully there is still some room for optimism with respect to that particular decision because it has not been cancelled as other projects have been. But as I was saying, Mr. Chairman, before I was so rudely interrupted by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) again, other matters of great importance were discussed with the federal minister, I had a three hour meeting with him the second time I met with him, one of them being a new federal forestry subsidiary agreement to allow us to carry on the things that we have been attempting to do in the last decade. Because prior to the year 1974 there really was not much done in the way of forestry improvements.

MR. NEARY:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas):

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the

member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, the minister is making such a beautiful and magnificent speech I am sure his colleagues should be in the House to hear it. Therefore, I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention there is no quorum. Obviously his colleagues do not want to hear what the hon. gentleman has to say.

QUORUM CALL

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

Is it agreed that the hon. minister may continue?

MR. NEARY:

Yes, boy, let him go ahead. He is finished anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Chairman, I am just about to clue up my remarks, but in view of the fact that I was interrupted I suppose I should repeat some of the matters that I discussed with the federal Forestry Minister, Mr. Merithew. First of all, I complimented him and the federal government for taking the initiative that they have in putting some emphasis on forestry. And I think that is generally accepted all across the country, by the way, by all governments, Tory or otherwise. I think it is a significant step forward. They are in a position themselves now of only being in place for the last month or so, so they are feeling their way around to try to find ways and means of implementing a reasonable level of

service and to provide for as much assistance as they can to governments and industry involved in the forestry.

There are a lot of other issues related to forestry that I discussed with him, the federal forestry subsidiary agreement being one of the major ones. I am happy to say that we both agreed to initiate negotiations and discussions immediately by establishing negotiating teams on both sides in the hope of perhaps being able to finalize the new agreement by the end of March. We touched on the Bowater situation in Corner Brook and the Kruger involvement there. I gave him an update and a briefing on what has transpired thus far and what is transpiring now, and indicated to him that our objective, hopefully, is to have the situation concluded by late November or the early part of December. Things are progressing on schedule, but, obviously, when you get lawyers and accountants and all those sorts involved there are a lot of details to be worked out.

The other matters related to job creation, Mr. Chairman, specifically as it applies to the direction that the federal government could place funding under their new job creation programme that Mr. Wilson also announced in his statement, and we tried to encourage him to have a look at the possibility of directing some funds toward silviculture programmes as it relates to the forestry for two major reasons, one being that obviously silviculture programmes mean that there will be a future for the forestry in this Province but, secondly, and even perhaps just as importantly, is that by directing funds into silviculture

programmes as job creation programmes they are considerably different than the old make-work projects which would be of a ten or twelve week duration. Silviculture programmes are, in fact, permanent jobs of a seasonal nature, because those projects last for four month periods on some occasions. So we made a considerable amount of progress in that regard and put in a fair degree of representation to have him consider that. I am happy to say that the Premier is also going to be discussing that sort of attitude with the Prime Minister.

I see the hon. the member for LaPoile is anxiously awaiting his opportunity to get to his feet so, therefore, I will let him have that opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman, the former Speaker should observe the rules of the House and when his time is up, sit down and do not continue to make a fool of himself like he has been doing for the last minutes.

Just to show you the mentality of that individual, Mr. Chairman, do you know what he is doing now? You would expect, when a minister is promoted or is appointed to some board or some committee, the head of the administration, the Premier, to make the announcement. But we have a new policy now, a new procedure. The minister himself makes the announcement about his own appointment. He put out a news release the other day through Newfoundland Information Services - again, we were not allowed to do this sort of thing - and listen now, he is talking

about himself, this comes from his office. "Len Simms has taken on some new responsibilities, including appointment to the Treasury Board, with his move to the Forest Resources and Lands portfolio. Mr. Simms became a member of Treasury Board November 1. Mr. Simms said that he has spent two and one half years on the Cabinet Social Policy Committee and will always have a ear for matters of social concern." Promoting himself again, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) should pay attention to that. This is a new technique now. If the Premier does not recognize your promotion, put out your own release, patting yourself on the back, announcing your own appointment. Is it any wonder, Mr. Chairman, that the press refer to these machines in their news rooms as the manure spreaders?

Now, Mr. Chairman, the other day in this hon. House I mentioned that the equalization payments to the provinces were under review. And the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) kept shouting across the House and saying, 'No, they are not under review, they are entrenched in the constitution.' Now I knew I had read it in *A New Direction for Canada*, but my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), kind of threw me off by saying 'transfer of payments', 'established programme funding'. I said, 'No', if you remember, 'the equalization payments will be under review.' Well, I went home on the weekend and I read Mr. Wilson's statement.

Mr Chairman, the hon. Minister of Finance probably has not even taken the trouble to read this statement, and it is so important. "The Fiscal

Equalization Programme provides essential help to the lower income provinces to make it possible for them, along with their local governments, to provide reasonably comparable levels of public service. The Fiscal Equalization Programme expires at the end of March, 1987 and will be reviewed in consultation with the provinces." Now, the Hon. Minister of Finance contradicted me the other day when I said that that was going to happen. The fact of the matter is that the established programme funding for health care and for education may change next year. And, Mr. Chairman, the Medicare payments may change next year, transfer payments may change next year. But the fact of the matter is that the equalization payments to the provinces, that programme will expire in 1987 and is up for review. Nothing is sacred any more. And the hon. gentleman can sit there with a smirk on his face and say it is entrenched in the constitution. All that is entrenched in the constitution is that the federal government has to pay equalization payments to the provinces but they do not say what formula they have to use or how much they have to be. That is subject for review.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my colleague, when he was on his feet, made some very valid points about the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) going up and licking the boot straps of his counterpart up in Ottawa, saying, 'Me too. Please, Sir, three bags full, Sir.' He did not want to offend him. Now, Mr. Chairman, my colleague did not have time to go on and talk about all the other things that they have been silent on in the last couple of months since their pals got elected up in Ottawa. Mr. Chairman, how often

