



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

First Session

Number 82

---

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

***Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas***

Friday

14 February 1986

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

### Statements by Ministers

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, just a very brief statement. I would like to inform this hon. House that the Province has negotiated a \$100 million debenture issue in the Canadian capital market. The issue, which has a term of twenty years and bears an interest rate of 11 per cent, has been priced at 99.50 to yield 11.06 per cent. This completes the Province's borrowing programme for the 1985 - 1986 fiscal year.

The issue was arranged through our usual Canadian underwriting syndicate which is headed by McLeod, Young, Weir, Dominion Securities Pitfield Limited, Merrill Lynch Canada Incorporated, and Richardson Greenshields of Canada Limited.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, we thank the minister for the information. The minister should have gone a bit further and informed this House and the people of the Province how the minister's mismanagement of budgetary and financial matters, together with the Premier's incompetence, resulted in a lowered rating in

the financial markets. The minister should indicate to this House how much that has cost the people of this Province in additional financing charges over the past year.

MR. TULK:  
That is right.

DR. COLLINS:  
None.

MR. BARRY:  
None! Like hell, none!

### Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. I would like to ask the minister whether he could take a moment and explain to the House why he saw it necessary to move the sculpture and painting The Red Trench from the Confederation Building?

MR. YOUNG:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:  
Mr. Speaker, I guess this is a very urgent matter this morning, on the weekend. The sculpture was not moved in the dead of night. I instructed my officials to have the sculpture removed after receiving much negative criticism. One must realize that

it was a public building. I must say, congratulations coming in to me for removing it are about five to one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, would the minister confirm whether in fact this move was made on the direction of the Premier?

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

No, Mr. Speaker. No, no!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister responsible for matters of culture whether the minister agrees with this overriding of the Committee which was set up to advise the minister and the administration with respect to the quality of artistic matters which were to be included in the extension to Confederation Building?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, as Minister responsible for Culture in this Province, I am very proud of the support that we lend to the Cultural Affairs Division of my department and to the artists and people interested in culture in this Province. We give a significant amount of money to support artists and sculptors, etc., in this Province. As it pertains to the sculpture and the piece of art in question, I fully support the decision of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) in what he did because I, as well, received considerable negative criticism, in that I received many calls and letters outlining, really, public concern, and suggesting that, in essence, it should be removed from where it was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) indicate to us whether he informed the artists who formed the committee to -

MR. J. CARTER:

Ah, sit down!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:

If you want it over on that side with you, I will go down and get it and bring it up.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:

If that is what you want now, I will go down and bring it up.

MR. BARRY:

The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), Mr. Speaker, is a good example of bravado when he is sitting in the backbenches. He has tried for ten to fifteen years to get himself in the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, is still trying to get into Cabinet and has still not made it, and I do not think he is likely to make it with the quality of those comments. I would like to ask the minister, were these artists informed before they sat on this committee at the invitation of the minister, that the administration would be censoring the final product that came out of that committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, Mr. Speaker, the committee was not informed of that.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Now, I would like to ask the Premier if this is the cultural policy of his administration, to toy with the artists of this Province, to set them up in so-called independent committees

and then ultimately reject their recommendations on the grounds of censure.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we are elected by the people of the Province and we are elected to try to respond to those concerns expressed by the people. As it relates to cultural policy, I am very, very proud that this administration has done more for culture in this Province than every other administration put together since Confederation. On that the record is clear. All other administrations since Confederation can add up what they have done for culture and put it against what this administration has done, and we will stand head and shoulders over the collective sum of what they have done, number one. Number two, Mr. Speaker, we set up committees and in the majority of cases, not the majority of 51 per cent, or 52 per cent, or 60 per cent, or 70 per cent, or 80 per cent, but 98 per cent or 99 per cent of the time we accept those recommendations and life goes on as normal. But, there are examples, because we are entrusted by the people of the Province to carry out their wishes and to be sensitive to their concerns, that there will come times when the government or a minister under the power vested in him through this Legislature will respond to concerns from the public, like in this particular instance, and to me that demonstrates what democracy is all about. You do not just make decisions in absence of what the majority of the people are saying, and there was an overwhelming majority of people who communicated to the Minister of

Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), and to all members here on this side of the House that this particular piece of work, in their view, was not the kind of work that should be displayed in a public building owned by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Did the Premier consider, Mr. Speaker, obtaining the views of other members of the artistic community before taking the steps that were taken? Did the Premier consider obtaining the views of other members of the artistic community with respect to determining whether there was artistic merit in that particular work?

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, we had representations from many, many artists, some pro, some con, as it related to this piece of work. We were quite aware of what the opinions were of the artists out there in the community, and there was no clear consensus there, either. I do not know but that if you did a poll, there might be as many supporting what we have since done as were supporting keeping it there, from a global or philosophical artistic point of

view. We will be sensitive to artists, we will be sensitive to all people who live in this Province and have the right to vote and have the right to express their opinion. We did know the views of a lot of the artists in the artistic community before the decision was taken. I think it is a right decision. I think we are responding as a government to what the people are saying to us, and if the day ever comes, Mr. Speaker, when we are so insensitive as a government to suddenly not respond to what is clearly the majority opinion in this Province, then we do not deserve to be here any more.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, the Premier should have left several months ago on that standard.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier whether this is not the same symptom that we see displayed with respect to the approach of funding the arts, where the intent of government was to set up an independent body but then when the funding, as decided by the artistic community itself did not go the way the Premier liked, for political purposes, that power was taken away.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Is this not symptomatic of the same approach, where the administration wants to take decisions on cultural matters for the purpose of purely partisan, political reasons?

MR. REID:  
You would not do that?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult. We know that we are cutting to the quick when we hear this screaming from the other side. But can the Premier stand up in this House and say that he has sufficient confidence in the artists of this Province to let them determine, Mr. Speaker, the matters which he promised he would let them determine, between 1979 and the point when he took funding away? Is this not another example of the Premier promising something and then backing off from his promise when it comes down to the difficult crunch?

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Not a chance, Mr. Speaker. Not a chance! There was a problem with the Arts Council, which was created by this administration, and that problem has been resolved. There is a new group of individuals in place. The act has not been changed. They have complete independence. They are given the money and they can dispense with it how they like. There was personal politics within the artistic community as it related to the whole question of arts funding and so on. I think we have it resolved. There is a new group of people in there running the Arts Council under the mandate given by this House. We have not changed the act to try to take any power -

MR. BARRY:  
So it was not you who wanted to do it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No. No. Not true! Is the Leader of the Opposition saying that the people who are appointed now to the Arts Council have not got the personal integrity to make decisions on their own without taking guidance from here?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
That is what he is saying.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) accusing Don Cook and Chris Pratt of not having the personal integrity to do under the Act, independently, what they want to do for the Arts community?

MR. BARRY:  
Are you putting a question to me?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
He, cannot answer questions.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
It is a rhetorical question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Is the hon. Leader of the Opposition posing a question?

MR. BARRY:  
The Speaker will find out in a moment, as soon as this pig repeats what he is saying.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Sit down, boy! Sit down, boy!

MR. MARSHALL:  
He thinks he is Premier.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, this is Question

Period.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:  
Sit down when the Speaker is talking.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
I understood the hon. member to say he was going to give an answer, so this was the reason I wanted to know if you were going to pose a question. It is quite simple.

MR. BARRY:  
It is Question Period, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I am well aware of that.

MR. BARRY:  
If the Speaker wants me to answer a question from him as well as one from the Premier, I will be glad to try and do that.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Would the Leader of the Opposition pose his question?

MR. BARRY:  
The new members appointed to the Council will show the same independence as the last members, they will resign when the true action of this government and the true intent of this government comes out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
You hope.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
You are just waiting for them to resign.

MR. BARRY:  
It is amazing that they have not actually, but I am sure it will not be much longer.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Speaker, this is the Question Period, the time, presumably, to ask questions, and the hon. gentleman is on a supplementary question. I understand that he wants to attack the Arts community. A little while ago he insisted that another very prominent group was in the pocket of the government because it was being paid, and insulted the Arts community that way. He can insult the Arts community outside the House but he is to ask questions, Mr. Speaker, on supplementary questions and not be making a speech.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order the hon. Leader of the Opposition is on a supplementary and I would ask him if he would pose his question.

MR. BARRY:  
Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, this is a new question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
It is a new question then.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if he is proud of what is taking place in this area of policy with respect to the Arts over the last year? Is he proud of the fact that we had respected artists who found it necessary to resign from this committee that was responsible for funding? Is he proud of the fact that government has overridden this

other dedicated and sincere group of artists who volunteered their time to review the arts purchases for the extension of Confederation Building? Is he proud of the fact that his administration has censored -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

No, it is a new question.

Is he proud, Mr. Speaker, that he is giving the Arts community the independence and the integrity that they must have if the Arts are to flourish in this Province? Is he proud of that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am proud that this administration has spent more money on the arts than all other administrations since Confederation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that we established an Arts Council which is now functioning well and providing support to artists for the first time in the history of Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that we have supported through a sustaining grant the Newfoundland Symphony Orchestra. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that we have provided sustaining grants to other theatre groups in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I am as proud as punch that we have the intestinal fortitude and, more particularly, the sensitivity to listen to the people of this

Province when they speak loud and clear on matters of arts in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

My question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Leading up to the question, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from Hansard of last Friday the answer given by the hon. the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate when he was asked a question concerning electricity rates. "When the cost of crude falls, the people of the Province of Newfoundland will get the benefit of it." This is the answer he gave. It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, listening to reports yesterday, that the cost of crude has fallen by some ten dollars a barrel. Given that an oil tanker comes into Holyrood on an average of every two weeks carrying 250,000 barrels, at ten dollars a barrel that totals up to about \$60 million a year in savings for Newfoundland Hydro. That is quite a large sum of money considering what the consumers of this Province are paying.

I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs if the consumer will now, seeing that this answer was given last week and the price of crude has fallen a great deal, benefit from these falling prices?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.



MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I find it quite interesting that the hon. the member for Port de Grave is talking about matters affecting electrical rates in this Province, when the party which he represents sold this Province down the drain on the Upper Churchill deal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RUSSELL:

I wonder if the hon. the member for Port de Grave is proud of that? Mr. Speaker, I admitted in this House that the cost of electricity rates to the consumer is very high, and that is certainly unfortunate. I also said that this government is subsidizing electrical rates in this Province to the tune of something over \$40 million which I think, under our present financial circumstances, is as much as we can do. If the hon. member has a question pertaining to Newfoundland Hydro and to Holyrood and to fuel coming in there, maybe it is best directed to the hon. the President of the Treasury Board.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

I would like to ask the minister as one part of my question, what does fourteen years go or eighteen years ago have to do with the prices consumers are paying today?

We are talking about oil prices. It has been clearly stated that when oil prices go down, when Newfoundland Hydro pays less for

crude oil, that the consumers of this Province will benefit from it. At the same time, immediately there is an increase in the price of crude, the consumer has to pay the increase accordingly. What you are actually saying is that they are not going to get the benefits from it.

Now, they also are paying the fuel adjustment charge. It has been falsely stated that the fuel adjustment charge is no longer there. Would the Minister of Consumer Affairs explain to the people of this Province why this is being falsely stated?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, whether or not Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro is paying less for its crude oil is perhaps a matter of opinion. Has the hon. member contacted Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to see if their prices are less?

MR. CALLAN:

Have you?

MR. RUSSELL:

I posed the question to the hon. the member for Port de Grave. I doubt whether he has. The hon. member for Port de Grave wondered what thirteen or fourteen years in the past had to do with this. Maybe a sixty-five year contract some years into the future has a lot to do with it. He and his colleagues in that party sold this Province down the drain, now he is screaming because the electrical rates are very, very high.

MR. EFFORD:

A new question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Obviously the Minister of Consumer Affairs did not check with Newfoundland Hydro to see if the prices are falling. A year ago they were paying \$37.50 a barrel, today they are paying \$27.50 a barrel. That is a ten dollar decrease per barrel. Each tanker coming into the Holyrood Generating Station carries a total of 250,000 barrels of oil, and at ten dollars a barrel that is a large sum of money. Over a year that is \$60 million.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. the member please pose his question?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I submit that if the party opposite had not signed such a deal on the Upper Churchill Holyrood would not have to incur this expense to bring in this crude, which is costing the consumers of this Province a considerable amount of money. I submit, Mr. Speaker, factors other than the actual price of crude are contributing to the high cost of electricity in this Province.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Would the Minister of Consumer Affairs be prepared to allow Hydro to go for a \$60 million increase if the prices had not dropped?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, there were several members speaking, and I did not get the first part of the hon. member's question.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) be satisfied for Newfoundland Hydro to go for an increase of \$60 million this year if the price of crude had not dropped \$10 a barrel?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, there are many factors other than the actual price of crude, I submit, which contribute to the cost of electricity, water levels and many other things. Certainly I would be prepared to -

MR. CALLAN:

What happens now, do we dig wells?.