in the past four years have we heard in this Province the Premier, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) demanding this from Ottawa, demanding that from Ottawa? Demanding a corridor, demanding the Government of Canada, not ask, but demanding that the Government of Canada force the province of Quebec to give us a power corridor across that province. Demanding that the Government of Canada, the Liberals, demand that Quebec reopen the Upper Churchill Falls contract. Now, Mr. Chairman, how often have we heard these two issues raised? How often have we heard these demands on Ottawa? How often have we heard the administration there opposite demand control of the fishery? How often did we hear them demand improved Air/Sea Rescue capabilities in this Province and how often did we hear them demand a full military base for this Province and how often did we hear them demand control and ownership of the offshore? Now all of a sudden, Mr. Chairman, they have become silent on these matters. Why are they silent now, Mr. Chairman? When we hear the Ontario philosophy being imposed on Newfoundland and on Atlantic Canada, why are they not as vocal as they used to be? Why are they not as vociferous as they used to be, Mr. Chairman? Why when we hear this divisive technique that is being used now by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Mulroney to divide Canada, to separate the Atlantic Provinces from Ontario, the Ontario philosophy, why are they not vocal about it, Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with them? Where are the traitors now to Newfoundland? Where are those now who betrayed Newfoundland? Mr. Chairman, we have a situation down in Ramea

where three young boys went out in a boat and for all practical purposes are lost. Have we heard, as we used to hear from the administration demands to improve the Air/Sea Rescue facilities in this Province? When did we hear it last? We have not heard it since September 4, 1984, Mr. Chairman, and I doubt if we will ever hear it again. Mr. Mulroney now wants blood and they are prepared to put our heads on the chopping block and let him take all he wants. There is not a peep out of them over there now. It is sickening to me, Mr. Chairman, to see what is happening. If the Liberals had done what the Tories did last week or ten days ago in that financial statement, you would have had a provincial election in this Province now. Would they not declare a day of mourning, Mr. Chairman? They have declared days of mourning for less. They probably would have declared a week of mourning if the Liberals had done what the Tories did ten days ago in Ottawa and there is not a peep over there. The backbenchers over there run along like little sheep behind their leaders and say, 'Me too.' Mr. Chairman, it is shameful. The whole of Atlantic Canada, especially Newfoundland and Labrador, are concerned about their future and we do not hear a sound from hon. gentlemen there opposite. The evidence of it is in the Wednesday Order Paper. When you look at the Order Paper for Wednesdays every resolution on the Order Paper from gentlemen there opposite is a condemnation of Ottawa for something or other. I am hoping we will get to some of these resolutions just to see how they weasel and worm their way out of it, Mr. Chairman. Their whole strategy was just partisan politics, political game playing,

that is all it was, and the people know that. The people of this Province see it now as if you put it up on a screen it is so obvious. The hon. the gentleman for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) used to be so vocal in demanding this of Ottawa and demanding that of Ottawa. Where are his demands now? Mr. Chairman, where are their demands now? Why are they not out screaming and hollering at Mr. Mulroney to force Quebec to reopen the Upper Churchill Falls contract?

MR. MARSHALL:
It will come.

MR. NEARY:
It will come? It will come after the next election, Mr. Chairman. They are hoping to keep the lid on. They will not even give us the environmental impact study which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) tabled some information on today, and we know why. You know, Mr. Chairman, one thing, Newfoundlanders will not forget the suffering and pain that is being imposed on them as a result of their partisan politics and now they are running for cover, now they are just licking the boot straps of their pals up in Ottawa, and we are going to be crucified; Newfoundland is going to be raped socially and economically by that crowd up in Ontario and Quebec and they are sitting over there like dummies.

MR. BAIRD:
You lay back and enjoyed it for twenty-three years.

MR. NEARY:
Mr. Chairman, they are not opening their mouths. Now is the time to call an election. Let us get out and fight it out. Now nothing is sacred, including the equalization

payments to this Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Chairman, I am going to have a very few words on the supply bill, especially, Mr. Chairman, after attending an hour's session this morning with representatives of the women in this Province on the eleventh floor, Mr. Chairman, and knowing their concerns has been illustrated time and time again to this government, but very, very little action has been taken. And, Mr. Chairman, I believe, as I said in Question Period today, that some of those concerns will cost this government very, very little money. My hon. colleague from the Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) spent the last eight or ten days going through his district finding out the concerns that people have outside of the Overpass. Do you know what their major concern is? Their major concern is how fast can the Premier call an election so they can get rid of this crowd in power. That is the major concern outside of the Overpass. They are anxiously waiting for the Premier of this Province to call an election and get rid of this crowd that is putting this Province right down into the ditches. You know, Mr. Chairman, it is amazing. With all due respect to that hon. crowd over there, we now have three ministers responsible for education, three ministers, we have a Kindergarten minister, we have a career minister, and we have a minister who looks after careers. So, Mr. Chairman, this government has to be doing something wrong. Education is vital in this

Province, and the former Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) was unable to cope with the problems confronting students and parents and teachers. So the Premier decided to chop up the Education Department on the theory that if one woman cannot do it, perhaps one lady and two men can do it. So that is what they did to the Department of Education. Now that is the kind of mess, the kind of turmoil that the education system is in in this Province.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, all we have to do is look at the report on the drop out ratio in this Province. Mr. Chairman, it was only about eleven o'clock this morning it arrived on my desk, and I can tell the hon. kindergarten minister that that report is devastating, to say the least, on the attitude that this government is taking toward education in this Province. On this side of the House we have said time and time again that the former minister's ego got the better of her because the Premier let her institute Grade XII. She brought Grade XII into this Province when the Province was not ready for it and that is the whole problem, Mr. Chairman. The Province was not ready for Grade XII. All you have to do is look at the statistics from Memorial University on the number of students who fail to pass their mathematics examinations, and it goes to show there is too broad gap now between Grade XII and university. And who suffers? It is not our kindergarten minister who suffers, but the students who go from Grade XII into university with big expectations to go forward in the education field but, unfortunately, over half of them fail to get the required mark in mathematics to continue. Mr.

Chairman, that is just one problem we have in the field of education.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Why not let Fenwick ask questions?

MR. WARREN:

I have not troubled to ask a question in the last few days in the Question Period because I do not want to see a member of the House cry, and by the way the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is acting, I expect him to cry because he cannot get to ask a question. I would not want to embarrass him too much, Mr. Chairman, but I am sure all members would like to see the latest news release from the NDP which he has circulated to the media and has just come to my desk. In it he cries all over again, saying that he has not got a chance because the Liberals will not let him ask any questions. So he is going to the media and get his questions out.

Page 2 of his release contains 'Questions the Liberals would not let me ask in the House today.' Mr. Chairman, I suppose we have to give the hon. member who just came in a fair chance, and probably one of these days we will have a caucus meeting and decide to give him the whole Question Period. I assure the hon. House that the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) never as much as asked us could he ask this question. We have already told him to come and consult with us and we will see what we can do to accommodate him. I have been in this House since 1979 and I cannot recall a single time when a ruling of a Speaker or Chairman has been challenged, but within the past five or six days the member for Menihek has twice challenged the way Mr. Speaker handled Question

Period. I leave it up to the Speaker. If he wants to recognize me he can, but it is entirely up to the Speaker.