MR. RUSSELL:

If the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) would keep his yap shut, I might be able to answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:

Shaheen's little toady.

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, now we have to get down to baby talk for them.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly be willing to speak to my colleague, the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) about matters and factors contributing to the high cost of electrical rates in this Province, and I am sure that if there is anything this government can do about it we will do it.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

It was stated this morning on the news that Mrs. Carney has announced that the fall in gasoline prices will come into effect in a few weeks. Possibly this might have to do with the way she was treated just recently, when Cabot Martin was paid a large sum of money, \$150 an hour, to deliver a cake to the hon. Mrs. Carney. Possibly this had something to do with the fact that she is now going to relieve us where gasoline prices are concerned.

Now, I asked earlier, and this was very clearly stated, if the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) would make sure that the consumers of this Province are no longer fooled as far as the fuel adjustment charge is concerned? They are being told it is no longer there, when they are actually being charged nine-tenths of one cent per every kilowatt hour they have burned, which on the average home is 5,000 kilowatt hours, which is \$45 a month for twelve months of the year, not

just when the fuel is burned.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, this minister will ensure, to the best of his ability, that he will protect the consumers of this Province in every way possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to follow up on the question the minister did not answer that was put by the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). We have seen the fuel cost to Newfoundland Hydro drop by some \$10 a barrel already. It would have gone down further if Hydro was not locked into a one year contract. Now, the drop in the fuel prices is the equivalent, on the member's calculations, to something like \$60 million over a year. Is the minister saying that these other factors would permit Hydro to apply for a rate increase of \$60 million this year if the prices had not dropped?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

No, Mr. Speaker, the minister is not saying that at all. This minister has already indicated he will discuss this matter with his colleague and if there is anything we can do about it we will do it. It is fine, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), who scampered across from this side of the House when things got a little hot and he could not take the heat, to now get over there and criticize this government for something which he was too chicken to stay over here and combat.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I can stand these thrusts, these vicious, wicked thrusts. The minister asked the member whether the member had checked with Newfoundland Hydro with respect to the effect of reduced costs. Has the minister checked with Newfoundland Hydro with respect to the effect of their reduced costs and would the minister tell us the result of his calculations? What is it that Newfoundland Hydro is saving this year? Are they entitled to keep that in their kitty rather than return it to the consumer? What is the amount?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the information that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is posing may or may not be accurate.

MR. BARRY:

Have you found out? Did you check?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RUSSELL:

The minister is certainly prepared to check with officials of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, and to pass on any information he receives to this hon. House.

MR. TULK:

You mean you have not yet?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this is unbelievable! We have had the oil prices crumbling now for several months. Is the minister saying he has not yet checked with Newfoundland Hydro? Has he or has he not checked with Newfoundland Hydro?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, when I see fit to pass on that kind of information to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, who scampered across the House because he was too chicken to stay over here, I will pass it on to him.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Consumer Affairs now saying that he is not going to have the courage to stand up in this House and answer questions? Is he

saying that he is going to close out from the consumers of electricity in this Province this vital information? Has the minister checked with Newfoundland Hydro yet? Yes or no? I do not think that is a matter that should be covered under the War Secrets Act.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, this minister will not back off from any responsibilities he has, as the Leader of the Opposition did a little while ago.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I am glad to hear that. Now, would the minister live up to those responsibilities and would he answer that question? Has he checked with Newfoundland Hydro and what did he find the figures are that Newfoundland Hydro has saved?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, when I get the information from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro I will pass it on to this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to address another question to the Minister of Culture. Is it correct that the

Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) removed "The Red Trench" at the direction of the Minister of Culture?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

This issue on "The Red Trench" has gone on now for, I suppose, a couple of months and, to be very honest with you, Mr. Speaker, I have not seen anyone, or heard tell of anyone, by phone call or by letter, who has been so emphatic about The Red Trench as the hon. member over there. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, I may be being presumptuous, but perhaps there is a reason for that.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the minister would answer the question: Did the Minister of Public Works and Services receive direction from the minister?

MR. YOUNG:

No!

MR. BARRY:

Oh, he did not. Okay. The Minister of Public Works and Services says he did not. Well, then, I would like to put this question to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth. Has the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth decided that the censorship czar for the

Province on artistic matters will henceforth be the Minister of Public Works and Services? Has the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth and the Premier decided that the level of artistic quality in this Province will be determined by the member for Harbour Grace, the Minister of Public Works and Services? Is this what we can expect in terms of determining the quality of art that will be permitted to hang in public places in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, that question has already been answered before. Because of public outcry and public opinion on that particular piece of art, there was a decision made to remove it from the building.

MR. YOUNG:

And I did it.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That directive was given by the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services. I had discussions with the minister on it.

MR. TULK:

You said you did not!

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, I did not say I did not talk to the hon. minister about it. No, I did not. I said that I did not instruct him to take it down. On this side, when we have a problem or a controversy such as that, we talk and we consult. We do not have one person on this side who muzzles the rest and gives directions, such as you do.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I see. Now, maybe the minister can tell us a little more about this decision-making process. All of a sudden it was not the Minister of Public Works and Services in the dead of night, or was it? As far as the minister's life-style is concerned, it could be the dead of day. Would the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth tell us if he is saying there was a collective decision of Cabinet, that this took up a full day of Cabinet? Is that what the minister is saying?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what Cabinet was like when the hon. member was there, but I can tell him right now that when we spend days in Cabinet discussing situations pertaining to this Province, we do not spend days talking about The Red Trench, we talk about more important issues, such as the Atlantic Accord legislation, which is before this House and which is pertinent to the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

How about artistic integrity? How about artistic independence?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Maybe that is why the hon. member is where he is, because he wanted to spend his time in Cabinet talking about red trenches. We want to talk about issues which are pertinent to the people of

this Province.

Because of public opinion expressed to me as Minister responsible for Culture, Recreation and Youth and to the Minister of Public Works and Services who is responsible for maintenance and so on, negative criticism on that piece of art, there was a decision made to remove it. I totally support the decision, and the directive was given by the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Now, let us get this clarified, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

What is your position on it, 'Leo'.

MR. BARRY:

My position is that 'gofers' should be seen and not heard.

Mr. Speaker, let us get what the minister is saying clearly established. I do not want to misrepresent the minister in what he is saying. Is the minister now saying that on cultural matters, Mr. Speaker, he is prepared to pass off the decision-making to his colleagues, such as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) and Services, and when it comes to artistic independence, artistic integrity, that as long as he has some general discussion with the Minister of Public Works that henceforth he will be prepared to have the Minister of Public Works censor what is hung in a public place in this Province

and as Minister of Culture he is satisfied with that? Is that the extent to which he is providing guidance to the arts in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many times you have to give the hon. the Leader of the Opposition an answer. The situation is that we are very proud of what we are doing for culture in this Province and what we are doing for the arts in this Province. As the Premier outlined, this situation with this particular piece of work is just one in one hundred. There was concern expressed about it. When I first saw it, to be very honest with you, I was surprised at the actual piece of work. I really was not pleased with it as Minister of Culture. I was amazed at it. Consequently it was removed, and I support the decision 100 per cent; I support it because, obviously, the majority of people who saw it wanted that to happen. The majority of people who actually saw the piece of art wanted it removed and consequently, as a government, we acted responsibly and we removed it. That is the way it is. The hon. gentleman goes on talking about things being hung in public buildings. I would say if he cannot come into Question Period with more pertinent questions and more serious questions about the problems of this Province, he is soon going to be hung and I do not know if it will be in a public building.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the Minister of Culture would confirm that he is in the process of having the provincial anthem changed to, "Lord, won't you kick me through the goal posts of life."?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would like now to welcome to the galleries the delegation from the Badger's Quay-Valleyfield-Poole's Island town council. The council is represented by Mayor Rev. Ralph Moss and councillors Gladson, Stratton and Town Manager Harry Harding.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Order, please!

I would like to rule also on the point of privilege that was raised yesterday by the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons). In the words of the hon. member, 'I rise to correct the record.' I checked Hansard of yesterday and that of February 11. There are two versions of a conversation that took place in the hon. member's office when he was a federal member. The hon. member rose on a point of privilege to give his version yesterday but there is no prima facie case of

breach of privilege.

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to table the twelfth annual report of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation for the year ending March 31, 1985.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the annual report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation -

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of privilege has been raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General has supplied the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) with a copy of his report for last year. Mr. Speaker, Section 67, Subsection 2 of the Financial Administration Act requires that the minister table that within one week after the commencement of the next



ensuing session, if the House is not in session when the minister receives the report. Also, Section 56 of the act is relevant because that requires tabling one week after the minister receives the Public Accounts.

The minister has applied his own interpretation to this section, obviously, or he has found somebody to tell him, Mr. Speaker, that session - presumably this is what he is saying - refers to new session. This seems to be the only way the minister can avoid or try and avoid his statutory responsibility. Mr. Speaker, that is a forced and distorted interpretation of that section and I would like the minister, and I think it is important for the due process of law for the laws of this Province to be observed by ministers of the Crown, as by everybody else.

I would like to ask the minister whether it is a fact that because of the damning indictment contained in this year's Auditor General's Report that it is the strategy of the minister, of the Premier and of the administration to conceal this from the public as long as possible, using every legal device possible and every warped and twisted interpretation of the statutes of the Province? Is this the course of action that the minister has set out upon? Is he going to try and keep this Auditor General's Report from this House as long as he can? Is that what the minister is seeking to do?

Will he not agree that the definition of session as contained in the first part of that section, where it talks about, 'If the House is then in session,' obviously is not referring to the

37, 38, 39, or 40th session? It is using the normal dictionary meaning of the word session, 'The sitting together or meeting of a group, assembly, as of a court, legislature, council, etc,' as the minister will get from any standard dictionary. The ordinary meaning of session is that the next time that the House of Assembly meets, as we are today. Will the minister get up and tell us what is his position? Is the information in the Auditor's General report so damning and so damaging to the administration that they are trying to hide this as long as they can from the people of the Province?

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Finance, to that point of privilege.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege the hon. member posed some questions there. I do not really think that question period is going on. But I understand his point of privilege is that, in his opinion, I have strayed outside the statutes of this Province, specifically, The Financial Administration Act. Mr. Speaker, I deny that allegation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I will study that point over the weekend and rule on that on Monday.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I table the report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation for the year ending March 31, 1985.

### Petitions

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of 146 residents of Milltown in St. Albans in the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. The petition reads thus 'We, the employees of Forest Resources and Lands, have been working in the woods for the past seven years. We now understand that the forestry programmes for Bay d'Espoir are now going to be administered by the Bay d'Espoir Development Association. If the Bay d'Espoir Development Association does the administration of this programme, does it mean that the 120 employees from Bay d'Espoir, who have been employed by the Department of Forest Resources and Lands, will lose our seniority and the rights we have built up over the years? We ask you to please protect our jobs. We realize that ten weeks work a year is not much, but it is all we have. Please protect it for us.'

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to this petition. I have been aware of the situation for the

last two weeks, when I received a letter, and the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) received a letter as well about the concerned workers. I have written the minister. I received a reply from him, and the part that stood out was that he said it is too early to condemn this programme from starting.

What has really happened in Bay d'Espoir is that they had a Forestry Economic Stimulation Programme, involving 120 workers, and which was administered by the Department of Forestry for the past thirteen years which has now expired. The workers that were normally working on that have now been cast adrift, by the look of it, and the Department of Forestry made a partnership with the Bay d'Espoir Development Association to apply for funds through CIEC programmes to take care of some of this programme in Bay d'Espoir.

There are two concerns right there. As I understand it, with this partnership that has already been formed, there is only one project approved which employs ten people. The other thing that I find hard to believe is that we have 120 workers that are trained as forestry workers and have worked in this job for the last seven to thirteen years. Now we find that we are going to re-train more forestry workers in this area of the Province where 90 per cent of the people are unemployed anyhow. These are the figures that are around there now. I will have the official ones next week, but it seems to me there is about 90 per cent at this time. So we are now going to re-train workers that have been working on this project for a certain amount of time. The other thing about it, as those employees point out in

the prayer of their petition, they have been part-time/full-time employees of the Department of Forest Resources and Lands. I think those are the words they use. I heard the minister use it when he talked about the people in the tree nursery in the Grand Falls area. But anyhow, they are the full-time/part-time workers. They were members of NAPE. They had pensions established and now they are going to be tossed aside and we are going to have another 120 people unemployed in the Bay d'Espoir area of Newfoundland, where unemployment is shocking, a disgrace and a crime. It is all right for the minister to smile. He does not have to live on \$240 every two weeks like those fellows down there.

What they want to ask the department, Mr. Speaker, is will their jobs be protected? Will those 120 jobs be protected or is it a situation where we are now going to have another 120 unemployed and we are going to train another 120 to do the job? In Bay d'Espoir, if those jobs are to be handled through Canada Manpower or the CEIC Programme, those 120 jobs will be destroyed. Those people will not be qualified to apply because the first ones who get the first chance to go to work are the ones who are the exhaustees in the unemployment insurance system.

I am not against those people going to work. I would like for everyone of them down there to go to work, but if we are going to put them to work at the expense of 120 people who at least had some semblance of a lifestyle and you are going to put those people on welfare, this, I do not think, is right.

It seems to me that that is not the mandate that the people of Newfoundland gave this government. The government has idle hands when it comes to creating employment, but it sure has an icy heart when it comes to caring for the people. The people of Bay d'Espoir need to be cared for.

So, Mr. Speaker, I submit this petition.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, I will make a few comments on this particular petition. First of all, he suggested that I was smiling at the issue. I must tell him I was conversing with his colleague, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), and it had nothing to do with his petition.

With respect to the matter that is raised, he would be aware, I am sure, that I expressed similar concerns myself publicly two or three months ago with respect to the programme that is now in place through the Jobs Strategy Programme when I appeared before the House of Commons Select Committee that was here in December or November or whenever it was they were here.

First of all, it is important to understand that the FESP Programme, the Forest Economic Stimulation Programme, was a separate programme to provide for silviculture activities in areas of high unemployment. That was separate from the silviculture programmes that we also carry out

under our normal forestry programme that we have negotiated between the federal government and the Province. We still do those silviculture programmes in any event everywhere in the Province, at least in priority areas which is, i.e., close to the industry or close to sawmilling.

So the FESP Programme was a totally separate programme that we negotiated with the federal government several years ago. By the way, we were the only province in Canada that had that special FESP Programme. We did it in consultation with the federal government of the day as more or less a pilot project to see how it would work. I must say it worked very, very well and we are very supportive of it.

At the present time, that particular five-year FESP Programme has expired and so has the forestry agreement, as the hon. member is also aware. We are presently, as a priority, trying to negotiate a new forestry programme with the federal government. That is our priority. We expect to have a decision on a new four or five-year programme before the end of next month.

I think what I indicated in the letter to the hon. member that we also intend to pursue discussions with the federal government to try to get some programme to substitute for FESP. I realize that does not address this particular and immediate concern but, in any event, that is our intention and that is what I tried to indicate to the hon. member.

The other point is, because of the Jobs Strategy Programme being introduced this year, it was felt

by the appropriate authorities, I guess, throughout discussions that the programmes that were undertaken by FESP for the last four or five years could possibly be picked up under the Jobs Strategy Programme. I recognize there is a problem there with respect to those people who can be hired for those programmes. I expressed that same concern myself. We have expressed that same concern to the federal government. My colleague, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) has expressed that same concern to the federal government.

We presently have discussions ongoing to try to see if we can improve that situation so that people such as those described and those in the petition would be able to obtain employment on programmes like that in the future. One of the things this has done is it has taken out of the hands of the Department of Forestry the opportunity and responsibility for administering that particular programme. It now can be applied for by any development association or any organization in the Province. What we have offered to do, as a provincial department, is provide the expertise to assist in the development of the programme. The terms of the employment, of course, are dealt with by another authority, that is the federal government, under the Jobs Strategy Programme. The criteria for hiring and the eligibility for hiring is something that we are trying to change.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

I rise and, in doing so, take pleasure in supporting the petition presented by my colleague and friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert). The issue of FESP, the Forestry Economic Simulation Programme, is one that I am very familiar with. It has been on an ad hoc basis, the economic mainstay of the Bay d'Espoir area for a number of years. I am very surprised, I say to the minister, that he and the administration of which he is a part has allowed the agreement to expire without getting an extension, even an ad hoc extension, until something more definite is put in place. This is a programme that was evolved some years ago between the two levels of government.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that were we this morning interested in getting involved in the partisan rhetoric, we would have recalled that this government, that you could not get a deal with years ago, is the one that put something in place for Bay d'Espoir in collaboration with this provincial government of another strife. Now we have the situation that the two governments who are supposed to be cheek to cheek, etc., etc., cannot even extend an existing agreement. Mr. Speaker, the minister will know, I do not have to tell him, how you extend an agreement. You put some more money into the kitty.

MR. SIMMS:

Our federal agreement has already been extended. The FESP programme has not been extended because it has been picked up by the Jobs Stratgy Programme.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, that is basically what the problem is with having kissing cousins in Ottawa. You buy all their technical arguments.

I put it to the minister that if a party of another strife were in Ottawa, he would be loud and continuous in his condemnation, and so he should be. You see, here we have 120 or so people who, for a number of years, worked. We are not talking any great hourly wage either. It is not only Bay d'Espoir. We are talking about a petition that comes from Bay d'Espoir. I can tell the minister, because I had a part in selecting the areas, if he wants to show the House our respective bits of knowledge on the issue, but I did not think that is what it was about, I did not think it was all about sparing. I understood it was about a petition from some people in Bay d'Espoir whose livelihoods are at stake. That is what I was trying to address I say to the minister.

Mr. Speaker, the minister can come up with all the technical arguments he wants. The fact is he knows, I know, the gentleman for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir knows and, certainly, those petitioners know, that the agreement was extended before because there was an economic need. It is a good vehicle. It not only provides jobs, but it helps in forest conservation, rejuvenation, reforestation, and it is a very good programme that has gone on successfully for a number of years. Now I hear, to my dismay, that they are talking about replacing that with something else. It is the whole business of change for the sake of change.

The hon. crowd that said they were not going to be in favour of short term job opportunities is now taking a quasi permanent programme like FESP with long term employment, in the seasonal sense, and replacing it with this circus programme, this Canadian Jobs Strategy Programme.

It is a scandal and the minister should know, better being my cousin and all, he should really know better. So, I appeal to him, politician to politician, man who is interested in the forest, to another man who is interested in the forest, and blood to blood, to get off those technical arguments and address the substance of the issue. The substance is that we can have a continuing programme if he would just say to his federal counterpart, "Please, drop a little money in the kitty and extend the programme until such time as they can find a suitable replacement," if that is the way they are going.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, having supported the petition, I want to welcome my good friend, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) back to the Chamber and I want to note that suddenly, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) thinks it is okay to sit beside him again. Thank you.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 22, Bill 59. The debate was adjourned by the hon. the Minister of Finance.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that in

regard to this historic bill that every member of this House will want to speak. If only, so that the record can show that they had a part in this whole historic event. I think that everyone will probably get copies of Hansard when this debate is over, they will chop out their bit of it, they will put it in a frame and they will have it for their grandchildren to say, "Look, I took part in this debate that brought this bill in that gave Newfoundland control over one of its major resources." This has redounded to the tremendous benefit of the people of this Province and will do so for generations to come.

I am not going to take up too much more time. I have had my share of the debate and it was a great honour to partake in the debate. I look forward to hearing other people speak on it.

I will just end with this continuing remark that I did not get quite get time to finish last day. We have to make sure that the benefits from this resource are spread to the widest possible extent throughout the Island part of the Province and the throughout the Labrador part of the Province. It is not going to be an easy task to do that in some respects because of where the find is and because the major population center of the Province is in close proximity to it but, nevertheless, that has to be done. It has to be done so that the people of this Province all feel that they have a fair share of the resources of this Province.

I do not want to lecture to the Opposition on the other side of the House. Having said that, I

will now proceed to do so. I think there will be a natural tendency for the Opposition to take the line that "You are not getting your fair share" when talking about districts or an area outside the immediate Avalon Peninsula area. "You are not getting your fair share so, attack the government over it!" This will pit parts of the Province one against the other.

I think that would be most unfortunate, I think it would be very disruptive to our society and I would urge that that line not be taken. Now, this is not to say that the Opposition should not criticize. That is their job. They have the right to criticize and they should criticize but, I think there is going to be enough benefit from this resource in all areas that they can get their piece of the cake in terms of political glory or political spinoff by taking a tact other than setting district against district. I think that that would be besetting sin if we set district against district in this Province. If there is a benefit out on the West Coast, for instance, I think the Opposition members whose districts are on the West Coast can get benefit from that benefit going out there. It will not all go to the PC members who are out there.

I think that this is where they should direct their efforts. Let them direct their efforts and get their own partisan political benefit from things that are happening. Do not try to get it by saying to the West Coast, "You are being screwed by those fellows in St. John's." That is not the case. That is not our endeavour. That must not happen. But if that is the approach that is put around

this Province, I think it will be a dastardly thing, I think it will be bad for our political system and I think it will be bad for the whole Province and the society we live in.

So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse this bill. I think it has been a tremendous sustained effort over the past six or seven years. I suppose most people did not believe we would achieve half what we have achieved, if not a quarter of what we have achieved. But fortunately we have and I think it is a marvellous thing for the Province.

A new historic era is about to dawn in this Province, and I think we are very fortunate in this House to be part of it.

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):  
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) talks about the new era that we are going to be thrust into as a result of this historic document, despite the attempts by hon. members to build this up as the most beneficial document that ever came before a House of Assembly or before a Parliament of this Province, despite all of that, as I read it through I get the distinct impression that this bill was certainly signed by humans. I get the distinct impression that ordinary human beings had their hands in this and that it was not done by any divine personnel or deity. There was nothing like that. I get the

impression from certain weaknesses and imperfections that there were ordinary human beings, with a tendency to err and to make mistakes, behind it. I got that distinct impression. Mr. Speaker, I will elaborate a little on that as I go on.

If there were certain people who thought that this bill was without imperfections, that this was the best thing ever to happen to Newfoundland, they should have changed their mind immediately and they should have had these lofty notions squashed the minute they saw the procedure that the Premier used to introduce this bill. The minute that they saw the procedure used they should have changed their mind. They should have immediately realized that this is not the bill that we thought it was going to be and that this is not the agreement that we thought it was going to be.

Indeed, it represents a cave-in and a scaling down from where the Premier started us off in 1978/79. As a matter of fact, it represents a total capitulation from the high expectations that the Premier gave us at that time to what the real document is. It represents a total capitulation. As a matter of fact, it does not represent a negotiated settlement. It does not represent that at all. What does it represent? It represents something that was forced upon us, that we had no choice but to accept because the Premier had so bungled and so mismanaged the process of negotiation, his Tory buddies in Ottawa forced the document upon him. He had no choice but to accept what was given.

We should have realized that by

the procedure that the Premier used in introducing the bill. Number one, if this were the historic document that the Premier would like it to be, if this had all of the benefits that hon. members are trying to make us believe that it had, then the Premier would have had this bill in his own name.

Do not kid yourself. Do not let us get carried away with that. If this were such an historic document the Premier would have published this bill in his own name. Why did the Premier not do that? The Premier is a proud and conceited man. There is no way that he would have allowed this agreement to come before the House, Bill 59, if it were such a beneficial bill. If it were so billed the way that hon. members are saying, the Premier would not have allowed that come in anyone else's name but himself. The Premier is so proud and so conceited that I hear his alarm clock does not ring, it applauds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

That is how proud the Premier is. So the Premier would not have allowed that bill to come in anyone else's name, so we should have known.

MR. W. CARTER:

It probably plays 'How Great Thou Art.'

MR. LUSH:

We should not have been carried away by that. We would not have had to read the bill at all. Just to know that it was presented in the name of another minister we should have known how far off our demands had been scaled down, or



his demands has been scaled down.

Secondly, our hopes should have been dashed when we realized the procedure used by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). He spent three parts of his time ridiculing the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). If there is any substance to the bill, he would not have had to do that but, he spent three parts of his time ridiculing and downgrading the Leader of the Opposition.