Mr. Chairman, I did not have a chance to raise this in Question Period, but the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) came back from Labrador last Wednesday or Thursday, and the next day I heard on Here and Now and through the different news media that the Minister of Social Services had said that there will not be a second chronic care facility in Labrador. Now either the minister was completely out to lunch when he visited Labrador, or maybe he went to Biafra or somewhere other than Labrador, because as far as I know there is no chronic care facility up there in the first place. What he is trying to say is the senior citizen's home is a chronic care facility. The senior citizen's home is run by a board of directors for the purpose of giving the best care possible to senior citizens, but because of the difficulty in dealing with this government, they are obliged to take in chronic care patients. I think there are something like forty-five senior citizens now on the waiting list to get into that home, but they cannot get in because the home is obliged to look after chronic care cases. Is this the way this government and the Premier show they care about the individual? I think it was on Thursday or Friday the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) said that now he was elected to the House we are going to hear about the concerns of the ordinary people. Speaking for myself I wish to advise the hon. member that those are the people that I have been speaking on behalf of, the ordinary people, since 1979.

The Liberal Opposition is certainly concerned about the ordinary people in this Province and that is more than I can say for the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) or this government.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is about time for somebody on this side to rise, since we have already been treated to speeches from two members of the official Opposition. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on what the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said as I came into the House but first of all, perhaps I should deal with the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). The hon. gentlemen there opposite seem to be absolutely obsessed with the fact that the member for Menihek is going to outshine them in this House. Now, Mr. Chairman, from the very brief time that the hon. member for Menihek has been in this House I can state from objective observations, because I am not a proponent of either side, they are all out of the same bag as far as I am concerned, but I would say, Mr. Chairman, anyone who has been in this House would agree wholeheartedly that the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is outshining every member of the official Opposition. The hon. gentlemen there opposite seem to be absolutely obsessed with the fact. We have a concerted effort by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) to get the former Leader of the Opposition, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) up attacking the member for Menihek

every time he gets up, getting up on a point of order to try to sit him down. You get the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) spending half of his speech on supplementary supply on what the member for Menihek was saying. They seem to be, with good reason, Mr. Chairman, absolutely obsessed with the fact that they are being swallowed up. Now in Ottawa the Liberals are concerned because thirty members of the NDP might take over the official opposition. And here the Liberals are so weak, Mr. Chairman, they are afraid that their miniscule seven- I do not count the Leader of the Opposition who is only a pretend Liberal anyway; he is an unelected Liberal and the only member who sits in this House without an endorsement from his constituency; he was elected as a PC, and he is now not only a Liberal but the leader of the Liberal Opposition - so will be swallowed up by the hon. member for Menihek, and their every act shows that they are obsessed with it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me get to the burden of the remarks of the member for LaPoile.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It was very burdensome.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is a very burdensome speech every time the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) gets up in this House to speak. And we hear him talking from time to time about why does this government do this with respect to Ottawa? He refers to us as being handmaidens of Ottawa. And, Mr. Chairman, all he is doing, because they have not got an original thought in their heads, the reason why he uses that expression is because we accused

them, as they were, of being handmaidens of Ottawa when they were leading this Province to its economic, social and cultural destruction over the past few years. Mr. Chairman, we do not mind being handmaidens to anybody once they treat us fairly and once they realize that Newfoundland is a part of Confederation, and once they give us a part in Confederation as the present administration is doing. I do not mind being a handmaiden of anybody who is going to act that way in a very forthcoming fashion. We had tried with the previous administration, week after week and day after day, the sweat pouring off our brow, to try to save the city of Corner Brook and the West Coast of this Province with respect to the Corner Brook mill. The government then in Ottawa were just turning a deaf ear to us, saying 'Oh, no, Newfoundland has already got all the money it can get. The \$7 million extra for the modernization of the pulp mill of Bowater is not going to be forthcoming. You have all you want and maybe you will get less than we said you were going to get. And what happened when there was a change of government, Mr. Chairman? Speedily, within a matter of two or three weeks, nothing to it, we got the extra \$7 million to keep Kruger happy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

We got the modernization. So, Mr. Chairman, I do not mind being a handmaiden of anybody or a partner with anybody when they are approaching us in this sensitive matter.

And what about the fishery? We

attempted, month after month, week after week, and day after day, to get Fishery Products International operational. We made proposals for a chief executive officer of Fishery Products International because any group, any company, cannot operate without a chief executive officer. What did we get? They rejected each and every proposal, despite the fact that some of the people put to them were eminent people, very successful business people. But no, the federal government of the day would not accept it. But consequently, within a short period of time, we have seen what has happened. There is a chief executive officer in place, there is a taking charge of the situation and appointing new directors to Fishery Products, people who are very respected in Canada, who can contribute greatly to the fisheries in this Province and the operation of Fishery Products International. We get a pledge that what we are going to try is to bring in capital to privatize the industry, to get it on a sound basis and on a sound footing. No, Mr. Chairman, I do not mind being handmaidens of anyone who operates in that effective manner.

Neither, Mr. Chairman, do I object or am I going to make any excuses to anyone for operating in partnership with a group of people in Ottawa who have enough sensitivity to realize what this Province is attempting to do in the offshore with respect to an offshore agreement, where very, very speedily when it got into government, for that matter even before it got into government, it entered into an agreement which gives us justice and equity on the offshore, which gives us the right to establish and collect revenues

from the offshore as if they were located on land, which gives us the right, Mr. Chairman, for joint management board with three and three and an independent chairman, who say to the people of this Province, "You are going to have the ultimate decision in the mode of production or the development plan." I do not mind being such a handmaiden. Mr. Chairman, I wonder why the hon. gentlemen there opposite were handmaidens of the people who were denying the people of the Province of Newfoundland their legitimate aspirations in that end and I can only remind the House that in place of having the right to establish and collect revenues as if they were located on land, what the people they were supporting were prepared to do was to say to us that, "You will get a certain amount of the revenues out there, but only insofar and for so long as you replace those revenues from that resource you brought into Confederation for the welfare payments and then we are going to take them all."

Mr. Chairman, also I would remind the hon. gentlemen there opposite that they were supporting a regime where the total management was to be in the hands of the federal government. So let us not talk about handmaidens of Ottawa. I will be a handmaiden of the Government in Ottawa, certainly, if they continue, as I know they will, to respond sensitively to the needs of this Province. At the same time, when the hon. gentlemen opposite are emitting their unoriginal expressions that they borrowed from the just accusations that were hurled at them when the other government was in, they should bear in mind and they should explain their previous position.