What was his logic? Let us look at it once more because this is very important, to look at the line of logic used by the learned man for St. John's East. He blamed the nationalization of Churchill Falls on the Leader of the Opposition. He even tried to blame the fact that the deal was not as good as it should be, he did not really say that but that it what he meant by inference, because the Leader of the Opposition walked out at a time when it was very crucial.

MR. BARRY:

How can you sabotage something that is supposed to be the best thing since sliced bread?

MR. LUSH:

Well, he managed to do it.

MR. TULK:

Twisted logic.

MR. LUSH:

He blames the Leader of the Opposition for the nationalization. I pointed out last day that the hon. member cannot slither out from under any bad decisions made by that government by blaming it on any particular one man. Therein, by doing that, he is breaking two established traditional principles

of British Parliament procedure, and traditions that nobody would dare break they are so honoured and so established, the tradition of Cabinet solidarity and collective responsibility. That means, to younger members who might not know this, that once a decision is made in Cabinet, every member of Cabinet sticks to that decision till death. They stick to it and they will defend members, even though they did not agree with it. For the hon member to suggest that he did not agree, Mr. Speaker, is a disgrace. There is cabinet solidarity and collective responsibility. We cannot blame things on other people, it is blamed on the government. If there are any bad decisions and if the Leader of the Opposition was a part of it, if he was involved, then the bad decision has to be blamed on the Tory government and nobody over there can try and slither out from under.

He then comes to the Churchill Falls deal and what does he do? He he tries to exonerate himself from any bad decisions made by that government and to exonerate all of his friends over there. That was not us. That was not the Tory government. That was the Leader of the Opposition. So, in his attempt to try to promote his own image and to try and enhance his own political purposes, he blames the Leader of the Opposition. But when it comes to the Churchill Falls deal, and the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) was on it today, who do they blame? The Liberals! They look over here and point at us and not one of us was ever a Cabinet minister. Now is that not great logic? How stupid do they think the people of this Province are? I see the man looking at me. It

is true what I am saying. I know it is hard for the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) to realize that with his narrow mind and wide mouth. I know that it is hard for him to understand that and it is hard for him to accept that, but that is the logic used by the member for St. John's East to promote his own narrow political purposes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Can hon. members sit and listen to the convoluted logic of the learned man from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall)? And using such childish language as, 'Leo is jealous!' You know, Kindergarten language! Is that not shocking, using that Kindergarten language in this House of Assembly?

I tell you he should not be jealous of this document. He should not be a bit jealous about that because that document, without having read the document at all, people should know that this document is not what the Premier led the people of Newfoundland to believe that it would be. We know that by the procedure of introduction, by, one, not having the bill in his own name and, two, by the procedure used by the member for St. John's East, the logic that he used, spending three part of his time trying to undermine the Leader of the Opposition and, in so doing, breaking with the established tradition of British Parliament, the two main principles, Cabinet solidarity and collective responsibility.

That only applies where he wants it to. He blames Churchill Falls on the Liberals, and some of us were not even born. He looks over and says "The Liberals sold you down the drain." Yet over there, they are not even responsible for what they did last year. Yet we over here, somehow, must assume the responsibility of what the Liberal Party did twenty-five years ago to thirty years ago. Well, what convoluted logic?

Is the press listening? Will they ever quote this man again, the man from St. John's East, with his illogic and convoluted logic. The learned man from St. John's East, trying to twist, distort and put things out of perspective to meet his own political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, that is not strange. This bill was created in a cloud of political rhetoric. This bill on the offshore originated in a cloud of political rhetoric. In 1978 was about the first time the Premier started talking about the offshore, but the Tories themselves, this same Tory government, started about 1976 talking about the offshore. It is 1986 and what are they doing? Still talking! It has not yet gone past the stage of wind and gas. It is still something that they are talking about. How they vacillated from ownership, saying "We will not settle for anything else but ownership and complete control. We are not going to let these Liberals up there take everything from us and take our resources."

Then it got to where the Premier got all excited and they were going to take our educational system, God forbid! They were going to monkey around with our educational system. It is too bad

they did not. The Premier got on the airwaves and got everybody excited about that. But he saved the day on that. He saved the day on the constitution. He came up with the formula. Nobody seems to know when it was or where he was but, he came up with the formula.

Anyway, he vacillated from complete ownership and complete control to joint management. He vacillated from complete ownership to joint management to "yes, Sir, we will take whatever you give us." That is what we have here now, "Yes, Sir. Yes, Mr. Mulroney, we will take whatever you give us." He had no choice because he bungled the process so badly that what we have is not a negotiated settlement but one that was given us.

In 1979, I think it was, if hon. members forget and think that this is not so, that the Premier did not vacillate in his stand and in what he wanted, that he was not like a yo-yo, let me read a quote from 1979. Do you remember the call of the election? The Liberals were never in such bad shape in their lives historically in this Province. The Liberals called a leadership convention. This brave Premier decided to call an election. Never before did it happen in modern politics, that a Premier would call an election when a party was down and out, on its back, with a leadership call. This brave Premier, this man who was a great fighter, decided he would call the election while they were down and kick them in the guts.

Where were the press? Where did this man get the name of a brave man? It was an act of cowardice that has never been displayed in this Province before, to call an

election when there was a convention called for a leadership. He was going to further wipe out the Liberal Party. Once he got in over the gunnels of the boat, well, then things were okay. Any man is all right when he gets in over the gunnels. This is how this Premier got in, by calling an election when the Liberals were down and out. Do not anybody forget it!

History will record that there was never an act of such cowardice displayed ever in the politics of Newfoundland, that a leader or a government in power called an election when the Opposition Party had called a leadership review. Check it out! I challenge anybody to check it out in the history books and they will not find an example of such cowardice. How was this man then to come across as a brave man? He is a chicken of the first order with no thighs, no breast, just a chicken liver and chicken heart.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Lies and deceit.

MR. LUSH:  
What was the issue that he called the election on? The Premier gave as his reason for the election call the need for a fresh mandate to negotiate with Ottawa on such issues as a confirmation by Prime Minister Elect Joe Clark that Newfoundland would have uncontested ownership of undersea minerals. Mr. Clark was the Prime Minister then. Do you remember he was the fellow going around with that letter in his pocket and he would not give it to anybody else. Going around with the letter in his pocket saying that he was going to give ownership.

I heard the Minister of Finance

(Dr. Collins) yesterday talking about how the West got ownership of its minerals. Is it not scandalous how men and women will get up in a public forum and talk about something which they have no knowledge. The minister knows no more about how the West got its minerals than hon. members know about why Challenger crashed a few days ago. He knows no more about it. Do you want me to tell the hon. member how the West got its minerals?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. LUSH:

It started in 1927, number one. There were oil discoveries and the West -

MR. TOBIN:

You were about 50 years old then.

MR. LUSH:

About what, sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER:

He said 50.

MR. LUSH:

I thought he said fifteen.

MR. TULK:

That is the kind of negative crack he brings up.

MR. LUSH:

Yes, and he runs off. That is as brilliant as he can be making a one-liner like that, interrupting somebody who is giving an intelligent speech, Mr. Speaker. I thought he wanted to know about how the West got ownership.

The West got ownership, one, through a process of long negotiations. It involved the courts and it involved a decision by the federal government. First,

it went to the courts to establish that the right to minerals did belong to the federal government, but the federal government then worked with the provinces, got the agreement of the provinces that were in Canada at that time, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, P.E.I. and Upper and Lower Canada. It was up somewhere around the 1940s before it was done, a long time.

You know, there was never an election called and won on it. The premiers tried to do it like this Premier but somehow they could not get the people excited about it. Everytime that a premier in the West, either in Saskatchewan or Alberta or Manitoba, called an election on the ownership of the minerals, they lost. They never won on that issue as the Premier of this Province did. Why did he win? I have my points of view on that one.

It was done through the process of the courts, the same as we did, but we lost in the courts because we were contesting the federal government. They were not contesting. It was established who owned in the way they went. The federal government established that they owned the minerals and then the federal government, through legislation, changed it and gave them -

MR. TULK:

In other words, it was not a confrontation.

MR. LUSH:

It was not a confrontation.

So, Mr. Speaker, the way that the West went about it was quite differently from the way we went about it. Maybe it was through circumstances or whatever, but we

went about it in such a hostile way, in such a political manner that by the time it was all over, we had no choice but to accept the deal that the federal government gave us.

So the Premier called an election in 1979 because he wanted to know if the people of Newfoundland would agree, as Mr. Clark did, that we owned the offshore oil? So he won overwhelming support at a time. When the Liberals were down and out, this brave man went with this big issue of getting ownership of our minerals, versus Liberals with no leader. The big brave man went out there and he won the election on that one. But what happened? Mr. Clark shortly got defeated and, of course, was up there nine or ten months and never measured up. He never gave us any deal at all, even though he said that we owned it and that he was going to give us that. Ten months went by and he never did anything. Did I not see the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) look at me? He knows that I am correct. He knows it is correct what I am saying.

Mr. Clark did not measure up. He did not measure up and what a letdown that was. What a letdown and what a colossal bluff that was. But the Premier took us right to the top of the mountain. He took the people right to the top of the mountain and said, "Here is the world," a great time in Lent, like when we were down and out, starving like Christ in the wilderness, and he said, "You can have all your minerals if you will vote for me." Here we were, with no leader and this brave man taking on a few fellows trying to struggle along, trying to keep democracy in Newfoundland, trying to maintain democracy and to keep

it here. I think we have lost the battle. This brave man went out there fighting with all the marbles and they said, "What a brave man he is, Newfoundlanders," and the press going about heralding the Premier. What a brave man, going up and fighting big Ottawa. Fighting? And here was Mr. Clark with a letter in his pocket saying, "We are going to give you uncontested ownership." But he wanted to know, "Would you agree with that Newfoundlanders?" Of course, when we agreed, Mr. Clark could not find the letter. After the people said they agreed, the letter was lost and we never heard of it after.

Then the Premier started to cool down a bit. We cannot have total ownership. One would have thought that would have been over. One would have thought after that he would have given up. But no, Mr. Speaker, he had done so little for the people of this Province in terms of creating employment, that in 1982 he decided he would have to try it again. It looked like things were down and out for him and he would have another election. What was that one for?

MR. SIMMS:

Would you permit a question?

MR. LUSH:

No questions. In 1982 he calls another election. What was that one for? What was this one for? Premier Brian Peckford stuck to his one swan song, his one theme or something throughout Newfoundland's election campaign. His government, he insisted day after day, required a new and strong mandate to continue negotiations with Ottawa on offshore oil resources - 1982. That is the second election. Never before in our history was a

single issue so politicized or were there so many elections on it?

Was there ever an election on Churchill Falls? I do not believe there was ever an election on Churchill Falls. Was there an election on Wabush? Was there an election on the Trans-Canada? "We will finish the drive in '65, thanks to Mr. Pearson." That was a good election. We got something out of it, the Trans-Canada. Term 29, well these were not emotional issues. We got something out of them. We finished the Trans-Canada. We finished the drive. Mr. Smallwood would not participate in the official opening of the Trans-Canada when Mr. Diefenbaker was Prime Minister because the highway in Newfoundland was not completed, but along came Mr. Pearson and said, "We will finish the drive in '65." And, of course, they finished it. But here, we have nothing finished. There is not a government in the history of this Province that has had such an unfinished and incomplete agenda.

In 1982, the big election call again so that the Premier could negotiate. Well, it says the Premier gave us his reason for the election call the need of a fresh mandate again to negotiate with Ottawa. Those are two elections, 1979 and 1982 and still we got nowhere with the offshore. Well, certainly goodness, one would have thought that would have been the end would it not? Did the offshore show up in the last election in 1985? What was that election called for? Oh yes, this was to be the beginning of the ultimate in Newfoundland. This was to be the utopia! We were finally going to reach the utopian era in Newfoundland. Imagine, we

were going to enter the land of milk and honey. Finally we were going to arrive at the new Jerusalem. What was it? A Tory government in Ottawa! "Elect us so that negotiating over the offshore will be a cinch. There will be nothing to it! Just elect us now and we will be in the land of milk and honey and Mr. Mulroney said he was not going to be afraid to inflict prosperity on Newfoundland."

MR. PATTERSON:

Where were you in 1982? Afraid to run, apparently.

MR. LUSH:

That is the reason why I came back, I could not stomach the Premier out that and I said, "If there is one thing that I can do, at least I can ensure that there is one district that he will not get" and what a fight it was!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

I caved in to the great pressure from Bonavista North. Every since I was a member, the people of Bonavista North wanted me to run there. Every time there would be an election, my phone would just about be torn off the wall with calls from people from Bonavista North. I got out of politics never to come back and when the election was called the phone started ringing and I said, "I cannot let the people from Bonavista North down. First and foremost I must do what I can to defeat this Premier!" I would have run in St. John's East if there was no other seat available. I would have run in

Pleasantville where I have been living.

MR. BAIRD:

What about Terra Nova? Why did you not run in Terra Nova?

MR. LUSH:

I would have run in Terra Nova and if the hon. gentlemen keep taunting me, I might do it! I might do it this time if they keep taunting me! I would run in Terra Nova where I would be assured of election. Hon. members know it and the present member for Terra Nova knows it. If he were here, I tell you, he would be telling his members to stop taunting me or he would have to go to the bathroom right quick. He would be going to the bathroom pretty quick if he heard hon. members taunting me to go to Terra Nova. That is why I came back because I knew, Mr. Speaker, the kind of prosperity that Mr. Mulroney was going to inflict upon Newfoundland. I wanted to be a part of the team that was going to try and stop that. It was a little too powerful and we could not stop it. Naturally again, the people of Newfoundland wanted to see what it looked like. They never, ever got a true belt of Toryism between the eyes, they never, ever got a load of it and now they are getting it! Now they are getting plenty of it. I will tell you hon. members something, there will never again be in Newfoundland, in our memory, two governments of the same political strip, particularly two Tory governments. Never in our living time there will not be two Tory governments, one in Ottawa and one in Newfoundland.

What saved the Tories over the past few years was that your first Premier was a Liberal. Premier Moores, the statesman, he was a

Liberal and that sort of saved him but, there was a Liberal government in Ottawa. Now, under this administration the true, blue Tories have begun to take over the party and, apparently, Premier Peckford is not as strong as Mr. Moores was. He was not able to beat back the onslaught of Toryism within his caucus but, Premier Peckford cannot do. So, Toryism is beginning to reign and now we have got it federally. For a little while Mr. Mulroney thought he might be doing all right but, he cannot keep back the ultraconservatism in his party, the Mr. Nielsens and the Mr. Stevenses who want to slash the social security programmes of Canada. He is not going to hold these back and he is going downgrade faster than I do not know what, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing ever lost support as fast as this Tory government, never, and taking the provincial government down with them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

No, I have told hon. members about how the West got their minerals and how differently it was. Hon. member certainly should be aware of that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a couple of more points. I talked about just observing how this bill was presented, how that would quash and squash any notions or opinions that this was to be a great bill.

MR. REID:

Are you going to vote for that bill?

MR. LUSH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am likely to

vote for this bill. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker?

MR. YOUNG:

Because it is a good bill.

MR. LUSH:

This bill should have been brought in at a high level of debate but the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) ruined that when he came in here, as I have said before, to try and further keep this enveloped in a political cloud along the lines of how this idea was always developed by the Tories since 1978, to make it nothing but political rhetoric. That is what the member for St. John's East did.

I would have preferred that this bill was brought in on a high level or sophisticated level of debate and debated for what it was, an ordinary document, an ordinary agreement with many of the major weaknesses that have been with every agreement ever negotiated by any government in this Province. That is what this bill is. This bill has a major weakness in the same manner that every industrial bill and every industrial initiative ever undertaken by any government of Newfoundland has had. It has got that same weakness. What is it? That it has relegated us to primary producers. It has kept us at the level of primary producers, that still this big money eludes us. The Premier's elusive dream. This big money eludes us because we are not not going to get any refining or any manufacturing.

Go back and look at every bill that has been signed by any government of this Province and that is what has happened to us. It happened to us right from the days of the fishing admirals when

we just caught the fish and we are still practically just catching them. This government made a deal like that. We have been ripped off by industrialists ever since John Cabot came here in 1497. We have been ripped off by the greedy, grubby grab-alls who wanted to stuff their own pockets.

That is why I said, when I started off, that it looks like this bill indeed was signed by humans, that there was no divinity. I could see no evidence of any divinity here or any infallibility in this bill. This was less than a perfect bill, that I could see some imperfections and the imperfections were these that I have named.

This is the level on which I would like to have seen this debate go. But the minister of petroleum or the offshore, whatever he is minister for -

MR. W. CARTER:

The part-time minister.

MR. LUSH:

The part-time minister, yes. And the Minister of Finance, both these hon. gentlemen, got into the political realm of trying to make people believe how the Liberals were trying to treat us as barbarians and that they were trying to take everything we had. I can assure hon. members that they would not have signed this Atlantic Accord with the Liberals. They used it for their political purposes until they had to take less than a perfect accord. They had to take something that was second rate because they used up their options, they continually used it for their political purposes, as I have demonstrated. They went



through three elections using it. If hon. member had their own way, they would try it for a fourth.

Hon. members must have heard the hon. the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) saying that the bill is not going to pass now. He is going to try and put the bill over into the next session. They have got so little going for them they would like to hang on to this bill for the next three years and try and bluff the people of Newfoundland that we are going to finally enter the land of milk and honey, that we finally arrived, that we are all going to be sheiks. Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland know differently. They started in 1975, talking about this. It is 1986 and we have not got anything going yet, not a thing going yet.

We have been in the exploration stage for ten years with this government. We have been in it longer than that, of course, for twenty years but that is all we have seen. In the meantime, they have called three elections. At one moment taking the people of Newfoundland up to the very summit of the mountain and then letting them down. I knew what I did, Mr. Speaker, when they took me to the top of the mountain, I puked. That is what I did, Mr. Speaker, I puked when they took me to the top of the mountain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I could very easily rationalize the erratic behavior and childish behavior of hon. members opposite. You know, I

have never seen the decorum of this House so low as it has been in the last few months. You can draw your generalizations from that. You can say that it represents a certain calibre of candidate that has come here who does not have the ability to debate at certain levels. Then the kinds of nonsense that they get on with: Resign, quit. You know, the Kindergarten stuff. Instead of being here talking about the issues of the day, this nonsense. And the member for Burin (Mr. Tobin) over there making little remarks back and forth. If a member just did not get them, he goes off laughing to kill himself, just like the fellows I used to teach in Grade VI and VII down in the back of the room. You know how they all get in the back of the room. He thinks he is funny. I think the Premier would do well to get them all together and to give them some lessons in how the House should operate and the kinds of issues they should debate. But, of course, I do not know. He probably would have a hard job on his hands to do that.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, to go on to a couple of more points. I pointed out why people should have their notions dashed if they thought this would be a very lucrative bill for Newfoundland.

There are two points I want to make about it before I conclude. These are: The time factor and to say that this agreement again has a major weakness, the same weakness that every industrial initiative had in this Province in that we are going to be denied the maximum money, the maximum potential of this development because we are only going to be producers of oil.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Pumpers.

MR. LUSH:

We are only going to be pumpers of oil. We are not going to get the secondary industry where the money is. In every development in the world, the cream, the big money, comes from the secondary development, from the manufacturing and, with oil, from the refining, the processing, the manufacturing and the petro-chemical development that we are not going to have. All we are going to be doing is pumping oil.

I can assure hon. members they would never have agreed to an agreement like that with Chretien as they might say and most of them cannot even say it. They would not have signed a deal like that with Mr. Chretien, let me assure you. But now here they are, signing a deal much less inferior than Mr. Chretien was going to give them and trying to make the people of Newfoundland believe that this is the best thing since sliced bread and apple pie.

Mr. Speaker, so these are the two points I want to develop. The time factor, this Accord could have been signed years ago and been much better, but the Premier wanted to win two elections and, together with the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), they put their own political interests, their desire for political power ahead of what was best for Newfoundland and there is no doubting that. Why three elections? Do you think the people of Newfoundland are stupid? The facts are there. They do not believe that and yet, I suppose, they believe the member for St. John's East when he gets up blaming all those decisions on

the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). If they believe that, they still believe in Santa Claus. Mr. Speaker, if they do not believe the logic of what I am saying, the facts are there. Three elections called since 1979 and the Premier facilitated, as I have said, from complete control, "we are going to settle for nothing else other than complete control and ownership," he facilitated from that to joint management, to, "Yes, Sir, we will take whatever you give us." These were the positions from which the Premier facilitated up and down making political points all along the way about it, trying to stay in power. That is what happened.

MR. MARSHALL:

Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

MR. LUSH:

No, no questions.

The hon. member is going to get a chance to clue up this debate and continue on with his convoluted logic developed a couple of days ago. That is what the hon. minister is going to do and I am not going to allow him to interrupt my train of thought at the moment. He is afraid that the people of Newfoundland will hear some truth, that is what he is afraid of. The hon. member is a great believer to in whatever is said the people will believe it, if it is said often enough.

MR. TOBIN:

Time is up Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH:

I have heard the occasional person throughout the Province say, 'Leo is jealous,' and it came from the minister responsible for energy and the offshore.

Anyway these are the two points, Mr. Speaker, the time factor. Now what did the time factor do? The time factor and the fact that we have here just an ordinary agreement, an agreement that contains the major weakness that every industrial agreement contained in this Province, number one, that we are just going to be pumbers of oil. We are going to miss out on the secondary manufacturing. We are going to miss out on the secondary aspects of the industry which give us the money, which give us the cream, and that is the same weakness that was in every deal that ever a government of this Province signed which shows me, again, that this crowd did no better than most other hon. crowds that proceeded them. They faced the same difficulty.

I heard the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) yesterday giving the obvious, something that we have all know, but hon. gentlemen opposite never expected that this is a hard Province and our economy is such that it is difficult to make any deals with companies. That has been a problem we have had ever since we began. As I said, we have been ripped off starting with the Newfoundland railway. It has not been easy.

To hear hon. gentleman talk, I remember twelve or fifteen years ago, you would not know but the Premier was out beating off industrialists day after day who wanted to come in here wanting to develop our Province. You would not know but he had to take a big stick and go out and get them away from my door, I cannot deal with them this morning. It is difficult. The same factors make it difficult and they have been there ever since we had government

in this Province. Our geography, the distance from the market, our climate, sure, all of these things make it difficult, but hon. gentlemen never thought that. They thought 'let them in and they will make the good deal.' Well, there deal is fraught with weaknesses, the same weaknesses that have been in every deal.

But what does the time factor do, by delaying for political purposes? What did it do? It stopped us from generating employment for our people. In a time of high unemployment, our people could have been working. They could have had this moving and we would not have had thousands of people out there unemployed. We could have had this moving. People would have been employed instead of playing political games and making this a political football the way they did. We have lost training time.

Where are we with training and research? Will hon. gentlemen sit up and listen to that? Do they know? Where are we with training and research? Have we lost out on training? What has been going on? Yes, \$35 million yesterday, and this has been going on since 1975. Where are the trained people? What were we doing before this?

MR. TOBIN:

The Liberals would not give us any.

MR. LUSH:

Yes, Liberals again. That is the level of their mentality, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals again. That is the only language they know.

MR. SIMMS:

You attacked a Tory.

MR. LUSH:

I have not attacked a Tory. It is the level of their language, Mr. Speaker. I am just asking a straightforward question, are we behind the eight ball? We have no training programmes so that our people can go out there and get the big jobs instead of getting the menial jobs, getting the managerial positions and the supervisory and the superintendencies, getting those jobs. Why did we not send our people where there is oil development, sponsor them and train them so that we could get those jobs. We start a training programme now but, every training programme worth its salt is going to take three or four years. Where are you going to train a person in five or six months? Unless it is this great Jobs Strategy Programme that the federal government has out. Whoever heard of training a person in less than three or four years? Now that person has to get experience. In three or four years it is going to be 1990. Now when the person goes out to get the job, "Oh, you have to have experience." And you tell me we are not behind the eight ball by starting training programmes now.

I certainly hope that hon. gentlemen will tell me four years from now how many people are employed in the offshore and what positions they are in. I hope that they are up here and not down there. I do not want to be a prophet of gloom and doom, Mr. Speaker, but one has to realize the facts that we have not had a training programme. We have had no training programme in place. Do you know what our training programme has amounted to? An MED course! That is what our programme has amounted to and they have played politics with that to

the hilt. They have played politics with that. Where have they put it? The MED Programme, the basic requirements for Newfoundlanders who want to enter into any kind of marine activity and where do they get the training? Here in St. John's! They cannot get it anywhere else in Newfoundland, they have to come here to St. John's to get it.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the only type of training programme that we have had. Yes, I welcomed the news yesterday of the \$34 million. I welcomed the news to train our young Newfoundlanders and Newfoundlanders not so young, so that they can get the maximum benefit of our offshore, so that they can get there work and so that they can get the top jobs. But why did we not have some programme together five or six years ago where we took these young people and took them to where there were oil fields and gave them training. If they have been doing it, it must have been done secretly. I have not heard about it. It it has been done tell us how many. When the member gets up to speak tell us how many. What have we called the programme? What has it been called? When the member gets up to speak he can tell me.