Today, for instance, I got a letter that shows how unaware they are from the unelected Liberal, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), the jealous Tory, the gentleman who sits on the other side of the House without a mandate from his own constituency - he was elected as a Progressive Conservative and he sits over there as Leader of the Opposition - making requests under the Freedom of Information Act. He says, "The information I request under the Act is the latest draft of the Mobil Oil environment impact statement given by the government to Mobil Oil."

Now I have not read the terms of the Freedom of Information Act, but I know one can only request information that somebody has. I mean, that is logical and I suppose that our legislation, if anything, it is certainly logical, or it certainly should be logical. So, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is we do not have the information the hon. gentleman is requesting. We have not got it and we have not got it for a very good reason. Because we have requested, Mr. Chairman, and the federal government has agreed that it be deferred.

MR. NEARY:

It has been widely distributed.

MR. MARSHALL:

We have asked that it be deferred in the interest of the people of this Province so that we can have a chance to look at it, so that we can see under this new arrangement that the ultimate number of job opportunities are going to be provided for young Newfoundlanders. So what does the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) do? The only thing he has to hang on to is despair, is gloom

and doom. He hopes that there will not be too many jobs for Newfoundlanders. Just like, Mr. Chairman, he hoped there would be no agreement. Just like, Mr. Chairman, when he went across this House, it was because he said, there could not be an agreement unless 'I, the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), am the only one who makes the decision with respect to it and do it all myself. This is the only agreement that will be acceptable to me.' Mr. Chairman, that is what he said. But we have an agreement now. And the name of the game now for the hon. gentleman is he hopes to be elected on the back of despair. If he succeeds, Mr. Chairman, his basis of success is going to be on a depression in this Province and there not being the jobs that are going to be provided as the result of the efforts of this particular government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say, as I had occasion to say to the hon. gentlemen on the media this morning, I want to tell them this, we fought long and hard for this right and we have secured that right. And if anybody wants any proof of the right that we have secured, all one has to do is look at the postponement of the filing of the environmental impact statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

And we have done that for one purpose and one purpose only, Mr. Chairman, and that is to secure the optimum number of jobs for the people of this Province from the development of Hibernia. After all, that was what the fight that we fought for the people of

Newfoundland was all about, and we will continue to do so. Now we happen to be fighting in a different milieu where we are getting co-operation and we are very grateful for that co-operation. I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), it is as clear as the nose on his face - the only trouble is you cannot see the nose on his face - but it is clear as the nose that other people can see on his face, Mr. Chairman, why the environmental impact statement was delayed. He should know it as former Minister of Energy. He knew it before he deserted and scurried across the House because really in effect he was afraid he could not bring about what this administration fought about and he would be condemned. He is due to be condemned right now. I say to the hon. gentleman, as a former Minister of Energy he knows why the environmental impact statement was postponed. Its postponement was positive for this Province. It was an exercise of the rights that we had gained and we are exercising those rights right now. If the hon. Leader continues on in this way all he does is give credence to the statement that the greatest enemy to Newfoundlanders and Newfoundlanders themselves. I say to the hon. gentleman he will not get elected on the doom and gloom and despair that he hopes will be realized in Newfoundland from the development of Hibernia. There will be good jobs in Hibernia and they will be enjoyed by the younger people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order please!

The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, listening to the hon. gentleman there is the saddest and most pathetic thing I have ever heard in this House. The hon. gentleman is now doing a complete reversal, Mr. Chairman, and he is right on the defensive. I was trying to think, while the hon. gentleman was talking there, of how I should describe hon. gentlemen there opposite now. You know what they remind me of, Mr. Chairman? They remind me of wolves who fight when they are mating. They fight, and the loser offers his throat in submission to the victor. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is what this crowd remind me of today. They are offering the throats of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to Ottawa just like a pack of wolves that are mating and fighting, Mr. Chairman, and it is sad, it is pathetic. The Government of Canada, the new Tory government has come out with a policy, an Ontario philosophy, that could mean the ruination of Newfoundland and the hon. gentleman stands over there with a face like a robber's horse and says, 'I am pleased and I am proud to be the handmaiden, the lackey of Ottawa. I am pleased to be the handmaiden of an administration that is going to rip apart the unemployment insurance programme, that is going to do away with the universality of social welfare programmes, that is going to allow medicare to charge user fees to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.' The hon. gentleman says he is as pleased as punch that CN Marine is going to be torn apart and that a separate corporation is going to be set up that has to pay its own way. He is as pleased as punch. The hon. gentleman is proud to be the handmaiden of an administration that is likely to see major

layoffs in TerraTransport and the abolition of the Newfoundland railway. The hon. minister is elated to be the handmaiden of an administration up in Ottawa that is giving control of the Newfoundland fishery to Bay Street, Mr. Chairman. Delighted, absolutely charmed to give away the fishery, to give control of the fishery to Seagrams so that they can go out after they have managed to get their few dollars out of the government to get Fishery Products International moving again, the strike settled, they will unload it to North Sea or to Seagrams. Paul Desmarais is not going to preside over a little measly Crown corporation. That is not his style. The fact of the matter is that they are going to unload it as quickly as they can.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You know nothing about Paul Desmarais' experience.

MR. NEARY:

I certainly do know about Paul Desmarais and I can tell you that Paul Desmarais is not going to preside over a little measly Crown corporation in Newfoundland for very long. You will see foreign capital being brought in. They probably have it now, because the door was open about a month ago, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The more the merrier.

MR. NEARY:

The more the merrier. Sure, allow them to come in through the back door, the foreigners, and we will see in a short while who will have control of the fishery. Mr. Chairman, the Premier and the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) are delighted and charmed over this, it is just

wonderful, Mr. Chairman. Cut back RRAP, cut back social housing in Newfoundland, rip unemployment insurance apart, Mr. Chairman, and he is charmed and delighted. Well, one of the first things they did when they took over in this Province was to do away with the mother's allowance, then the next thing they did, I believe, was close down the steel mill. Now they are out doing a feasibility study to see if we need a steel mill in Newfoundland, after they closed down one at the Octagon. Then they changed the dental care programme for children, then they attacked the students, made the student aid more difficult to get and reduced it. Mr. Chairman, they are eroding, they are chipping away at it. We brought in free education in this Province.