MR. TOBIN:

We have eighteen from Marystown Shipyard Ltd. now in Norway.

MR. LUSH:

Eighteen, very good.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

Well, that is fine. I am glad to hear that. I am glad to hear it.

MR. SIMMS:

If you were doing your job you would have found out about that stuff like that.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, who would take any recognition of eighteen when we have 30,000 to 40,000 people out there waiting to be trained. Who would hear of 18? That is a stupid statement made by the Minister, Mrs. MacDonald, when somebody told her about the high unemployment down in Newfoundland. She said, we just granted a project with ten jobs, that is what Mrs. MacDonald said. What a disgrace to have the affrontry and to have the audacity to say that in a public forum that we are giving jobs down in Newfoundland, "I just signed one yesterday," ten jobs and we with 80,000 people down here unemployed. No wonder that would bounce off somebody. Nobody would listen to that.

MR. W. CARTER:

Now that is twenty-eight, eighteen from Marystown.

MR. LUSH:

Eighteen people.

MR. TOBIN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

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

MR. TOBIN:

The hon. member referring to the training programmes? I must say I do take exception to the comments from him and certainly the counselling he is receiving from the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter). We do have a shipyard in Marystown, Mr. Speaker, that is owned by this government. The

government has shown initiative by taking twelve professional engineers and sending them to Norway for a one year to work directly on a concrete platform. Also, they had something like eighteen of their management people who will be trained in Norway. There are six of them over there right now for a four month period and there are two other lots of six to go.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is significant. I do not think it is anything to be jeered at and laughed at by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). We are training people. The Marystown Shipyard has shown leadership, Mr. Speaker, and it should not be allowed to continue.

While I am on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like some clarification on how much time the hon. gentleman has left to speak.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do you want to speak to that point or order?

MR. LUSH:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. The hon. member has provided some information and, obviously, there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

On the matter of time, I have asked the Clerk to see what the arrangement has been. My understanding is that there was an arrangement between the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), who moved the bill, that whatever time that minister used, the person responding would have an equal amount of time. Beyond that, it is unclear as to what the

arrangement was. So I have asked the Clerk to determine that for us.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I think all members of this House recognize that we are into a serious debate on an issue that is of tremendous importance to this Province. We indicated that we were prepared to permit members on the other side to go over their allotted time period, if they had matters that required their speaking longer than would normally be the case. We understood that this was the arrangement under which this debate took place. We would hate to see that agreement now being broken because of the tremendous oratory of my learned friends starting to go to the quick of members opposite.

The fact that the member is saying something that a member on the other side does not like, Mr. Speaker, should not be cause for interfering with this arrangement and curtailing the debate. We stood up, Mr. Speaker. We listened to the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) take, as the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) has said, more than three-quarters of his time on matters unrelated to the bill, matters of petty partisan politics. We did not stand up and object and try and renege on the agreement we have made. Just because we do not like debate, it is no reason, Mr. Speaker, for them getting up and saying, we gave you leave to debate as long as you say things that we like.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is nobody here going to unduly prolong debate. I think debate has gone very, very smoothly over the last several days.

The member for Bonavista North is in full flight. He has slipped the surly bonds of earth and, Mr. Speaker, is dancing the skies of the greatest oratory at the present time, making killing points.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
That is no reason for members opposite to get up and try and interfere with his speech, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
Any deal that was made was made on the floor of this House. It was done and the records of Hansard will show it. My understanding of the situation was that before the bill was introduced, I think it was the Friday before the Monday, I requested from the point of view of planning as to whether or not I could have more than the hour allowed in the Standing Orders. It was agreed that I could and then it was assumed, it would have been assumed in that particular case, that the person responding, who is the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), would be accorded the same courtesy. But

it certainly was not my understanding that there was any deal that every member would have unlimited time to speak in this particular debate. I understand that that is the way the proceedings have applied for all of the speakers on both sides, but I just want to say it is my understanding that the normal rules would apply after that.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The record will show it, Mr. Speaker, and that is our understanding of the agreement, and they agreed. The test is one of reasonableness and surely there is no member here saying that the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) has spoken at unreasonable length. It has to be mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance went over the allotted time and that was accepted. Other members on this side have gone over. I do not know about other members apart from the minister, I have not been keeping track, but I do know that the Minister of Finance was given the opportunity of going over the time, and it is in Hansard, Mr. Speaker.

I know that they are hurting and I know, Mr. Speaker, now that the Accord has seen the light of day -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am ready to make a ruling on the matter if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is through.

MR. BARRY:

If I could just finish briefly, Mr. Speaker. One has to wonder whether there is any point in anybody saying anything when we consider the approach taken by the Premier, where he said there are going to be no changes, no further changes. They have admitted a mistake as far as Clause 54 is concerned. The Premier has said, 'Now, that is it. No more changes.' So what is the point of debate from the point of view of the Premier? What is his concept of the House of Assembly if he is not prepared to listen to members on both sides to point out where there might be inadequacies or even typographical errors, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council. I will hear one more point and then I will make a ruling.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will just be brief, Mr. Speaker. I just reiterate that that was not my understanding of any such arrangement that was made here. The hon. gentleman has spoken, yes, for a long period of time. It is length, it is certainly not quality. We could sum up what the hon. gentleman said in about two minutes at the very most. As to the hon. gentleman there opposite, the Leader of the Opposition, we would hope that there would be meaningful debate with respect to this particular measure.

I look forward particularly to hearing him speak at length myself as to why he, in effect, committed the most dastardly act in the

history of this Province by leaving the Cabinet and destroying the united front of the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador with respect to this. I am interested in hearing his explanation with respect to that. But there is no need, Mr. Speaker, in order to get that explanation, for people to speak ad infinitum. We probably would not be up on our feet but for the fact that the hon. the member for Bonavista North's speech this morning has been so bereft of any kind of depth at all and without any substance whatsoever. If we are going to have a debate, let us make it meaningful.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
Can I draw Your Honour's attention to Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Yes, I have Hansard, Now, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition will take his seat, I will ask the hon. member for Bonavista North to resume his comments, if he wishes, while I am referring to the Hansard, and then I will make a ruling.

MR. LUSH:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly will not take up much more time. Your Honour, I just want to recapitulate, as I am prone to do and used to doing, to make sure that everybody understands the burden and the essence of what it was that I was trying to put across to hon. members. Mr. Speaker, I started out by saying that anybody with any sense at all, anybody in the general public or anybody in the House of Assembly for that matter, if they had any notions that this

was to be the document that the Premier has tried to pretend to the people of the Province that it is, should have had these notions quashed and squashed when they saw the method by which the Premier introduced this Bill.

First of all, by not having this bill in his own name showed that the Premier was not as proud of this as he ordinarily might have been, and he demonstrated that by putting the bill in the name of the Minister responsible for Offshore Resources.

Secondly, the low, partisan, political manner in which the minister introduced this bill was further evidence that there was nothing to the contents of this bill, nothing unusual, nothing spectacular, nothing dazzling, nothing extraordinary, just an ordinary piece of legislation that one enters into when negotiating with anybody in an industrial sense, Mr. Speaker.

I want to talk about what I thought were two major weaknesses associated with this whole Atlantic Accord, I want to identify two points. First of all, I talked about the time factor, how we wasted time and what that resulted in, and I will recapitulate on this again, and the second point I want to allude to is, considering everything, this is just an ordinary bill fraught with the weaknesses that have attended every piece of legislation or every agreement ever entered into with a company, or government to government, that this Province has ever negotiated with and that it kept us away from the big money, it made us just pumbers of oil, primary producers, in other words. It does not allow us the opportunity to get in where



the big dollars are and that is in the secondary industry, in the refining and in the manufacturing and in the petro-chemical area, because we are not allowed to have any of that in this Province. We are only going to be pumpers of oil and, therefore, we are not going to get all the money that we can get. Are we glad to have that? Yes, Mr. Speaker, anything that is beneficial to Newfoundland we are glad to have. We are glad that we have a deal, but is it the best deal? We say no, it is not the best deal.

In this bill are many imperfections and these imperfections were brought about by the method of negotiation used by the Premier over the past seven or eight years. The Premier used the offshore for his own political purposes, for his own political advancement at the expense of the people of this Province. That is what the Premier did and because of that the Premier boxed himself into a corner, got himself into a position where he could not negotiate. He got himself into a position where he was forced to take what the federal government gave him, what Mr. Mulroney gave him. He got caught in that position and therein, Mr. Speaker, lies the weakness of this particular bill. So, it is not the extraordinary bill, it is not the bill that is going to put us in the sun, as the Premier so often referred to. It is not that kind of lucrative deal! It is not going to put us in the sun, it is not going to put us in the land of milk and honey, it is not going to be the new Jerusalem, and the reason for that was the way that the Premier himself bungled and mismanaged the whole affair by trying to gain political points out of it since 1979.

I think I have made the case, Mr. Speaker, very clearly and unequivocally. What else could a government be doing when they had three elections on one issue? Now, how do you classify that? How could people answer if I were to ask people the question, why did the Premier have three elections on the offshore? Was that for the benefit of Newfoundland? Why could he not negotiate a deal after the election in 1979, when the people gave him overwhelming support. They believed the Premier and they said, 'Yes, we want to own our resources, now, Mr. Premier, we will go and vote for you, and you go and finalize the deal with Mr. Clark who told you before the election that you were going to have uncontested ownership.' The people gave approval but what happened? Mr. Clark could not do that. Mr. Clark knew he could not do it, but he gave Mr. Peckford the out.

How circumstances intervened. Mr. Clark got out of it because the people threw him out of power. The people threw Mr. Clark out of power and then they had to go back and negotiate with the Liberal Government. When they had to do that, ball game over, they were going to sign no deal. And everytime they were close to signing a deal, they would throw in another volley and disrupt the thing. So it went on until 1982. It is not too late to make a new beginning. 'It is not too late', as the Premier is so prone to quoting Ulysses. I do not believe though he has the spirit or the adventure and the zeal that Ulysses displayed. It is not too late to make a new beginning so in 1982, call on the people again. 'Somehow we have fallen down. We have not got that deal, give us

one more chance. Give us your support one more time', and they did it in 1982. They gave him overwhelming support, which just about destroyed the Liberal Party, and that is what the Premier was interested in. He was more interested in the destruction of the Liberal Party than he was in signing a deal. 1982 just about wiped out the Liberal Party, just about saw the demise, except that a few brave stalwarts were able to overcome it, Mr. Speaker. A few of us brave souls over here were able to withstand the onslaught. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the member for Port au Port, the member for Torngat Mountains - what other members were there? - and there was the member for Terra Nova. Seven or eight of us were able to stem the tide, Mr. Speaker, but in 1983 two members, in particular, thought they could not go once more, they thought they could not take it once more, fighting the Premier. They thought they could not do it. They got clay feet, they thought they could not do it. Oh, they did not cross on a matter of principle. The member for Bellevue, another one of the stalwarts who overcame, got back here in 1982. That said something about us, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the issue arose just a short while ago about the length of time in speaking and I think it was generally agreed that we were waiting for Your Honour's ruling on this. Nevertheless, I think it was sort of generally agreed that

as long as people were saying something sensible about the bill, that leave would be given to allow the debate to go on. But I do not think the hon. member is now really talking about the bill. And not only is he not talking about the bill, he is not even talking about anything sensible. You know, he is even misinterpreting what he is talking about when he is talking about the election. But quite apart from that, it certainly has nothing to do with the bill and I wonder if he is not moving outside what has been generally agreed in the House?

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Maybe we should do the same thing in this House with respect to debate as the Premier has decided should be done with respect to determining the appropriateness of art, maybe we should pass it over to the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) and let him decide who on this side of the House, or the other side of the House, is having anything sensible to say in debate. I can understand the Minister of Finance's logic, you see, because that is the logic that is being applied as far as the arts community is concerned, and I can understand if you are going to have censorship in one area, yes, why do we not have it in the House of Assembly as well? Why do we not cut off debate when members here are saying things government does not like to listen to? Sure, Mr. Speaker, why do you not put that to a vote and see if the

majority in this House want the Minister of Public Works and Services to become the censorship czar in the House of Assembly, as he is on the street?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has brought up another point that has to be answered. He brought the arts thing into this point of order and I do not think that can be left hanging there, it has to be answered.

I am sure all hon. members will have heard the gentleman on radio this morning, I think he had something to do with the Canadian Arts Council, he was a local president or something. He spoke very eloquently on this whole thing, but he brought up two points that he did not answer: One, what will we do with the thing? And two, who will have it? Now, there have been suggestions made as to what we will do with the thing. There are no cultural emblems out on the Grand Banks, so one suggestion is that we should have that portrayal of whatever it is be our first cultural emblem out on the Grand Banks, preferably in about sixty meters of water. The other point was, who will have the thing? The suggestion has been made that there is a group who collect pieces of art which are the most abysmally offensive and abysmally inept, and it is suggested that we might donate this to that particular group of people; they are collecting these and they have a whole museum of pieces of art that are of absolutely no artistic value whatever. Perhaps we could donate it to them. Now, this is a

little bit off what we were talking about when we started the point of order, but the hon. Leader of the Opposition brought up the issue so I thought we had better answer it.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could just briefly to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we, I think, would go along immediately with that last suggestion by the Minister of Finance and we would support having that object of art hung in that group's common room, which is the government member's common room downstairs.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you, Your Honour. Mr. Speaker, it is funny about hon. gentlemen opposite, that whenever you start getting to the core, the truth, it is up on a point of order to try and disrupt the train of thought of the Speaker so that he will not be able to develop the theme that he was developing.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking about how the Premier had called the election in 1982 on the issue of the offshore and how seven or eight of us here were able to survive that onslaught. I was just naming the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) because I forgot him, and I cannot see how I could forget because he put on a great battle out there in the district of Bellevue. And both the member

for Torngat (Mr. Warren) and the member for Port au Port put on great battles and they won, but in 1985, Mr. Speaker, they got clay feet. How could they go out there and fight again when the Premier was once more going out with his motherhood call, 'Support me in negotiating a deal on the offshore?' It was hard to do! Of course, you could not tell the people not to vote for it, it is just that you had to tell them, 'Look, that is nothing but a big colossal bluff!' And how correct I was. I can go out with a straight face and with a clear conscience and face the people, both in the Speaker's district of Terra Nova and in my own district of Bonavista North, and say, 'Now, am I not right? Here it is, 1986, and we are still not getting a plugged nickel from the offshore.' I do not know how the two hon. gentlemen can do it now, but the greatest charge I get out of that whole episode is from the remark made by the former Leader of the Opposition when they crossed the floor, Mr. Neary. I think he made the reference to the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), in particular. He said he was glad they left when they did, because he anticipated this big election coming on. He said, 'Imagine going to war and being led over the top by the member for Port au Port and the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). Imagine having gutsy people like that around you and being led over the top.' He said, 'I am glad they left.'

MR. TULK:

He would not want them at his back.

MR. LUSH:

He would not want them at his back when he was going over the top. Well, we went into that election

on the broad of our backs, we went into that election again with the call for motherhood, for Newfoundlanders to rally around the flag, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Would the hon. the member for Bonavista North take his seat?

MR. LUSH:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have reviewed the Hansard in relation to the question of unlimited time, I have consulted with the staff, and my interpretation in reading Hansard and discussing it is as follows: The President of the Council rose in his place and asked for leave to be given unlimited time in moving the bill and indicated that a similar arrangement would apply to the other side, and we have interpreted this to mean, as regards to many other precedents where such a situation occurs, that the person responding to the mover, in this case the President of the Council - whatever member on the Opposition side - would also have unlimited time.

In reading Hansard, I find that the Leader of the Opposition in responding said, 'agreed' and said that as far as the Opposition were concerned, any or all members could have unlimited time, to which there was no response from the government side. However, a number of members have spoken in the debate over and above the person who responded to the mover, the President of the Council, and no objections were raised. I would determine that this is the reason the Chair did not interrupt, because no objections were raised.

My ruling would be, therefore, that as long as no objections are raised as it pertains to any other member of the House, either side, then the person would go on beyond the time allotted in the Standing Order. However, if an objection is raised by any member, then the Standing Order allowing a half hour would apply. I, therefore, would rule that the member for Bonavista North should wind up his speech.

MR. BARRY:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would rule that the member for Bonavista North should conclude his speech, as he has gone overtime quite a bit.

MR. BARRY:

What?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

He has gone overtime quite a bit with no objection, and that is proper. The minute the objection was registered, I had to go and rule on the basis of that. That is my ruling.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Your Honour has obviously overlooked page L4362, February 7, 1986 where the Government House Leader is dealing with this point and says, 'The fact of the matter is, this is a novel type of legislative process' - referring

back to the federal one - 'one that has not been done in this Province before,' - in other words, the necessity of tying in ours with the federal process - 'and perhaps not in Canada before, so you have to adapt yourself and accommodate yourself to different modes and methods. In recognizing that I was hoping, in a forthcoming way, to give the Opposition plenty and adequate time to respond. But that is fine!'

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been proceeding on the clear understanding and assumption of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) that he had agreed and accepted to this. And we would ask the Government House Leader to adhere to that understanding, that members on all sides of the House, on such a crucially important issue, will have the time that they consider necessary and that the test, Mr. Speaker, should be one of reasonableness, and that is a test that it has not become necessary to strain at up to this point in time.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Government House Leader to restrain the members in his backbench who, when matters are raised that they do not agree with, feel that then the appropriate thing to do is to cut off debate. For heavens sake, do we want to make sure that this legislation is properly scrutinized, that we have the best possible package? Do we want to avoid the errors which members opposite indicate they feel were made in the Upper Churchill contract? Do we want to have a flawed piece of legislation come out of this debate because we have cut off members from having the opportunity to speak? Is that

what members are saying?

Mr. Speaker, we strongly, strongly object, in the strongest possible terms, that we not be muzzled in this debate, particularly in light of the fact that we had a clear agreement as is evidenced by the language used in Hansard and is evidenced by the precedent that has been set by the previous speakers. We object very strongly, now that members are hearing things that they do not like, that they try and cut off debate on this Atlantic Accord. It is shameful, it is shocking and, Mr. Speaker, it is not something that we, in the Opposition, can put up with.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The first thing, the hon. gentleman interprets things as the hon. gentleman wishes to interpret them. One of his problems in this House, if not in life, is that he hears things as he wishes to hear them and he interprets them in the way that he wishes to interpret them, which is not always in accordance with the plain, ordinary, common meaning of words that most people receive.

The very words he read in Hansard, Mr. Speaker, I used when I was referring it to be being a unique piece of legislation from the point of view of being a unique procedure, and so it is. I certainly had said that in the context of stating that this is an act that goes through coincidentally with the companion act in the House of Parliament.

This is very, very unusual. As a matter of fact, it is the first time it has ever occurred in this Legislature, and it may have occurred one or two times in the history of the House of Parliament. So, consequently, it is unique that we bring it through second reading, it will be debated in second reading in the House of Parliament, then it will go through their Committee stage, it will go through our Committee stage, and we want to dovetail it all to be quite sure that the final acts on both sides are identical.

Mr. Speaker, he wants to take everything out of context. That was the context within which that was spoken. It was also spoken within the context that when I asked for unlimited time in introducing the bill I was asking for myself to get as long as I wanted on introduction. I was not asking, Mr. Speaker, for members on this side of the House to get as long as they wished in unlimited time in debate themselves and the record clearly shows that.

When the hon. gentleman said, 'I assume we will have unlimited time to respond,' I said yes, certainly, and I meant the person, obviously, who is responding, as is under the Standing Orders. I could read the Standing Order, but the way it is in the Standing Order the person introducing it gets so many minutes and the person responding. 'Responding' is a parliamentary term which is applicable to the one person.

Now, the hon. gentleman says that nobody in this House who wishes to speak, who has something to say and it is important with respect to this bill, would be accorded a

reasonable time within which to do it. If the allotted time did not work out, then the members of the House, I would suggest, could decide, as they normally do, as to whether leave would be given. Now, what has happened in this particular case this morning is that the hon. member for Bonavista North has gotten up and he has spoken for the better part of two hours, or close to two hours. Mr. Speaker, if he wants to talk about muzzling debate, in our opinion he got off into all sorts of non sequiturs. I mean, they were very relevant, such as the Upper Churchill thing and about what has yet to be reported, but I am sure it will be reported once it is realized about my comments that I made on a Private Member's motion about the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, when he was Minister of Mines and Energy, introducing a bill to take away the rights of Quebec to our power and, at the same time, telling -

MR. BARRY:

What does that have to do with the point of order?.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

He does not want to hear it. - the Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation to go in and oppose it. That is what he was doing. There is nobody being muzzled, Mr. Speaker, in this debate. Anyone who has anything to say of relevance or importance to this bill and they require more than the half hour, or however long, will be accorded leave, I am sure. I just leave it up to the members of this House to decide as to whether the hon. gentleman, in his speech today, needs more time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, we had an agreement with the hon. member, when he was serving as Minister of Energy, that he was going to be like a true Newfoundlander and what he did was he knifed us and the people of Newfoundland in the back and prevented us from having a united front. That is the kind of agreements we have with that trash over there on the other side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The points made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) have not in any way detracted from the interpretation made with regard to what is written in Hansard. As I said, there is a certain amount of ambiguity insofar as the Leader of the Opposition gave agreement and specifically stated members of the House, meaning all members of the House. Where the ambiguity arises on the issue, it seems to me, in reading it and discussing it with the legal staff, is that the hon. President of the Council did not respond to the offer made by the Leader of the Opposition so the issue was left hanging. On the basis of that, hon. members who followed the member on this side, who went next to the President of the Council in debate, were allowed to continue over and beyond time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, by leave in silence because no one objected.

MR. BARRY:

It was not leave in silence, because you intervened.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

You intervened yesterday and you are doing the same thing today. There was no objection.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would hon. members permit me to finish my comments?

In finishing my comments I am simply explaining to hon. members the interpretation that is placed on what is written in Hansard. That is all the Chair has to go on. The other thing the Chair has to go on is advice from legal counsel sitting at the table. I have taken both of those situations into account and the only ruling that I can arrive at, in fairness to both sides, is that members of the House who have gone beyond the time went beyond the time with leave because there was no objection.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret, taking into consideration that Your Honour was the one, who, on a day previous, raised the question of how much time should go on when a member on this side was speaking, raised it himself without any objection being raised by this House, and taking into consideration that the Speaker did not raise it when the Minister of

Finance (Dr. Collins) went on for over an hour - as long as the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) has gone on - and taking into consideration that there was no objection today other than a question, Mr. Speaker, which Your Honour should have treated as a hypothetical until there was an objection raised, it is with great regret that we must appeal Your Honour's ruling.

Stand up gentlemen.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Hon members are quite familiar with the procedure in appealing the ruling of the Chair. The remarks made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition are accurate in one sense. I did raise the matter of time in relation to the hon. member, and I have raised the matter with regards to time because I was not aware of any arrangement for all members of the House to have unlimited time.

MR. BARRY:

There was no objection raised!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It was raised because I am aware of the fact that hon. members have a half an hour and when they go beyond that it is a natural thing for the Chair to raise it. When I told there was an arrangement, the hon. member was allowed to continue. It was raised today. It has not been raised since then. The Chair did not intervene. The Chair did not interrupt. An hon. member of the House got up and raised a question. On the basis of that, the ruling has been made.



MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we ask that this matter be put to a vote. We appeal Your Honour's ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

We are not going to be muzzled on this debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is a motion before the House that the Speaker's ruling be upheld or rescinded.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the 'ayes' have it.

MR. BARRY:

Division.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

All those in favour of the motion, please rise: The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey),

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

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the motion, please rise: the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), Mr. Tulk, Mr. Callan, Mr. Lush, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Baker, Mr. Efford.

MR. SPEAKER:

I declare that the motion has passed.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I am rising on a point of privilege arising out of the remarks made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition incidental to the proceedings that occurred

immediately before we had the division. Mr. Speaker, I do not have the transcript before me, but I heard -

MR. BARRY:  
Well, make it up.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):  
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:  
- Mr. Speaker, quite clearly the hon. gentleman when Your Honour was giving a ruling calling out things like "shameful," indicating that Your Honour had, in a partisan way, interfered and interjected into the debate today in order to preclude the hon. gentleman from speaking. He did not take into account the fact that Your Honour did not and, of course, and never has interjected into the debate. It was a point of order raised by one of the members over there. They constitute dispersions on the Speaker.