DR. COLLINS:

To the university?

MR. NEARY:

Yes. Brought it in free to everybody.

DR. COLLINS:

You must admit that was so crazy you had to take it away again.

MR. NEARY:

I see, it was crazy.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I was there at the university the day it was announced and I laughed at it.

MR. NEARY:

And now they are going to review the transfer payments to the Province and the established programme funding. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the Premier a question, man-fashion, point blank. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is now not concerned about changes in the established programme

funding, he is not concerned about changing transfer payments -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The agreement runs out in 1987.

MR. NEARY:

No, that is equalization.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, it is the whole works.

MR. NEARY:

No, no, no, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman obviously has not read A New Direction For Canada. 'The federal government also makes a substantial contribution toward provincial expenditures for health and post secondary education. This contribution takes the form of an equal per capita transfer to all provinces which increases each year in line with the growth of the economy. The amounts transferred to the provinces are in recognition of the broad and continuing national interests in these important fields.' And then they go on and say that all these things are going to be reviewed. But the agreement on equalization, that I was told the other day by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is entrenched in our Constitution, does not expire until March 1987 and will be reviewed at that time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, how can the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) stand over there with a straight face after the information that we were given today about employment projections offshore when we start producing oil?

Look, I have to read something from a letter that Mobil circulated to participants at a luncheon that they had recently,

August 7. "Of special note," they say, "is the fact that 16 per cent, 37,800 of all respondents to a survey that they conducted, and 21 per cent, 49,500 of the respondents in the impact areas expect to be personally employed by Hibernia. 49,500 Newfoundlanders in response to a survey carried out by Mobil Canada said they expected to get a job. Now we are told that only about 1,500 to 2,000 will find employment. The hopes and expectations of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians was built up by the Premier -

MR. ANDREWS:

Doom and gloom.

MR. NEARY:

No, it is not doom and gloom. Mr. Chairman, we are strong advocates on this side of the House of squeezing every job that we can out of the offshore. But I am afraid that the Premier has been misled by somebody. And, Mr. Chairman, that is why, and I said it the other day in the House, and I repeat what I said, they did not want the environmental impact study released. I mean, what difference is it going to make? If we all stick together and say, "No, you are not developing that with semi-submersible platforms," we might win the battle, but hiding the impact environmental study is not going to do any harm now, is it?

MR. SIMMS:

Using that logic what is the good of releasing it?

MR. NEARY:

The people want to see it, Mr. Chairman. They want to hide it for political purposes. They want to hide it until they get the election over. They want to try

to make it an issue in the election. It is not going to work anymore.

DR. COLLINS:

That is what you say.

MR. NEARY:

There is going to be an election next Spring. We would have had it this Fall only when the Premier got the polls and he saw that his own personal popularity, his own image was down, was battered and bruised, and that the Liberals would win a substantial number of seats, he got kind of worried and did not call it. But we will have it as soon as he can get an agreement on the offshore and get a few things on the ground, bang, we are into an election.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We can go now.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, let us have it now with the nonsense that just came out of Ottawa that is going to be devastating to Newfoundland.

MR. SIMMS:

The NDP will become the official opposition.

MR. NEARY:

The Ontario philosophy is going to be a disaster for Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman. It is going to be devious like we have never seen division in Canada before, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to say very much in this debate, but

after listening to some of the members of the Opposition I just want to say to the members of the Opposition the following, please keep on your present course as it relates to the delay of the environmental impact statement, please keep on your present course that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) just articulated for his side of the House and for his Party, we encourage this kind of point of view as it relates to it.

I remember, Mr. Chairman, back a number of years ago when I was Minister of Energy and the hon. member for LaPoile was attacking me and through me the administration of the day for driving away the oil rigs because we were taking a cautious and measured approach to it. I was accused of driving away at that time foreign investment that now suddenly I think the member for LaPoile does not like anymore. I was driving the rigs away. I have the copies down there in my files of the time that the member for LaPoile talked about the rigs we were driving away, because we wanted to strike the proper bargain out there with the federal government, and all we were doing was driving away the rigs. And the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the Liberal Opposition lost on that score, they lost badly at the polls as well as in this hon. House and in the court of public opinion. Secondly, then, they lost as they agreed to support their confreres in Ottawa as it related to the offshore agreement. And that, somehow, we were the bad guys, we were the confrontationists, we were the separatists, Mr. Chairman, we were everything that was bad because we were holding out again and taking a cautious and measured approach. Once again the Liberal Opposition

lost and they lost badly in the court of public opinion, in the ballot box, before almost everybody in Newfoundland when the facts became known. And now they are taking the approach, again, that because we have delayed the environmental impact statement which involves the development plan, because we wish to maximize the amount of employment opportunities for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, once again they have, Mr. Chairman, a death wish. The Liberal Party of Newfoundland, and the gentlemen opposite especially who represent that party, have a death wish. And we are delighted, Mr. Chairman, we are absolutely overjoyed with the position that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland has taken on this matter. And, I intend, Mr. Chairman, over the next few weeks, with a number of the ministers, to make Newfoundlanders aware of just exactly what the position of the Opposition is on this very important matter, what they are saying by opposing a delay to the environmental assessment plan is go ahead now, short-term jobs, forget about the future and the long-term jobs that we can get out of this for Newfoundland and Labrador, go ahead, it makes no difference. We want another Upper Churchill, we want another Long Harbour with the bad power contract. We want the same policies pursued in 1984, to 1994, to 2004, that were practices from 1950 to 1970. They have not changed one iota in their way. They only know the past, Mr. Chairman, and the mistakes that were made, and they continue to perpetrate them. Why does not the new Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), the disappointed Tory -

MR. SIMMS:

The current one.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The current one, yes, there has been so many over there- why do they not do some research, Mr. Chairman? The people of Newfoundland are demanding it. The political void in this Province that I have mentioned to the press on many, many occasions continues unabated. You are going to get wiped out as a political party if you are not careful and you are going to have the gentleman to your right, to my left - thank God he is to my left - and others are going to take your place. And I want to see political parties in the debate go. There has obviously been no research done on it. The new Leader of the Opposition must know, and the other hon. members, whether they were former Ministers of Energy or not, must know that when we are talking about anywhere from a \$2 billion or \$3 billion development to a \$8 billion development on one oil field, and you have a group talk about foreign investment, talk about being in bed with the companies, Mr. Chairman, this decision by the Government of Newfoundland, because of the letter between Mr. Mulroney and myself, which gives us more power, we were able to bring to bear our persuasive powers under that letter. And it just so happened that there was a sympathetic group in Ottawa who not only recognized the letter but saw the value of the advice that we were giving. We are not prepared, Mobil Corporation notwithstanding, Gulf Corporation not - withstanding, we are not prepared to simply gloss over something that has been prepared by the corporations and say that is the end of it. They have their experts, Mr. Chairman, and we will have our experts. And the same

kind of mentality we now see on the opposite side of the House predates even the other two events. When we were negotiating the offshore regulations, when in that year or I went to Calgary I do not know how many times, the oil companies graced us now and then with their presence in Newfoundland, negotiated hard with them, when I was supposed to be driving away the oil rigs, to get a set of oil and gas regulations which included in them some local preference, which included in them research and development and education and training. There are quite a few Newfoundlanders and Labradorians today who got their practical experience in Calgary and Houston and other places in the world who came back to Newfoundland as a result of those educational training provisions which we were not supposed to fight for, but just allow the rigs to come under some simplistic rules to govern the exploration of the offshore, and we said we would not do it. They are still in the same mode. They are still in the same mode. Anybody worth their salt today knows that it is in Newfoundland's best interests if we need to do those additional studies and get the best advice we can get, not only in Canada and in North America but in the world, to bring to bear upon this development. There is a big difference between a \$2 billion or \$3 billion development and an \$8 billion development. That is a big piece of business, and we have to be sure. And the same thing is going to happen. Keep it up, I say, Mr. Chairman, let the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the others speaking on behalf of that party keep it up, because in the same way as they were wrong three times before, next Spring

they will be wrong four times in a row, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It will be the fourth time that they will be wrong on this same policy, on this same industry, on this same development. They will be wrong again. Can you not learn after three times, Mr. Chairman, can you not learn to put Newfoundland and Labrador first and get away from your silly partisanship? There is wisdom in the crowd. People know the difference. They understand that on a massive development like this, who can doubt that today - how many are working offshore now, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) is there?

MR. DINN:

2,100.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

2,100 Newfoundlanders?

MR. DINN:

No, no, 1,800 Newfoundlanders.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

1,800 out of 2,100 people working offshore. Talk about an industry already. We seem to gloss over that every day. The media glosses over it. Everybody glosses over it. 1,800 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are working offshore right now. That is a pretty big industry. What other one industry now does that? What is the payroll? Forestry might with its two companies.

AN HON. MEMBERS:

The Iron Ore Company.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Used to, yes. But how many? Get

the payroll of those 1,800 and compare it with the payroll of any other industry in this Province today. Because every one of them are making \$25,000 to \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year. That would not have happened if the local preference provisions were not put in in our regulations in the beginning, for which we were condemned by the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

That is right, they opposed it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They opposed it, we were being bad Canadians. They even tried in some cases to link disasters offshore with our local preference policy. That is how far they went, that they hinted, implied, inferred that on the opposite side of the House.

I have a warning for the members of the Opposition. You were wrong three times on this issue and now you are on the wrong side again and next Spring you will have to eat crow for the fourth time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What a shame. I listened to your lecture, why can you not listen to mine?

MR. NEARY:

I cannot take it again.

MR. FENWICK:

Okay, we will give it to the rest of them then.

Mr. Chairman, I was listening across the corridor to some of the side comments there about how the Premier's popularity is up at 72 per cent, and that this augurs well for the election he has just told us will be called in the Spring. And I am hoping that he is using the same posters that he used up in Menihek. Before the election was called, according to the letter that the Premier published in The Aurora, which is the local paper up in Labrador West, he said that the PC candidate was ahead 65 per cent to our 15 per cent. And if that is the case then, and that pollster is still being used, I would suggest they very quickly look at the 72 per cent to see how accurate that might be.

The other thing I would like to say, and it is too bad the Premier still is not here to listen to it is that I am pleased he is upset, especially with the comment that obviously is attributable to myself and which I will repeat right now because I think it is worthwhile repeating, that he and his government are in bed with the large corporations that are essentially running this Province. I repeat it because I think it bears repeating. We are listing here to a whole debate about offshore oil and who are going to get the benefits from it. I maintain if you look at the record of this government over the last couple of years, if you look at the intentions of this government in terms of legislation that it will be advancing over the next couple of weeks, that you can see clearly a bias in favour of large corporation, the extractive corporations of our Province, and a bias against the average working people in the Province itself. I think that is important that

somebody in this Province - I know that the Tory who leads the group to my left right here is not particularly interested in speaking out for the average working people of the Province - and I think it is incumbent upon myself to speak for the average working people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Where have you been for the past twenty-five years?

MR. SIMMS:

He was in Ontario, boy.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes. I thought I would mention that. I was born in Ontario and I think I should bring it up because I think it is important that everybody in the House realizes that I was born in Ontario. My mother tells me, of course, that when I was two months old we left that particular town and moved to another province, but I thought I would mention that as well because it was brought up in the election. People felt that it was important that if you were born in Ontario that you somehow were not appropriate to belong to the Legislature here. I am not going to particularly point at it but I think I can recognize about a half a dozen of the speakers up there who were not born in Newfoundland and who seem to make a significant contribution to the Legislature including, I think, William Carson down there who I believe was born in Scotland. But I am going to leave that aside for now because there was a better answer for the whole thing. The fact of the matter, Mr. Chairman -

MR. MORGAN:

He is giving us a lecture.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes. I figure since I am getting them from your guys, I might as well give them back.

The fact of the matter is that I was born in Ontario but I chose to move to Newfoundland and Labrador. I chose that. That was a conscious decision on my part unlike, perhaps, most of the people here, although I believe the member from Exploits (Dr. Twomey), judging from the accent, probably was not born in Newfoundland as well but I do not hold that against him either.

The point I would like to make right here, if I can, is that the same question was brought up when I was talking to a high school class. One of the girls in the high school class asked me the same thing and I said there are those two facts in my life, neither of which I apologize for and neither of which I am ashamed of. I said because there are 50,000 to 100,000 people unemployed in this Province each year, you yourself may decide, because you want a job and think your employment prospects are better, to move to Ontario. When you are there and somebody asks you where you were born, I hope you will be reasonably proud to say that you were born in Newfoundland and Labrador and unfortunately you had to move somewhere else in order to get a job. So I just bring up this issue because it had been used before, especially by the former Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), who used it in a scurrilous campaign he waged against me in Terra Nova, which I remember from last year and whose style of politics has never raised

above the gutter and I do not think it every will.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:

I must say at this point I must congratulate him on his fishing techniques and wish him more success in the future.