I want to quote, Mr. Speaker, from Beauchesne, page 38, Paragraph 117: "The chief characteristics attached to the office of the Speaker in the House of Commons are authority and impartiality.

"He calls upon Members to speak and in debate all speeches are addressed to him. When he rises to preserve order or to give a ruling he must always be heard in silence. No Member may speak when the Speaker is standing." This is most important to the operations of the House, Mr. Speaker. "Reflections upon the character or actions of the Speaker may be punished as breaches of privilege. His actions cannot be criticized incidentally in debate or upon any form of proceeding except by way of a substantive

motion.

"Confidence in the impartiality of the Speaker is an indispensable condition to the successful working of procedure, and many conventions exist which have as their object, not only to ensure the impartiality of the Speaker but also, to ensure that his impartiality is generally recognized."

Mr. Speaker, no parliament or legislature can exist without there being respect for the Speaker. The Speaker, of course, is whoever occupies the position that Your Honour is now. The remarks that the hon. gentleman made were remarks that were obviously dispersions on the character of the Speaker in conducting his office. This Legislature cannot continue with that kind of comment is allowed to go.

Mr. Speaker, that I would ask, I would hope that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) would reflect on it and reflect upon the consequences, of particularly someone in his position doing it, as Leader of the Opposition in this House and the affect that it would have in the House.

Now that we have had this ten minute debate where he is cooled down, because he is obviously very hot under the collar he might think of disposing of this by apologizing to the Chair and withdrawing his remarks.

If not, Mr. Speaker, I think the matter has to be dealt with because nobody can allow that type of comment to go on in this particular House. It is not the case of Your Honour in his

persons, it is the case of the institutions we have inherited in this House. This is the peoples' House of the people of the Province of Newfoundland. We are elected to it and no member is allowed to desecrate this institution. What he is doing really is casting a shame on the people who have elected him as well as all the people of Newfoundland. He should withdraw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, to that matter, I fully realize the seriousness of the matter that is now before this House and I fully realize the seriousness of what I am about to say. Mr. Speaker, -

MR. J. CARTER:

Apologize.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

- we have today seen an issue that is crucial to the future of this Province, Mr. Speaker, government decide that it will proceed to muzzle the Opposition. Because the debate was beginning to point out certain flaws, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite would rather not have pointed out to the people of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

The decision has been made by government to try and muzzle us and to not, Mr. Speaker, fulfill the agreement that was entered

into and which was evidenced, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that not only the Government House Leader, but the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was permitted to go on well in excess of the time normally allotted. There were no notices sent down to the Minister of Finance. There were no questions raised with respect to the Minister of Finance as to how long he was going to be permitted to go on for, Mr. Speaker, and the understanding was that all members would have an opportunity to set out what they felt should be set out with respect to this Accord.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret and realizing the significance of what is happening here, and realizing the significance for the Province if we permit this bill to go through without complete scrutiny, it is with great regret, Mr. Speaker, that I have to reconfirm and reiterate what I said and to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion Your Honour has acquiesced in this attempt by government to muzzle the Opposition and that I have lost confidence in Your Honour to carry on with that essence which was so aptly put by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), Mr. Speaker, that in order for democracy to continue, and in order for this House to continue, there has to be, Mr. Speaker, impartiality and there has to be fairness in the treatment of both sides of this House.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen, as I mentioned earlier, attempts to muzzle the arts community, and maybe we can, maybe the Premier would like to have the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) be the assessor of what should be said in this House as to whether it is something we are allowed to say in

the House of Assembly. Well, this is an issue, Mr. Speaker, which requires full and open debate and requires the Premier of this Province, and members opposite, to open up and start telling the people of this Province what is going on.

For example, is the Premier aware that Bob Blair has now revealed that the Premier's good friend, Ms. Carney, is putting pressure on him to cut back drilling on the Grand Banks and to reduce the number of wells to be drilled, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I will not take orders from the Government House Leader. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, with great regret, that I have lost confidence in the ability of Your Honour to proceed with impartiality and fairness to all sides of this House as evidenced by Your Honour's conduct in acquiescence to the government's attempts to muzzle the Opposition. Gentlemen, it will not work. It will not work. The problems that exist with respect to the Atlantic Accord will be brought out and will be fully debated. It will either be done here or it will be done outside this House, but it will be debated and we will not be muzzled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please! The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

May I just respond to that? It just goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman cannot distinguish between the two situations. Number one, sure it is not correct but it is permissible for a member of the opposite side to say the government is trying to muzzle them. That is always said by the Opposition. In actual fact, nobody is being muzzled at all. Everybody has a full right to get into the debate. That is one of the reasons why the matter was brought up by the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) today, because the hon. gentleman was going on with what we thought was no substance. But that is one thing, Mr. Speaker.

It is another thing altogether, and this is where the hon. gentleman has no perception at all, and one of his biggest dangers, he turns his petulance on the Chair. He cannot distinguish between the two. Now, he has chosen to do it, Mr. Speaker, and he has obviously reiterated his aspersions on the Chair quite openly. So there is only one thing left to do, Mr. Speaker: I move that the hon. gentleman be named in accordance with the rules, and I do so with a certain amount of regret, but, Mr. Speaker, he has to be dealt with. Then there will follow the usual motion that is appropriate to those occasions.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

There is a motion on the floor.  
All those in favour of the motion,  
'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the motion,  
'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the motion is passed  
and I think it is in order for  
Your Honour to name the hon.  
member now. That is the way of  
the procedure. You have to name  
him by name rather than district,  
that is the tradition in which it  
is.

MR. SPEAKER:

Mr. Barry, the hon. member for  
Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. MARSHALL:

The gentleman now, in accordance  
with the rules, must leave the  
Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Boo! Boo!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

We will not be muzzled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

You will have to answer before

this debate is finished.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member should leave the  
Chamber.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, it is customary then  
for the Government House Leader to  
get up and move a motion for the  
time of expulsion of the hon.  
gentleman. Now, what the hon.  
gentleman has done, I would say,  
has warranted an expulsion for a  
much longer period of time, but we  
are in the Atlantic Accord  
legislation and I am sure he would  
love to be expelled from the House  
for the period of time that it is  
on. But we want him back in here  
to respond to this legislation  
and, bearing that in mind, I am  
not going to move that the hon.  
gentleman be suspended for one  
sitting day because it would only  
be for five minutes and it would  
be ineffective, so, Mr. Speaker, I  
move that the hon. the Leader of  
the Opposition be suspended from  
this House for the remainder of  
this sitting and the sitting that  
will occur on Monday.

MR. TULK:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman moved a motion,  
as is his right to do. It is  
customary for the Government House  
Leader to move that motion, but in  
so doing -

MR. MARSHALL:

It is not debatable..

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

I am not debating the motion - but in so doing he has gone beyond the normal limits. Normally, and by precedent, the hon. gentleman from St. John's East should have moved the motion that the hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry) be expelled for the remainder of the sitting day. It just goes to show, Mr. Speaker, the hatred of that hon. gentleman for the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island. That is the reason he wants his two days. He wants to get in his own bile against the hon. member because he has made such a mess of this Atlantic Accord, anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

There is a motion on the floor. All those in favour of the motion, 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the motion, 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

Carried.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Division.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It being one o'clock, is there leave to stop the clock?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour of the motion, please rise: The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Career Development of Career Development and Advanced Studies, the hon. the Minister Forest Resources and Lands, the hon. the Minister of Health, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications, the hon. the President of the Council, the hon. the Minister of Finance, the hon. the President of Treasury Board, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services, the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, the hon. the Minister of Education, the hon. the Minister of Social Services, Mr. Baird, Mr. Greening, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Reid, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Tobin, the hon. the Minister of Environment, Mr. Peach, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Warren, Mr. Woodford.

All those against the motion, please rise: Mr. Tulk, Mr. Callan, Mr. Lush, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Efford, Mr. Baker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I declare the motion passed.

MR. MARSHALL:

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

On Motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday

THE FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Affl.</u>
Mr. K. Aylward	Stephenville	Lib.
The Hon. Mr. R. Aylward	Kilbride	PC
Mr. R. Baird	Humber West	PC
Mr. W. Baker	Gander	Lib.
The Hon. Mr. Barrett	St. John's West	PC
Mr. L. Barry	Mount Scio - Bell Island	Lib.
The Hon. Mr. T. Blanchard	Bay of Islands	PC
The Hon. Mr. C. Brett	Trinity North	PC
The Hon. Mr. J. Butt	Conception Bay South	PC
Mr. W. Callan	Bellevue	Lib.
Mr. J. Carter	St. John's North	PC
Mr. W. Carter	Twillingate	Lib.
Dr. the Hon. J. Collins	St. John's South	PC
The Hon. Mr. R. Dawe	St. George's	PC
Mr. C. Decker	Strait of Belle Isle	Lib.
The Hon. Mr. J. Dinn	Pleasantville	PC
The Hon. Mr. N. Doyle	Harbour Main	PC
Mr. J. Efford	Port de Grave	Lib.
Mr. P. Fenwick	Menihek	NDP
Mr. G. Flight	Windsor-Buchans	Lib.
Mr. C. Furey	St. Barbe	Lib.
Mr. D. Gilbert	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir	Lib.
Mr. G. Greening	Terra Nova	PC
The Hon. Mr. L. Hearn	St. Mary's-The Capes	PC
Mr. T. Hickey	St. John's East Extern	PC
Mr. E. Hiscock	Eagle River	Lib.
Mr. J. Hodder	Port au Port	PC
Mr. J. Kelland	Naskaupi	Lib.
Mr. T. Lush	Bonavista North	Lib.

THE FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

...2...

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Affl.</u>
The Hon. Mr. Wm. Marshall	St. John's East	PC
The Hon. Mr. Wm. Matthews	Grand Bank	PC
Dr. The Hon. P. J. McNicholas	St. John's Centre	PC
Mr. C. Mitchell	LaPoile	PC
Mr. J. Morgan	Bonavista South	PC
The Hon. Mr. G. Ottenheimer	Waterford-Kenmount	PC
Mr. Wm. Patterson	Placentia	PC
Mr. M. Peach	Carbonear	PC
Mr. A. B. Peckford (Premier)	Green Bay	PC
The Hon. Mr. C. Power	Ferryland	PC
Mr. J. Reid	Trinity-Bay de Verde	PC
The Hon. Mr. T. Rideout	Baie Verte - White Bay	PC
The Hon. Mr. J. Russell	Lewisporte	PC
The Hon. Mr. L. Simms	Grand Falls	PC
The Rt. Hon. Mr. R. Simmons	Fortune-Hermitage	Lib.
Mr. G. Tobin	Burin-Placentia West	PC
Mr. B. Tulk	Fogo	Lib.
Dr. The Hon. H. Twomey	Exploits	PC
The Hon. Ms L. Verge	Humber East	PC
Mr. G. Warren	Torngat Mountains	PC
The Hon. Mr. N. Windsor	Mount Pearl	PC
Mr. R. Woodford	Humber Valley	PC
The Hon. Mr. H. Young	Harbour Grace	PC



THE MINISTRY

The Hon. A. Brian Peckford	Premier
Dr. The Hon. P. J. McNicholas	Speaker
The Hon. Mr. R. Aylward	Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
The Hon. Mr. H. Barrett	Development and Tourism
The Hon. Mr. T. Blanchard	Labour
The Hon. Mr. C. Brett	Social Services
The Hon. Mr. J. Butt	Environment
Dr. The Hon. J. Collins	Finance
The Hon. Mr. R. Dawe	Transportation
The Hon. Mr. J. Dinn	Mines and Energy
The Hon. Mr. N. Doyle	Municipal Affairs
The Hon. Mr. Wm. Marshall	President of the Council/ Government House Leader/ Minister responsible for Petroleum Directorate/ Nfld. and Labrador Hydro
The Hon. Mr. Wm. Matthews	Culture, Recreation and Youth
The Hon. Mr. G. Ottenheimer	Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Mr. C. Power	Career Development and Advanced Studies
The Hon. Mr. T. Rideout	Fisheries
The Hon. Mr. J. Russell	Consumer Affairs and Communications
The Hon. Mr. L. Simms	Forest Resources and Lands
Dr. The Hon. H. Twomey	Health
The Hon. Ms L. Verge	Justice
The Hon. Mr. N. Windsor	President of Treasury Board
The Hon. Mr. H. Young	Public Works and Services