MR. MORGAN:

Go talk to your buddy Cashin.

MR. FENWICK:

I got no problems with being a buddy of Cashin.

MR. MORGAN:

What is the difference between your views and his?

MR. FENWICK:

I am afraid one of the problems when you rattle a cage is that the orangutans inside continue to make noise, but we will see what we can do about it.

I would like to get back to the Kruger deal which the Premier is going to table tomorrow. I think it is finally about time that we have it and it is about time that we do have a look at it. But there is enough of it known that I think it is appropriate to make some comments now. First of all, what is the situation in Corner Brook where Kruger took over the mill? We had a mill there, the mill has been in use since about the 1920s under various ownership and so on and so forth. The mill now is quite frankly a basket case. The paper machines there are antiquated, they require almost twice as much labour as the mill, for example, in Stephenville in order to produce paper, and the quality of the paper they produce is inferior because it is

one-sided paper rather than two coated paper. The question you have to ask yourself is who is responsible for this sorry state of affairs? And it is quite logically Bowater's responsibility. They were given some of the best concessions in this Province, something like 50 per cent to 60 per cent of the best forest land in the Province and a huge chunk of a power resource that they continue to exploit at a very low rate. They made enormous profits over the decades and yet, despite all that, they did not invest the money required to modernize the machinery there so that they could continue to operate it on a long-term basis. And the reason for that is because of the negligence of the government on that side. If the government on that side had insisted on them investing properly, on modernizing their mill, on doing the silviculture they were supposed to, Bowater would still be there because there would be enough investment in there to maintain it. I am not arguing that we should have some sort of worker relationship, or some sort of a worker ownership in that particular mill because I think that is the only way it should be done, I am arguing that because what we have now done is we have taken a robber bandit by the name of Bowater, who have managed to run down the mill and scamper off to the American South in order to operate their mills now, and we have replaced them with another group who we hope will be better but we have no guarantees whatsoever other than the fact that they are willing to accept large chunks of government money in order to take over a mill. That is all we have been assured. And I argue with you that if it is

in their economic best interest five, ten or fifteen years down the road, they themselves will allow the machinery to deteriorate again and we will be back to square A. The suggestion that was ridiculed by some of the Cabinet minister opposite last time we were debating this was that a co-operative was not an appropriate way to operate it. Well, tell that to the people at the Tembec mill in Temiscaming who have been operating as a co-operative for the last dozen years and have been extremely successful at it, and have been putting the investment in it because it is their jobs that they are trying to keep up. I argue with you that it may be more difficult in the short-term to get that kind of a thing going and to get the marketing done for it, but in the long run we would at least have the priority straight. What we are interested in are long-term jobs and not the profits of Bowater, or Kruger or anybody else.

MR. SIMMS:

Kruger has a good record.

MR. FENWICK:

Kruger has a good record now, Eric Bowater had a good record twenty-five years ago, so do not go telling me that things cannot change because they do.

MR. SIMMS:

You cannot compare apples and oranges.

MR. FENWICK:

Well, I am comparing them because they are both interested in the bottom line, which is their own profits, which are not necessarily synonymous with the best interests of Corner Brook, Stephenville, or anywhere else in the country.

MR. SIMMS:

Are the workers interested?

MR. FENWICK:

What I am telling you is this: We are already going to be one of the big donators through the federal tax system in terms of the money that is going in there. To me we should have completed the process and made sure that the people of Corner Brook had the ownership and control of that mill so that in their long-term best interest they could continue to make it viable. And when I listen to the Premier, and I listen to the former Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) with the feeble efforts that they have put forward in terms of addressing this problem before, what I realize is that they are so committed to an antiquated system of owning things and of operating our economy that they cannot understand that the rules changed about twenty years ago. And unless you guys wake up and find out that these systems are not working well for a peripheral area like Newfoundland and Labrador -

MR. MORGAN:

What is your answer to it, nationalization and co-operatives?

MR. FENWICK:

My answer is that we have to have control here by the people who live here and depend on those industries. And I have a lot of confidence in Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that they can do that. I do not go and put my confidence in Mobil, I do not put my confidence in what is a Bay Street bunch and Fishery Products International, I do not put my confidence in Kruger, I do not put my confidence in any of these corporations. I put my confidence in Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who I believe are

capable of doing it given half the chance. And I do not believe in giving these industries away piecemeal or wholesale the way we have been doing it.

I should like to address one last thing before I sit down, and that is the local preference policy. The Premier does not recall that in the debate we had back in 1982 I was totally opposed to the local preference policy being enshrined in the Constitution the way it is. I still am, my party still is, because if you had the brains that you were born with you would have seen how dangerous a programme that is. There are presently 85,000 people working in the rest of Canada who were born in Newfoundland and Labrador and who have been forced to go there for work, and once you started messing with the mobility rights under the Constitution you threatened their jobs and that is the reason I opposed it.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
I thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am going to be somewhat brief on this. There are just a few matters that the hon. gentleman for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) referred to which, I think in my opinion at least, need some comment. With all due respect to the hon. gentleman, nobody in this House gives a damn where he was born or where anybody was born. We are all here, we are Newfoundland Canadians, we are members of the House of Assembly, some of us are

in Opposition, some of us are in government, some of us were born here, some of us were born there, some of us are of this faith, others are of another faith or of no faith, but we really do not care where any of us were born. That has never been an issue in this House that I am aware of, nor do I think it should be an issue. So it really does not make a darn bit of difference.

Briefly on two other matters, the only conclusion that I can draw from what the hon. gentleman was saying with respect to the Corner Brook situation is that it should be state ownership. I mean that is a consistent policy, that is a tenet, I suppose, of democratic socialism.

MR. FENWICK:
That is oversimplifying it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Oversimplifying it? The hon. gentleman did refer to a co-operative, but surely to heavens we are not going to have a multimillion dollar affair run as a co-operative. I do not think even the socialist countries do not do that. Really what it comes to is state ownership.

MR. FENWICK:
Look at the fishing industry in Iceland, which is totally co-operative.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
I am not sure where the hon. gentleman would find a great number of co-operative pulp and paper mills. I am not sure that there are very many co-operative pulp and paper mills, huge undertakings like that. I would suggest that the socialist policy would be state ownership, and I think one may as well call a spade

a spade. I mean, there are places where there is state ownership. They are democratic countries, they elect governments, they have oppositions, and it is recognizable position. Certainly my view, and I am pretty sure it is that of this government, is that we cannot afford the luxury of a doctrinaire or ideological approach, we cannot afford the luxury of socialist organization of our economy. We have to attract capital, we have to see when private investors are here they act in a responsible manner. And that is what governments are for, to regulate, to see that they are good corporate citizens, to make sure that matters with respect to the environment, matters with respect to fair pay, matters with respect to industrial health, that whole area, a valid, necessary area of public concern, is addressed by the public authority. But surely, as far as Newfoundland is concerned, we do not intend, I do not think, to accept the policy of state ownership and of socializing the entire industrial base of Newfoundland.

Certainly I think that it will be a long way off before the people of Newfoundland will be interested in a doctrinaire socialist approach to the problems of the economy. I think we have to be fairly pragmatic, not too ideological. But where private capital can achieve something, and where the public authority can put in the appropriate regulation and control to see that the public good is maintained, surely that has been the experience in most countries of the Western World as the best way for social and economic development for the people. So I think the hon. gentleman will have a lot of

arguing to do before he will convince many on this side at least that socialism is the answer in Newfoundland today.

And one other matter that I just wanted to mention and that is the hon. gentleman said he did not agree with local preference. He did not agree with the Newfoundland Government's policy of local preference. I am not sure if the hon. gentleman is fully aware of what our policy is. Our policy is that local preference would be operative until the rate of unemployment in Newfoundland is equal to the national average, and then it would not be a factor. That is what the policy is.

MR. SIMMS:

Right on. What is wrong with that?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Now all throughout Canada and throughout all of the Western World affirmative action is recognized for people. There are affirmative action programmes for women, there are affirmative action programmes for people of various ethnic backgrounds, there are affirmative action programmes for the handicapped, there are affirmative action programmes in many categories. And surely we are not going to refuse to recognize the validity of affirmative action for ourselves. Charity does begin a bit at home -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

- and this is not charity, this is fairness.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

So what are we going to do? Are we going to say to the rest of Canada, we have, and have had ever

since Confederation and continue to have the highest rate of unemployment throughout Canada, we have always had it, but we have no affirmative action for ourselves, we do not intend to give any local preference to Newfoundland even until we come up to the national average? We have not said until Newfoundland leaves Canada in its rate of employment. We have said until Newfoundland comes up to the national average. And surely a government which did not recognize a principle of local preference of that nature, a government which agrees to affirmative action for other disadvantaged groups and would not recognize that there was a certain economic disadvantage in being a resident of the Province with the highest rate of unemployment in Canada -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

- and to apply affirmative action to others, quite properly so, and to deny it to our fellow Newfoundlanders and Labradorians would, I think, be extremely unwise and indeed a total shirking of our responsibility and duty to the Newfoundland people.

So those three matters prompted me to reply; number one, on where the hon. gentleman or any hon. gentleman was born really I do not think anybody is interested in that. Number two, with respect to the principles of socialisms, certainly it is interesting to hear them espoused, one can say it brings a new perspective to the House of Assembly that I do not think we have ever had officially a socialist presentation or a socialist philosophy being put forward as the cornerstone for our economic development, and it is

interesting to hear. All I can say is that I think hon. members on this side will need a lot of convincing. And thirdly, with respect to affirmative, action local preference, surely I really do not see how a member of a legislature in Newfoundland, here to represent Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, who agrees with the principles of affirmative action for so many other people, and who as long as Newfoundland leads the rest of Canada in the rate of unemployment, will not recognize the validity of a local preference until our rate of employment comes to the national average, then I ask myself if such a person is doing their full rights in representing the interests of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I only have three or four minutes and I do not want to get involved in this philosophical discussion that is taking place. I want to get back to what the Premier said. The Premier announced this afternoon that there will be an election in the Spring. He announced that today. And he also told the House what the issue would be, at least what one of the issues will be. And then he had a few words of warning for the Opposition. Now, Mr. Chairman, what did the Premier try to do this afternoon in the House? He tried to stake out a position for the administration.

MR. TULK:

That will probably change tomorrow.

MR. NEARY:

That could change. But he tried to stake out a position and I can guarantee you, Mr. Chairman, that the position he tried to stake out he will not get away with it.

MR. SIMMS:

You have said that before.

MR. NEARY:

No, he will not get away with it. Because there will be information go out to the Newfoundland and Labrador people and it will go out from both sides of the House.

Mr. Chairman, he can try all he wants, as he tried to do again this afternoon playing his little partisan political game like he did with the fishery, like he did with the ownership question, Mr. Chairman, and he warned the Opposition just keep it up, keep it up, and four times you will be wrong. Well, we will see who is going to be right and who is going to be wrong.

MR. SIMMS:

We will find out tomorrow.

MR. NEARY:

We will find out tomorrow. I do not have time to get into it in great detail this afternoon, Mr. Chairman. But he will not be allowed to stake out his position that he is trying to stake out. Because we on this side of the House believe that every job possible should be squeezed out of the offshore. That has been our position.

MR. SIMMS:

You will not be running next time.

MR. NEARY:

Is that so? That is what the hon. gentleman thinks.

I will be back in LaPoile, you

need not worry. I will be back in LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am glad I got the Premier up on his feet. I was the one who provoked him, unusual as it is for me. You know, the Premier of late has become such an affable individual that you can almost get to like him. We have not seen him ranting and raving now for a couple of months. He is trying to create this new image. He is trying to get himself away from confrontation politics and being accused of being a separatist. You can almost get to like the hon. gentleman here lately and I get worried about that. When I look across the House I say, 'My God, he is not a bad fellow after all. You can almost like him.' Mr. Chairman, I get very concerned about it.

On that note I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD:

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

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, in the spirit of co-operation that we have constantly shown to the Opposition, I want to advise that I think tomorrow we will probably get on to legislation. So tomorrow we will be calling the Certified General Accountants Act, An Act To Amend The Dispensing Opticians Act and, if there is time, An Act To Amend The Medical Act. And then, if there is time, An Act To Amend The Livestock Act, very applicable to the Opposition, and, finally, An Act To Repeal The Gander Development Corporation Act, and then, if we get through those, we will get back into supplementary supply, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:
Why do you not debate the Kruger bill?

MR. MARSHALL:
Because we are running the affairs of the House and we will bring it before you when the time is right.

MR. NEARY:
Then you will come in and slap it up to us.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, it has not been printed yet. It is in the process of being printed. Of course, the simplest bill you have got to give the hon. the members of the Opposition two or three days to read it over.

So, Mr. Speaker, having advised the hon. gentlemen as to the

schedule, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 20, 1984 at 3:00 p.m.